

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.
Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There were well over 100 Questions on Notice this week, and I am informed that today's Notice Paper now shows 80 Questions on Notice to be answered when Parliament resumes on Tuesday next. On previous experience, we can expect many more. It is frankly impossible for us to process the detailed answers which are sought to that number of questions in a week. If honourable members persist in putting so many questions on the Notice Paper, I am afraid we will be faced with the fact that it will not be possible for us to process the answers in time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government is perfectly prepared to deal with Questions on Notice within reason, and that is far in excess of what was the tradition of putting Questions on Notice in this House previously.

Mr. Mathwin: When we had two hours for Question Time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The number of Questions on Notice far exceeds the number of questions that could have been asked during a two-hour Question Time. Unless we have a reasonable list of questions, I am simply warning honourable members that it will be impossible for us to process fully the number of questions at present being asked. I suggest to honourable members, looking at some of the questions put on notice in the past week, that they should consult one another about the questions they are putting on notice, because in numbers of cases different aspects of the same matter are being asked for in detail.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WOMEN'S SHELTERS

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): I seek leave to make a statement.
Leave granted.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am making this explanation to ensure that the House does not misunderstand what I said here yesterday in the same way as it appears my remarks were misunderstood and subsequently printed in today's press report on allegations concerning women's shelters. When the Deputy Leader asked his question yesterday he sought to establish the outcome of investigations officers of my department had made into some (I stress "some") of the allegations concerning Naomi Women's Shelter. My emphasis on the word "some" is deliberate, because there have been many allegations about matters concerning Naomi for a considerable time.

As I did yesterday, I stress again that they are allegations, unproven, unsubstantiated allegations, and in all that I have received there has not yet been one sworn statement. When the member for Hanson asked in a supplementary question whether I had been aware of the allegations made by the Deputy Leader of misconduct and misappropriation of funds at the shelter, I replied "No". I am sure the honourable member will recall that occasion. I took the honourable gentleman literally (I am sure he realised that) and facetiously pointed out that I could not be expected to know what was in the Deputy Leader's head. That was quite correct. I had not been aware of the Deputy Leader's particular set of allegations until he made them. That is the reason for this explanation. But I had previously acknowledged, in my reply to the Deputy Leader, that some of the allegations he had listed were in line with those I had received. If the members check *Hansard* they will see that that is correct.

I also related that the investigation into those allegations revealed a fairly long-standing dispute within the Naomi management structure and that on advice it had been conveyed to those who had made the allegations that, because Naomi was an incorporated body, the matter was one for the Registrar of Companies. In the past few days I have also received reports of a number of allegations concerning an assault involving people associated with the Naomi shelter. If the people involved in this alleged assault were employees of my department, involved in departmental business, I might have an excuse for wanting to know what had happened. They were not, and in those circumstances allegations of assault are a matter for the police. I am sure honourable members will agree with that. I believe that the allegations in question have been taken to the police and are being investigated.

What this whole affair boils down to is defining what powers the Community Welfare Department has in relation to the operation of women's shelters. The department is required to investigate matters concerning the care and protection of children in whatever circumstances they find themselves, and this applies to the Naomi shelter as it applies to any other place in South Australia. My department's liaison officer with women's shelters has not detected any unsatisfactory situation relating to the care of children who from time to time stay at Naomi. Apart from the stone-throwing incident referred to yesterday by the member for Torrens (in fairness to the honourable member, I think it would have been more accurate to say "incidents"), we have no evidence that matters are other than satisfactory. My department's only other power relates to financial matters. Before December, 1976, the Community Welfare Department acted as a clearing house for the Hospitals Department in the disbursement of Federal funds allocated to women's shelters by the Federal Health and Hospitals Commission. Since January 1 last, my department has accepted the responsibility for ensuring that accounting records kept by shelters meet departmental requirements. In the case of Naomi, the department has received an audited statement of the financial position to the end of last financial year, and this has been forwarded to the Hospitals Department. Receipts and payments to the end of December, 1976, have been checked and, although not audited, appear to be satisfactory.

Now that my department is responsible for the accounting procedures, quarterly statements of receipts and expenditures for the previous three months are required before the subsequent quarter's payment is made to the shelter. The final quarter allocation of \$14 650 is now due and payable to Naomi. Ms. Willcox has been informed that it

will not be forwarded until a statement of receipts and expenditures covering the three months to the end of March has been supplied to my department.

Mr. Millhouse: Audited?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member is notorious for anticipating, so I deliberately will not reply to that interjection. The Naomi management will also be required to submit an audited annual statement of accounts at the end of this financial year.

That is where my department's powers stand in relation to women's shelters, but this is not an indication that I am disinterested in other matters. As I pointed out yesterday to the Deputy Leader, a women's shelter committee has been established on my suggestion and has accepted the task of setting down guidelines for the good government and operation of women's shelters. The sum of \$50 000 of State Government money for new or established women's shelters is now being distributed on the basis of that committee's recommendations to me. The expenditure of that money by the shelters will be accounted for in the same way as other grant moneys issued by my department. I am grateful for the constructive way in which the women's shelter committee has tackled the issues of shelters generally, and I am confident that it will continue to form a valuable bridge between my department and shelters throughout the State. This Government has demonstrated time and time again that it is willing to give all the support possible to community self-help organisations. There would be few organisations in the State entitled to as much praise as the women who helped get women's shelters off the ground. They had to battle for community acceptance against considerable prejudice, and the number of women who have used the shelters since their inception is an indication that the founders were on the right track.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: Before we start Question Time I wish to make an announcement. On Thursday, March 31, I gave an undertaking to the House that I would investigate the claim made by the honourable member for Fisher relating to an agreement reached some years ago regarding Question Time. Having investigated the position, I can find no evidence to support this claim in any of the records available to me. However, whilst the honourable member for Fisher expressed concern about the small number of members who were called on to ask questions, in fact many supplementary questions were asked by way of interjection and answered. My investigation of the question period referred to revealed that 11 members asked questions when called, but 37 questions were asked by way of interjection of which 30 were answered. I draw members' attention to Question Time yesterday, when interjections were at a minimum and 21 questions were answered other than by interjection.

Mr. Millhouse: It was a dull day, though.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would therefore ask for the co-operation of all members of this House to enable the maximum number of questions to be asked and answered through the Speaker. On the other hand, I warn members that I intend in future to rule out of order all questions asked by way of interjection.

WOMEN'S SHELTERS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare say why he was not aware of the investigation made by the Premier's Women's Adviser into allegations regarding the administration of Naomi Women's Shelter (as well as being unaware of the Premier's involvement in the inquiry)? Does he intend to make any further inquiry into the matter? Yesterday in the House, in spite of his explanation today, the Minister said quite clearly that he was not aware of the allegations outlined by the Deputy Leader, and he was obviously as surprised as everyone else when the Premier rose to add to the Minister's reply. Either the Minister was not aware of the involvement of the Premier's Department in the matter or he deliberately misled the House yesterday. The Premier said that he was aware of the situation and had ordered an investigation by his Women's Adviser "who was then in touch with officers of the Minister's department". The Premier then signed a full report on the matter, which was sent to the complainant. Does the Minister consider that this episode constitutes a take-over of his Ministerial responsibilities, or does he agree with opinions expressed in the community that the Premier was trying to cover up a potentially damaging situation for political reasons? Will the Minister take further action on his own behalf in the matter?

The SPEAKER: Before the honourable Minister replies to the question, I point out to the honourable Leader that he is not setting a good example, since he has asked a series of questions rather than one question.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: First, I point out that, if one has a dirty mind, one often sees dirt in any situation, but if one has an open mind one sometimes finds out what is involved. I suggest that that concept should be kept in mind. I should have thought that the Leader was aware that Deborah McCulloch was attached to the Premier's Department and was also the Women's Adviser to the Government, and to me it would seem perfectly proper (perhaps I am biased because I am on this side) that she might be involved in matters relating to women's shelters. The Leader may see something wrong with that situation, but I cannot. He spoke about the fact that the Premier had said something about people being in touch with officers of my department, but I am damned if I know what he is driving at. Is he suggesting that every time someone gets in touch with an officer of my department I have to be kept informed? I would not think that that should apply. I have every confidence that officers in my department discharge their duties to the public. Many Opposition members have approached my officers, and I should think that they have always received satisfaction. I suggest to members that many times I would not be informed immediately of such happenings. Perhaps the advice is on the way to me now. I cite the case of one Opposition member (whose name will be anonymous) who visited McNally. He rang someone in my department, the facility was afforded to him, and some time later I was told of this visit. I find nothing wrong with that sort of situation, so I am surprised at the Leader's question. I do not know whether the Leader had his question prepared and was shot down by the statement or what. I think the Leader concluded by asking me what I propose to do. I am going to keep an open mind on the topic of women's shelters generally, because as I said yesterday the best people to give advice on how to run and operate women's shelters are women, as I am sure the Leader would agree. I intend to listen to their advice on this matter and on the whole question of women's shelters.

PRIORITY ROADS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Transport say whether priority roads have been a success or not since they were introduced in the metropolitan area? Having four priority roads in the Unley District (South Road, Goodwood Road, Unley Road, and Glen Osmond Road) which are main roads for vehicular traffic to the south of the city and which are heavily used in peak periods, I look forward to the reply from the Minister.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: An investigation has been conducted into the success or otherwise of priority roads, and I think most members, with the possible exception of the member for Eyre, would be interested in the results. The implementation of the priority road system in metropolitan Adelaide was commenced in July, 1975, and is continuing. Because of the widespread change in driving habits that might have been expected as a result of introducing priority roads, it was decided to undertake a study into their effectiveness. Although a full report will not be available for several months, it is now appropriate to summarise, in a brief preliminary form, the main findings of the study into the effectiveness of priority roads. Councils and other bodies have requested information and decisions, on the extension of the priority road system, which remain to be made. The area studied was almost entirely in the district of the member for Unley and comprised four north-south priority roads, namely, South Road, Goodwood Road, Unley Road and Fullarton Road, and three north-south quasi-arterial (non-priority) roads, namely, Winston Avenue, King William Road and Duthy Street, and the network of local streets connecting them from the hills face to Greenhill Road.

Traffic speeds, volumes, delays and travel times were measured in June, 1975, and again in June, 1976, when differences were examined to assess the effects of priority roads. Accident information relevant to that area is now available for only 10 months—September, 1975, to June, 1976, and data for this period was compared with trends based on the corresponding 10-month period for the previous seven years. The figures quoted are approximate, being based only on preliminary analysis, although figures from the more rigorous final analysis will differ only slightly. When a result is described as "significant", the term is used in the statistical sense of being "unlikely to have occurred by chance, to the 95 per cent level of confidence". This is a common degree of accuracy used for analyses of traffic engineering measures.

Regarding traffic volumes on priority roads, no significant change occurred. The increasing trend line over the past several years was unaltered. For quasi-arterial roads, generally small increases in traffic occurred, but those increases were not significant. For minor roads a significant decrease in traffic volume of about 5½ per cent occurred. Regarding travel times only on priority roads, no significant change occurred. Travel times rose slightly in association with slightly increased traffic volumes. The next point is important, because some people have the wrong impression about vehicle speeds. No significant change was noted in vehicle speeds on priority roads. Individual vehicle speeds measured were slightly higher in some locations but lower in other locations. Overall no change occurred. That statement tends to show that the view that many people hold that priority roads have provided simply for additional speed is not borne out by the investigation. Vehicles exiting from minor roads to priority roads experienced essentially unchanged delays. Motorists seem to favour the easier left turnout, and

traffic seemed less congregated on certain streets when turning right. Overall accidents were reduced by about 7½ per cent, which is on the fringe of being described as statistically significant. The reduction of 8 per cent in the accident rate on priority roads was highly significant.

Mr. Mathwin: Did you—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I know that the honourable member is not interested in road safety, but I know that other members are interested.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must continue with his reply.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Regarding driver stress, the Australian Road Research Board's instrumented vehicle was used to measure stress levels of drivers, as evidenced by changes in galvanic skin resistance and heart rate. The board concluded that there was a marked reduction in driving demand and difficulty that is attributed to the priority road system. The investigation concluded by stating categorically that the priority road system has been successful because of the following three specific factors:

- (a) traffic accidents have been reduced significantly;
- (b) traffic has been directed out of minor residential streets; and
- (c) driving stress and difficulty have been reduced.

I am sure that it is gratifying to everyone to realise that the priority road system, which has been operating now for a little less than two years, is playing such a significant part in our road pattern.

FOSTER CHILDREN

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Community Welfare urgently investigate and report on the circumstances in which two brothers (Lee and Robert) found themselves, when placed by the Community Welfare Department in a private home at Garden Avenue, Westbourne Park, with a practising homosexual?

The Hon. R. G. Payne: How did you like that, Robin?

Mr. Millhouse: Pretty dirty.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: He's a nice chap, isn't he!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: The circumstances as I know them and as they have been given to me (I know some of them because of inquiries I have made) are as follows: the boys' father is in gaol for 4½ years for an action it was proved he took in an emotional state against the property of a person who he believed was having an affair with his wife. The home in which the boys were placed is an all-male home. The mother had deserted the children, and was not interested in them, so the department had that responsibility. A Community Welfare Department officer (Mr. Kitto) was aware of the homosexual ways of the head of the household at Garden Avenue and, in fact, I believe he also knew that he had served a gaol sentence previously, possibly under another name. Several other males lived infrequently at the premises, some being between the age of majority and 25 years of age; one under the age of 18 years was admitted to McNally for an offence he had committed about the same time as the boys were at the home. Urgency is required, because other boys may be placed in similar circumstances by the department. I know that the Minister would be aware of the father's mental traumas, as he is in gaol and knows about this matter because the boys have told him.

One of the boys experienced a similar problem in one of the Government homes in which he had been placed before being placed in a private home. I believe that the boys are now being held in Stuart House. The boys were emotionally upset because of the family break-up, because the mother had left them, and because the father was in gaol, and then they were placed in the circumstances of an all-male home with a practising homosexual where it has been said that the head of the house had motherly instincts and would give good and kindly care to the boys. Will the Minister investigate this matter urgently and bring down a report?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes, I shall certainly obtain the *Hansard* containing the long story the honourable member has recounted and have it investigated by my department. I am somewhat surprised at the motives of the honourable member in asking the question because, without naming anyone, the gentleman who is presently languishing elsewhere was originally referred to me at my electorate office—

Mr. Evans: By me.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: —by the honourable member, who said to me, on the telephone, "I don't seem to be able to help this bloke. Will you do what you can for him?"

Mr. Evans: In the interests of the children—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I made available to that man at that time a considerable amount of my time, and tried to help him in various ways. I was assured by the man at the time that he understood that I had done what I could for him; that, of course, was prior to the circumstances now outlined. I shall endeavour to have an examination of the matter carried out and bring down a report for the honourable member.

WHYALLA SCHOOL

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Education investigate the facilities available in the city of Whyalla for the education of intellectually handicapped children, especially those deemed suitable for a special class within a normal school? I believe the Minister would be aware that, in Whyalla, there is a special school specifically handling children requiring special-type schooling. However, I understand that one class exists of the type I now raise with the Minister and that that class exists at the Bevan Crescent Primary School. I have been approached by a constituent who has told me that five children approaching the age of five years will be seeking education within a special school class of the type that exists at the Bevan Crescent school. I understand that it is the only class of its type in Whyalla and that the number of students has reached the number allowed. Will the Minister examine the position to see whether it is possible to get another class of this type in another primary school in Whyalla?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I shall examine the matter for the honourable member. As he is aware, it is departmental policy, despite the extremely good special schools that have been built, to retain children in the normal school set-up if that is possible. Since the honourable member's suggestion is in line with this policy, I guess it is simply a matter of resources before we can do this. Whether we have the immediate resources to do it, I am not sure. I shall obtain a report for him.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: My question is directed to the Minister of Labour and Industry, if he is available.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member can continue to ask his question.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not think I am allowed to put questions to the gallery.

The SPEAKER: It is up to the Speaker whether the honourable member is allowed to ask the question. The honourable member will continue with his question.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Certainly, now that we have the Minister in the Chamber. When does the Government intend to introduce the amendments that will exempt sporting clubs from workmen's compensation provisions? Reports indicate that the Minister has convinced Cabinet of the necessity for exemption, and there was a strong impression that there was some urgency, as winter sports were about to begin. The Minister is reported as saying:

Like every other South Australian, I want to see the football and soccer season get under way on schedule. The doubts about the present legal situation threatened a possible delay to the start of the season and there was also a threat to many sporting organisations. That was the reason for the Government's prompt action.

The prompt action has consisted of a statement from the Minister. I understand that a special sitting was convened of the Legislature in New South Wales to enact the necessary changes there. Does the Minister intend to introduce legislation fairly soon? The Government has not been at all prompt, as we are now in the second week of sitting.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is obvious that the Deputy Leader does not know what he is talking about, as usual. Only last night I was able to confer with the Secretary of the South Australian Football League and the Secretary of the South Australian Soccer League, both of whom seemed very pleased with the action the Government had taken. The area is not a black and white area; it never is in these circumstances.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What action have you taken?

The SPEAKER: Order! I direct that the honourable Minister do not answer that question. I have warned all honourable members regarding supplementary questions by way of interjection.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Thank you for your direction and your control, Sir. I am always amazed to see the control you have in this House, especially over the Deputy Leader. The action that is being taken will be announced to this House early next week. The only person I know who would be dissatisfied at the moment would be the Deputy Leader, because the football league is happy with the action we are taking, as is the soccer league. Not only are they happy, but I was congratulated last night by both representatives on the role we are playing in this matter. I was able to say last night, as I can say here now, that legislation will be introduced early next week. It will be retrospective.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It has to be made retrospective to cover any injuries that occurred in the past. It is not a black and white situation. There has been some difficulty in defining what is a semi-professional sportsman. It may be necessary at this stage to bring in legislation similar to that introduced in New South Wales. The legislation might have to be on a temporary basis to give some respite until we can properly examine the position and give all football clubs in South Australia, either through the head bodies or of their own volition, an opportunity to

make submissions, because there is also a difficulty concerning people who will not be covered by workmen's compensation and who will have to be given some guarantee by the clubs that they will be covered. That is what I emphasised to the managers of the football and soccer leagues. The matter is well in hand. I was hoping I would be able to introduce legislation today, but it will certainly be brought in next Tuesday or Wednesday. There is no difficulty I can see in the matter.

POLICE BAND

Mr. OLSON: Will the Premier investigate the possibility of using the South Australian Police Band and mounted cadre for the promotion of tourism in this State? Having recently had the pleasure of visiting an open day at the Police Academy at Fort Largs, I was impressed, as were thousands of other visitors, with the displays of the mounted police and the Police Band marching and drill display. As the Canadian Mounties are used for tourist promotion by being depicted on gifts and souvenirs as well as providing displays, will the Premier consider the police giving such performances during the two or three months that are recognised as the tourist season in this State? Should the Premier consent to this proposition, will he advise tourist agencies accordingly?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will take that up with my colleague the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport.

DRAINAGE PIPES

Mr. DEAN BROWN: When the State Government decided to buy only PVC 4in. drainage pipes, rather than both PVC and clay, for the Engineering and Water Supply Department, can the Premier say whether the Government was aware of the devastating effects that this decision would have on the clay pipe industry in South Australia? If it was, what action has the Government taken to alleviate these effects? At present the department buys a 50/50 mixture of PVC and clay 4in. drainage pipes. After June, however, apparently only PVC 4in. piping will be bought by that department. Two companies now produce clay pipes in South Australia. The decision of the Government is expected to force at least one company, and possibly both companies, to discontinue the production in this State of 4in. clay pipes. One company could be forced to move out of clay pipe production altogether, and as a result many specialist tradesmen could lose their jobs. The other company will produce in South Australia only clay pipes of 9in. and upwards. All 4in. clay pipes for other uses would then have to be imported from other States. South Australia would then be at the mercy of the PVC industry with rising prices (because of the world shortage of petroleum and its by-products), and the interstate clay pipe industry. On technical ground the decision of the Government may be justified. However, the Government has a responsibility to ensure that decisions it takes do not unduly disrupt any section of our community.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As the Government examined this problem over a considerable period, I think the best thing for me to do would be to get a full report for the honourable member. I will do that and bring it down.

MIGRANT ADVICE

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister for the Environment say what his department has done about providing essential advice to ethnic groups in their own language? I think the House should know that the Federal Government has decided not to publish cases for and against referendum questions in languages other than English, thus putting migrants at a disadvantage. I am sure the Environment Department is much more understanding about the needs of migrants.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I think it was last year that my department issued two of its information sheets in Greek and Italian for the benefit of migrants. These refer to the benefits of composting and the nuisance created by the burning of rubbish. We have been evaluating the response to those leaflets and are considering an extension into the Serbo-Croat language. We came to the conclusion that the area in which it was most necessary to ensure that migrants were fully informed was that of hunting regulations. This is partly because in some of the Mediterranean countries it seems to be accepted that anything that can be trapped is fair game for the pot. Therefore, migrants who come here are at a very considerable disadvantage, because almost all of our native birds are protected, and migrants can unwittingly run the risk of being prosecuted and losing firearms as a result of prosecution, so a pocket-sized pamphlet printed in English called *Hunting in South Australia* is now printed in Italian and is available to members of the public. A Greek translation is with the Government Printer and will soon become available.

URANIUM

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say exactly what type of guarantee he would require from a customer country before he would approve mining, processing and exportation of uranium to that country? On Monday evening the Chairman of the Japanese Energy Commission was speaking here, and he said that Japan could not survive industrially without the use of nuclear energy. He also said that he was not prepared to discount Australia as a main source of uranium for his country. He said that, rather than seek alternative sources of supply, he appreciated that we were still awaiting the second Fox report to be handed down, and that he was highly appreciative of the need for some forms of guarantee. In the light of that statement and the concern he expressed, what sort of guarantee would the Minister be looking for? Would the Government be prepared to believe written guarantees, or has it a closed mind?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The policy that was adopted, initially as a Cabinet policy and now by the unanimous resolution of this House as a policy of this House, was that it is yet to be demonstrated that it is safe to supply uranium to a customer country. Therefore, it is not a question of what any one individual would do or require to be done to be satisfied on this question, but it becomes a question of what, in the first instance, would satisfy the Government collectively and then, ultimately of course, this House, because the Government has to retain the confidence of this House. On the question of what would satisfy the Government collectively, the Government would need to be satisfied in relation to three main points: first, the question of reactor safety—

that the safeguards that were being adopted were appropriate and led to the understanding what the risks involved in that area were, in terms of our own judgment, collectively, acceptable risks; secondly, the same general degree of satisfaction being achieved with respect to the methods to be adopted for the disposal of waste products, and again, the Government, and ultimately the House, would have to be satisfied collectively on that point; and thirdly, and probably the matter of chief interest overseas, the question of the safeguards that were being adopted to ensure that there was no unreasonable risk with respect to possible terrorist activity that some plutonium among the waste products might or might not be used for terrorist activities.

Mr. Millhouse: What do you call unreasonable risk? Any risk, I suppose.

The SPEAKER: Order! I direct that the Minister do not reply to that question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On all these matters it has to be the collective judgment initially of the Government and then of this House, and each one of us no doubt will contribute in our peculiar idiosyncratic way in the making of that collective judgment. I can only indicate to the honourable member the kind of issues that I believe will be taken into account in the making of that collective judgment either by the Government or by the House or the Opposition. Because of what the Leader said yesterday, that he was not as yet satisfied on these questions but he believed he could be, presumably he and other Opposition members, such as the member for Mount Gambier, will have to make the same general judgment also. I can only point to the issues that have to be taken into account. How members of the Opposition gain a degree of satisfaction on anything has always been difficult to understand, and no doubt it will remain a somewhat murky area even on this issue.

LOWER NORTH-EAST ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport obtain a report on the latest position regarding the proposed reconstruction and widening of Lower North-East Road between the Torrens River and Anstey Hill? The Minister is aware that I have raised this matter for several years by letters, questions, and speeches in the House. The last time I asked a question was on September 21 last year, to which question the Minister replied on October 14. On all previous times I have explained why this work should have a high priority, and in my opinion the road is dangerous in its present state. I refer the Minister to my previous representations, and will not repeat all that I have said before, except to say that increased population has brought an increase in the number of motor vehicles using this arterial road, and this has caused the need for reconstruction and widening. Part of the road is used by heavy vehicles associated with quarrying operations. The road is in urgent need of improvement in respect of alignment, drainage, and pavement strength, and as regards visibility at road junctions and private entrances.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to get that information.

LAND RENTAL

Mr. BOUNDY: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy on behalf of the Minister of Works, ask the Minister of Lands what is the basis for deciding the rental of Crown and perpetual leasehold land? Yesterday, I received a reply to

a Question on Notice in which I had asked what percentage relationship the annual rental levied on Crown and perpetual leasehold land bore to their total valuation. The reply I received was as follows:

The annual rent levied on Crown and perpetual leasehold is not related to the total valuation.

When I related that reply to a lessee of perpetual leasehold land he said, "Well, if it isn't related to the total valuation, what on earth is it related to?" That is my question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member would appreciate that, with most perpetual leaseholds, the rental is not subject to a variation but that the original rental was struck years ago and inevitably bears no relationship to current valuations or to anything else. I presume that the honourable member is directing his question to new rents that are struck for perpetual leasehold land and the method of determination. If he is not directing his question to that matter, I am puzzled.

Mr. Boundy: Those that are subject to change.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Those subject to change, and what is the basis of that change: I shall be pleased to take up that matter, now that the honourable member has confined his question, and ascertain whether a reply can be provided.

ROAD FUNDS

Mr. WHITTEN: Has the Minister of Transport's attention been drawn to a report in this week's *Weekly Times* (the throw-away paper that circulates in my district) about David Terrace and Kilkenny Road? Those roads form the boundary of the Spence and Price Districts, and are the only roads over the Port Adelaide railway line between Woodville Road and South Road and are a direct link between the Port Road and Torrens Road. They are much used by traffic, including vehicles from John Shearer Limited, which is a large manufacturer of agricultural equipment. This route is the company's only outlet from its factory. The report, which has been attributed to the Woodville council's city engineer, states:

David Terrace and part of Kilkenny Road may be zoned as a residential street, if Government grants to reconstruct the carriageway are not forthcoming, and a traffic management scheme involving David Terrace . . . may be adopted to halt the through flow of traffic . . . Kilkenny Road and David Terrace serve a very important role in Adelaide as a metropolitan traffic road . . . to reconstruct the road to highway standard would cost around \$195 000—a cost beyond council resources. Woodville has applied to the Highways Department for either State or Commonwealth grants towards the reconstruction of the road.

I wish to ascertain from the Minister whether any Federal money has been approved for this road and what is the position if no Federal money has been approved.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have not seen the report to which the honourable member refers, because I do not live in his area. The paper that I receive is the "Mathwin-Becker Weekly".

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will certainly ask the Road Traffic Board to provide me with information about whether it has received an application from Woodville council along the lines suggested in the report or whether the report

is simply a subtle way of trying to put a bit of weight behind an application, which I presume would have been made, for the 1977-78 financial support for the reconstruction of that road. I am not aware of any of the details concerning this matter, but I will obtain that information.

SHOPPING HOURS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask my question of the Minister of Labour and Industry, and I am surprised that it has not been asked before. What is going on about shopping hours in South Australia? I have been waiting for a couple of days now for an Opposition member to ask the question, but perhaps they thought that it would—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must confine his remarks to the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They probably did not want to embarrass the Minister, and therefore they did not ask it. There has been in the past few days a good deal of newspaper talk about Government reaction to the so-called policy announced a few days ago by the Liberal Party of free shopping or trading hours, except at weekends. I was pleased to see this step in the right direction from the Liberal Party, because I had long advocated completely unrestricted trading hours: I still do, and that includes petrol stations.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must point out that the honourable member is now debating the issue.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will not do that, but I will quickly bring my explanation to a close—

Mr. Venning: You should never start.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That shows the honourable member's intolerance, and that is typical of his Party.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Apparently the Minister has seen his trade union "advisers" and has at least once called in the retailers, but then dismissed them without seeing them. Apparently he meant to talk to them about the matter, too. I know that both the trade unions and the retailers, completely ignoring the views of the public, are against any increase in trading hours (indeed, I think that they would probably like to reduce them, if they possibly could).

The SPEAKER: Order! I must point out that the honourable member should be seeking information, and not giving it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am seeking it. I finally say (and it is right on the point that you, Mr. Speaker, have just made) that I believe that the House and the public are entitled to know what is going on, and that is why I put my question to the Minister.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member has certainly given me a wide course. I understood him to ask what was going on in South Australia. That is a somewhat wide question for me to answer. He did not ask what was going on in the Government.

Mr. Millhouse: It was assumed.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Never mind about the assumptions; the honourable member must ask directly. Many things are going on in South Australia. For example, about three weeks ago the Liberal Party announced (I am not sure whom it consulted, if anyone; probably no-one, as usual) its policy, and almost within a week it made another announcement about its policy. We have seen two policy changes within three weeks from the Liberal Party.

Mr. Millhouse: From them?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That is right. You have always stood for unrestricted trading hours, so you are consistent.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must point out to the honourable Minister that the expression "you" is unparliamentary.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Well, Sir, one can slip sometimes, and I am sure that you understand that. If the honourable member had asked what the Government was doing, I would point out that the Government (not as a result, as the Leader would have the public believe, of any action his Party has taken) has started to talk to people about this matter. I have had an examination going on for about five months of the position in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria, long before the Liberal Party announced its policy.

Dr. Tonkin: We did embarrass you, though, didn't we?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Not for one bit have I been embarrassed. This Government's policy has always been to consult, whereas the Liberal Party's policy is not to consult, but be told from the Adelaide Club what to do. At least we consider all sides. I make no apologies. The member for Torrens may laugh, but what I have said about whence his Party gets its orders is a positive fact. There is no question that a lot of policy is made for the Liberal Party in the Adelaide Club.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have been accused of taking orders from my advisers. Members opposite do not like it when it is turned on them. I make no apologies for the fact that I have consulted with the people affected in the industry. I shall be consulting with the retail traders at 4 p.m. today, and I shall be consulting with consumers and with all people interested before the Government determines what its policy will be. As soon as those consultations have been completed, I shall be pleased to announce the new policy of the Government so that members opposite will all be aware of it.

REGIONAL PANELS

Mr. ABBOTT: Will the Minister of Community Welfare tell the House whether the regional panels established to handle notifications of non-accidental injury to children will be ready to operate when amendments to the Community Welfare Act are proclaimed tomorrow? Recent press and radio reports have announced that the regional panels have been formed, but little has been said about the preparation of the panels for the tasks they have been given and how they will tackle the problems with which they are presented. In view of the seriousness of the problem of non-accidental injury to children, will the Minister give the House more information on the preparations made?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I can give the honourable member some more information. The five regional panels have been appointed. The three metropolitan panels have had administrative officers appointed to them, and officers of my department will assume the administrative role with the two country panels until the appointment of full-time officers is arranged. The amendments involving panels make possible a new approach to dealing with the steadily rising problem of non-accidental injury to children, providing still greater protection for the child in danger and at the same time providing better mechanisms for tracking down the reasons for such incidents and doing

something about them. The panels also will have the responsibility of keeping cases under review for as long as it is considered appropriate, and they will prepare statistics and records which it is hoped will be of considerable value in the area of research. To help panel members, a seminar was held at the Modbury Hospital on Monday last. It was attended by almost all panelists, and a thorough briefing was given on the problem of child abuse and its magnitude, details of the report and recommendations of the advisory committee which investigated non-accidental injury and the operation and terms of reference of the panels. Members also took part in a case conference, in which a mock panel examined a series of cases of the type they are likely to encounter in real life. It is important to note that the panels as appointed contain a very considerable amount of expertise and, in almost all cases, members in their professional and working lives would have had a considerable amount of contact with cases of non-accidental injury to children. At Monday's seminar, it was agreed that there would be an exchange of information between panels in different regions, and that another seminar would be held in about six months time to examine what progress had been made and what problems, if any, had been encountered. I am sure all members would join me in wishing the panels the best of luck in functioning as panels in what will be a most difficult area.

SEX DISCRIMINATION

Mr. WOTTON: Is the Minister of Labour and Industry aware of claims of apparent deficiencies within the Sex Discrimination Act, and has he taken action to prepare amendments to rectify these deficiencies? A recent newspaper article states:

The Sex Discrimination Act in South Australia has been in force six months and, according to employers, "is not worth the paper it is written on" where jobs are concerned. The report continues:

The Employers' Federation and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry see the State laws as largely "a bastardisation of our society and against the common interest". This criticism from organisations representing most employers in the State follows recent attacks by trade unions and others on the Government's worker participation plans.

A report attributed to Mr. Branson, General Manager of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, states in part:

For a start, offering jobs to all persons, instead of specific people, is causing lots of unnecessary problems, not so much for employers but job seekers.

He went on to say:

Under present practice in S.A. an employer has to accept applications from males and females for almost any job. But the employer still has the right to make his selection. The real problem is that there are biological and physiological reasons why some jobs are more suited to men than to women.

Mr. Gregg, the Industrial Director of the Employers' Federation, stated in the same report that all the State legislation was doing was bastardising society and destroying fundamental concepts on which it was based.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am not aware of the article, nor am I aware that either of the persons mentioned in it has written to my office telling me of inadequacies in the Act. I have no recollection of that. I know that I have been sending out letters to every organisation in South Australia within the confines of the Act, telling those organisations to fix up those matters where they are now in conflict with the Act. I have had no complaints whatsoever

from any person to whom I have written stating that there is any inadequacy in the Act. I have had no complaint officially from the honourable member. He certainly has not raised any complaint with me; there is no question about that. I would be prepared to say unequivocally that no person has written to my department making the allegations appearing in that document, and I shall be pleased if the honourable member can set out for me what he sees wrong in the Act.

PERMAPINE LOGS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister for the Environment inform the House whether any dangers exist where the community may be using Permapine logs? These logs have been treated with preservatives containing arsenic, copper, and chromium, and they are being widely used today for a variety of purposes, especially for fences, garden furniture, and children's playgrounds. Whilst I understand that there are no real problems generally with the use of this form of timber, I know that fears were expressed some months ago by people who felt that, if off-cuts from the logs were used in barbecues, they could present considerable danger. I understand one of the environmental agencies was looking at the matter to see what risk may exist. Will the Minister tell me the result of any inquiries he has had made?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The matter has been investigated, and I have some advice to offer.

Mr. Vandeeper: He is knocking the pine forest industry, isn't he?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I hope that the member for Millicent will be good enough to listen, so that he may learn something. As the honourable member was good enough to give me some notice of his interest in this matter, which is quite typical, I have some details at hand. First, may I say that the green-coloured Permapine timber is, as the honourable member has said, perfectly safe for all uses to which it is normally put. The Woods and Forests Department and at least three South Australian timber companies treat pine with a mixture of copper, chromium and arsenic, usually described as C.C.A. This is a most effective preservative. The matter of safety to humans has been raised within the industry itself, and many tests have been carried out and have established that the chemicals are locked inside the timber and can be released only by burning.

Mr. Vandeeper: Those tests were made years ago.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Timber Preservers Association, as a result, has issued a warning that green coloured C.C.A.-treated timber must never be burnt in an enclosed space or used for barbecue fuel. One of the association's publicity sheets, made available to purchasers of C.C.A.-treated timber, makes the point this way:

In our everyday life we have learned that many things require care in their disposal. We don't throw broken glass on the garden or surplus horticultural spray into the fish pond. We do not put rubber tyres or aerosol cans in the incinerator, nor do we burn large amounts of plastic materials where the toxic smoke may be a health hazard to us or our neighbours.

That is what the manufacturers of the product say as a warning to their customers. They add that the chemicals in their timber can present a hazard only when burnt, so that, if this is done, care must be taken not to inhale the fumes.

However, my department has undertaken further investigations and has established that studies in Great Britain on this matter have shown that there does not appear to be a great deal to worry about. Treated timber was used in several tests when bacon and fish were smoked. The arsenic content in this food was found to be no higher than that naturally occurring in similar uncooked foods. The whole matter, I think, was raised as a precautionary exercise by the National Health and Medical Research Council late in 1976, and from that organisation through the Australian Environment Council. What has now been established is that the timber is 100 per cent safe if handled according to the manufacturer's specifications. Permapine is not sold as a fuel but, if it is used for this purpose, we have been able to establish that the risk of poisoning by inhalation of smoke from the burning timber is slight. However, for those who wish to be completely safe it is best for them not to cook their chops and sausages over a Permapine fire.

GIFT DUTIES

Mr. VENNING: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to raise the present gift duties allowance exemption to a sum more realistically in line with present-day values? If it does not, why not? If it does, when?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are examining the gift duties legislation, as we examine periodically all taxation legislation in South Australia, but I do not expect any Bill to amend the Gift Duties Act this session.

PORT LINCOLN WHARVES

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy, representing the Minister of Works, report on the outcome of the latest negotiations between Government officers and the Waterside Workers Federation to ensure that the bulk loading wharf at Port Lincoln will be used on completion? Following a question in November last year, the Minister of Works explained the series of discussions the Government was undertaking with the Waterside Workers Federation. The concern of the federation is the loss of employment for members when the new wharf operates. In a few weeks the Marine and Harbors Department will be trial-testing the new wharf. The problem, however, is that the concern of the federation's members has still not been solved satisfactorily. The union is refusing to permit the loading of ships under the new loaders until an acceptable manning scale has been negotiated.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will refer the matter to the Minister of Works and ask him to bring down a reply for the honourable member.

GREEN ZONES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister for Planning say whether Mr. Hart, in his review of planning legislation and procedures, was given any specific brief about green belt zones, their extension and/or maintenance?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There was no specific brief, but in view of the interest of the honourable member I will draw the matter to his attention.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: MR. ARNOLD

Dr. Tonkin, for Mr. EVANS, moved:

That one month's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Chaffey (Mr. P. B. Arnold) on account of absence overseas on a Government-sponsored study tour.

Motion carried.

PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pipelines Authority Act, 1967-1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill which amends the principal Act, the Pipelines Authority Act, 1967-1974, is intended to confer on the authority additional powers to facilitate its entry into all aspects of petroleum exploration and exploitation. Substantially, the new powers are proposed to be conferred on the authority by clause 4, which inserts a new section 10aa in the principal Act. This new section is commended to members' particular attention. Before I deal with the technical details of the Bill I would like to make two general points. First, our main concern in the Cooper Basin has been the question of getting adequate exploration under way so that the resource can be effectively provided in order to ensure that this State has plenty of advance warning about any requirement for additional exploration or the requirement for alternative fuels.

Secondly, in this connection it must be understood that commercial companies with high rates of discount of future cash are simply not able to undertake from their own funds the kind of exploration that the Government requires. The Government has therefore announced its additional financial provisions for such exploration on the grounds that, as the normal commercial rules do not permit commercial financing if the Government requires the exploration to be done on behalf of the community, the Government in representing the community must provide the necessary finance.

The other major problem that has concerned us particularly with the Cooper Basin has been the degree of atomisation in ownership. To some extent the unitisation of the basin has assisted in hopefully giving some degree of unity in the way in which decisions are reached, but that process in itself has involved a huge amount of paper work. It has probably been one of the greatest conveying exercises ever undertaken in this country and the legal fees associated with it are fantastic; I imagine they amount to more than \$1 000 000.

Mr. Millhouse: They are probably justified.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member would no doubt have his opinion on that. It would be most unfortunate if there were further atomisation of

ownership of the Cooper Basin and, as the Commonwealth has indicated it wants to sell its interests, we have indicated our desire to purchase, but we have also indicated to everyone associated with the Cooper Basin our desire to purchase if possible in a way that will lead to consolidation of interests. We have not determined a policy that the Government interest will be held on its own with no association with other companies or other interests. Discussions are proceeding at present with other interests in relation to this matter. I hope that a further announcement will be made on this matter before long.

For that reason, and because any negotiations with other interests will take some time, it is appropriate that the legislation should be in a form to enable the Pipelines Authority either to become a producer directly and to explore directly itself, or to take a share interest in another company or venture that is a producer and undertakes the exploration. That is why the Bill is in this form. Hopefully, it will be possible to establish an arrangement with other interests, but it may be some months before it is completed. In the meantime, it is necessary to finalise the purchase of the Commonwealth interest. The remaining sections of the second reading explanation are explanatory of the provisions of the Bill, and I seek leave to have them inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

REMAINDER OF EXPLANATION OF BILL

Proposed subsection (1) sets out a definition of "petroleum resource" and subsection (2) sets out the proposed new powers; at paragraph (a) the authority is empowered to seek a licence, permit or authority relating to the exploration for or exploitation of any petroleum resource under a law of this State, the Commonwealth, or any other State or Territory of the Commonwealth. At paragraph (b) the authority is empowered to seek any interest in any body corporate that itself has an interest or share in any such licence, permit or authority and at paragraph (c) the authority is empowered to assist any body corporate to carry out its obligations under any licence, permit or authority in relation to exploration for or exploitation of a petroleum resource.

Subsection (3) recognises the "commercial" nature of this aspect of the authority's activities and ensures that the authority shall make payments in aid of the general revenue of amounts equal to the amounts that it would be liable to pay by way of Commonwealth income tax, if the authority were liable to this form of taxation. Clause 2 of the Bill which amends section 3 of the principal Act merely makes a drafting amendment to the definition of "petroleum" which is reflected in the definition of "petroleum resource" in clause 4. Clause 3 is an amendment consequential on the amendments proposed in clause 4. Clause 4 has been dealt with, in some detail, above. Clause 5 is in part consequential on clause 4 and at paragraph (b) authorises the Treasurer to make grants to the authority as well as loans. A grant of the order of \$5 000 000 has been foreshadowed in the Supplementary Estimates already before this House.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNITING CHURCH IN AUSTRALIA BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

The object of this Bill is to make the necessary alterations to State law to enable the union of the Congregational, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches (other than continuing congregations) to be fully effective from the inauguration day at present planned, namely, June 22, 1977. The Bill contains provision to make it clear that both the Methodist Church and the Congregational Church have the necessary statutory authority to unite. Provision for union is already contained for the Presbyterian Church in the Presbyterian Trusts Act, 1971. At the same time, it is made clear by the Bill that the Uniting Church can change and develop in the future without property questions arising and can also enter into union with other branches of the Christian church.

The Bill establishes a property trust which in principle will hold all the property of the Uniting Church in South Australia. This trust will be a "dry trust". Its activities will be entirely under the control of the Synod of the Uniting Church within South Australia. The Bill contains the necessary provisions for vesting property of the Uniting Churches in the Property Trust as from inauguration. These provisions will be explained in detail later. Provision is made for future gifts to vest in the Property Trust and provision is also made for future gifts in favour of the Methodist Church or the Congregational Church to take effect in favour of the Uniting Church. The Bill makes alterations to the legislation affecting various bodies such as Methodist Ladies College (now to be called Annesley College) and Prince Alfred College, the Parkin Mission and the Parkin Trust and the opportunity has also been taken to bring into the trust the property of the R. H. White Settlement and at the same time to modernise the trusts of that settlement. Necessary alterations are also proposed to the will of the late John Henry Champness. This will be explained in more detail later.

I should refer to the fact that one of the parties involved in the proceedings still has a few problems in relation to this Bill. However, I believe that such matters will be resolved during the passage of the Bill. Part I of the Bill (clauses 1-5) contains formal or preliminary provisions and does not call for comment. Part II deals with the inauguration of the Uniting Church. Clause 6 formally empowers the uniting churches to unite. Clauses 7-10 are of a confirmatory or enabling nature designed to avoid legal argument in the future. Clause 10 in particular gives the Assembly of the Uniting Church the necessary authority to change and develop in future and to enter into union. Part III (clauses 11-18) provides for the constitution of the Uniting Church in Australia Property Trust (S.A.), an incorporated body which is to hold the property of the Uniting Church in South Australia. It is to be noted that clause 12 authorises the trust to deal with or dispose of property notwithstanding provisions of any trust subject to which the trust holds property. Part IV (clauses 19-33) deals with the vesting of property in the trust and makes the necessary alterations to the trusts affecting property.

Clause 19 provides that the Bill is not to divest an incorporated association from being a prescribed association unless it voluntarily brings in its property later on. Prescribed associations are listed in the fourth schedule to the Bill. Mostly they are incorporated congregations but certain other incorporated associations have been added to the lists of prescribed associations so that property from these associations which the Uniting Church is to have

will vest in the Property Trust. Thus the Congregational Union of South Australia Incorporated is listed as a prescribed association and so also is the Congregational Chapel Building Society of South Australia Incorporated. All the property of these associations will vest in the Property Trust.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of South Australia Inc. and the two incorporated Presbyterian Development Funds together with the Presbyterian Fellowship of Australia in South Australia Inc. are also listed as prescribed associations. This is not to say that the Uniting Church will necessarily receive all the property of these Presbyterian associations or indeed any of it. This will depend on the Presbyterian Trusts Act, 1971, which provides for a division of property. The effect of the Bill is only to vest in the trust the property of a prescribed Presbyterian association that comes to the Uniting Church under the Presbyterian Trusts Act, 1971.

Except where an association is a prescribed association, all the property will stay with the incorporated association. Thus it is contemplated that all the property of the numerous Methodist incorporated associations will remain with the associations and that the property of various other bodies such as the Spicer Cottages Trust, the Trustees of the Payneham and Dudley Park Cemeteries Trust, Scotch College (Adelaide), Annesley College and Prince Alfred College will remain with those bodies subject nevertheless, where money is held on trust, to any necessary change to Uniting Church purposes. Clause 21 provides for property to vest in the trust on inauguration and for necessary changes in trusts. Subclause (1) provides for all the property of the Methodist Church to be vested in the property trust. Subclause (2) similarly provides for property held by the Congregational Union, any other prescribed Congregational association or any other person in trust for the Congregational Church to vest in the Property Trust. Provision is made for the vesting of land in Torrensville Congregational Church Incorporated and also vesting of land in Waitpinga Congregational Church Incorporated. These congregations are the two continuing Congregational congregations.

Specific provision is made for a house at Victor Harbor held in trust as a holiday home for ministers of the Congregational Church, and also land in the name of the Goolwa Congregational Church Incorporated, an incorporated association dissolved in July, 1938, to vest in the trust free from their former trusts. The opportunity has been taken to divest Methodist and Congregational trustees of land forming part of Parkin Wesley College and to vest that land in the property trust free from any trusts. Subclause (3) provides for the vesting of Presbyterian property in the property trust. Provision is also made for property belonging to the Uniting Church under section 22 of the Presbyterian Trusts Act, 1971 (which provides for the splitting up of gifts after inauguration) to vest in the trust. The provisions are designed so as not to affect the division of property between the congregations of the Presbyterian Church continuing to function after inauguration and those going into union. The whole of subclause (3) comes into operation by special proclamation on a date to be fixed. Subclause (4) frees property vested in the trust from prior statutory and general trusts and also frees churches, manses and halls vested in the trust from the trusts relating thereto. Subclause (4) also converts references to any of the Uniting Churches in a trust in existence at inauguration into a reference to the Uniting Church.

Clause 22 provides for the property comprised in the R. H. White Settlement to vest in the Property Trust and modernises and simplifies the trusts of the R. H. White Settlement which at the moment are set out in a deed dated May 6, 1927. The provisions are not intended to affect proceedings at present pending in the Supreme Court brought by and against trustees of the R. H. White Settlement. Clause 23 alters the trusts of the will of the late John Henry Champness. Under his will he directed \$10 000 to be set aside for the income to be applied in the support of students at the Methodist Brighton College. The Bill provides for the income to be applied for the support of theological students in such manner as the Moderator of the Synod of the Uniting Church in Australia within South Australia thinks fit. Clause 24 deals with gifts taking effect in the future. Subclause (1) provides for gifts to the Uniting Church to vest in the property trust and subclauses (2) and (3) provide for references to the Methodist and Congregational Churches to be read as references to the Uniting Church with some special provisions in relation to the continuing congregations of the Congregational Church.

Clause 25 authorises the synod to resolve any ambiguity or obscurity where a reference to one of the Uniting Churches is by the Bill to be read as a reference to the church. Clause 26 provides for an incorporated association voluntarily to hand over all or any part of its property to the synod. Clause 27 provides for the dissolution of an incorporated association where by virtue of the Bill, or by virtue of the Bill and the Presbyterian Trusts Act, 1971, it ceases to have any property. Clause 28 authorises an incorporated association to alter references in its rules to any of the Uniting Churches to references to the Uniting Church. Clause 29 provides for the Bill to have extra-territorial operation in respect of property outside the State to which the trustee of a trust situated in the State or the trust is entitled. Clause 30 relieves property of the Uniting Church from forfeiture for breach of a condition in the Crown grant. This clause is one of a series of clauses sought as standard provisions throughout Australia. Clause 31 contains an evidentiary provision to facilitate proof that property is held by the trust for the church.

Clause 32 provides for the trust to be subject to liabilities attaching to property vested in it and also to have the same rights as the former owner. Clause 33 provides for the Registrar-General to register the trust as proprietor of an interest in land on application by the trust suggested by a certificate given by the trust and documents of title. No stamp duty or registration fees are to be payable.

Part V of the Bill (clauses 34-46) deals with miscellaneous matters which in the main do not call for comment. Clause 38 authorises the trust to apply for probate or letters of administration where the church has a beneficial interest and also authorises the trust to act as trustee. Clause 40 makes provision for the Assembly, the national body of the Uniting Church, to make regulations relating to trust property. Section 38 of the Acts Interpretation Act will not apply to such regulations.

Clause 41 facilitates schemes of co-operation with other churches. Clause 43 authorises the synod to declare new trusts where it has in the opinion of the synod become impossible or inexpedient to carry out trusts. Clause 45 authorises the trust to invest in a mixed fund. Clause 46 authorises investment in any form of investment authorised by Statute or the Assembly.

The first schedule to the Bill sets out the basis of union, the document upon which the Uniting Church is based. The second schedule sets out the Acts to be repealed by the Bill. It will be noted that no Presbyterian legislation is to be repealed. The third schedule amends the legislation relating to Prince Alfred College; Methodist Ladies College (now to be called Annesley College); the Parkin Congregational Mission of South Australia Incorporated, now to be called the Parkin Mission of South Australia Incorporated; and the Parkin Trust. The amendments in each case primarily make the alterations to the relevant legislation necessitated by union. The opportunity has also been taken to bring the relevant legislation up to date and to make the administration of the bodies concerned more flexible.

Prince Alfred College is incorporated under Prince Alfred College Incorporation Act, 1878. The Act as it now stands provides for the college to be run by a committee appointed annually by the Methodist Conference. The college for some time past has in fact been run by a subcommittee of that committee called the council. The Bill provides in lieu of these arrangements that the college is to be governed by a council which is to be appointed as set out in a constitution. The constitution to apply from the commencement of the Bill, until altered with the approval of synod in accordance with provisions contained in the Bill, is set out in a new schedule to Part II of the principal Act.

Synod will have the choice only of accepting or rejecting variations submitted to it. (Under the present Act rules may be made by the committee but are subject to disallowance or modification by the Methodist Conference.) Under the new constitution the synod appoints the President, Secretary and Treasurer of the college and a body of electors who in turn appoint 16 ordinary members of the council. The Headmaster is a member of the council *ex officio* and the council itself may appoint up to four additional members. The remainder of the constitution sets out provisions relating to the council and its procedure. The Bill amends section 12 of the principal Act to delete a limitation on the application of surplus funds which is no longer of any practical effect. The Bill gives the college an unlimited power to borrow and give security in place of the existing limited power contained in section 13 of the principal Act. Section 14 of the principal Act is amended to confer a wider power of investment

Methodist Ladies College: The Bill alters the name of the college to Annesley College. The Bill also makes other alterations necessitated by union and generally brings the Methodist Ladies College Incorporation Act (which will now be called the Annesley College Act) up to date. The Bill repeals and re-enacts section 13 of the principal Act to give the council a wider power to deal with the college estate as defined in the principal Act and also to give a wider power to mortgage the college estate. In addition to the powers contained in section 13 of the principal Act at present the college is to be authorised to raise moneys by way of mortgage for the purpose of purchasing land or for any other purpose approved by the synod. It is to be noted that the college is by new section 4 given a general power to borrow.

The Bill repeals section 14 of the principal Act and enacts a new section 14 giving the college a wider power of investment. The Bill repeals the whole of Part IV (which deals with management) and substitutes therefor a number of provisions based on the provisions of sections 15-31 other than those dealing with the details of the constitution

of the governing body (formerly known as the Committee of Methodist Ladies College). The detail is set out in the constitution to appear in Part II of the schedule to the principal Act. The new sections and constitution do not call for any detailed comment. It is to be noted that new section 19 gives the council power to alter the constitution with the approval of the synod. Section 38 of the Acts Interpretation Act will not apply to rules made by the council under this section. Whereas under the Act as it now stands the Methodist Conference could disallow or modify rules made by the college, under the Bill, the synod will have the choice only of either accepting or rejecting the rules submitted to it. New section 21 of the principal Act gives the standing committee of the synod authority to act on behalf of the synod for the purposes of the Act except where the particular act is to be done at the annual meeting of the synod. A certificate of the Moderator of the synod is evidence of an act of synod.

The Parkin Congregational Mission of South Australia Incorporated is an association incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act, 1956-1975. The Parkin Congregational Mission of South Australia Incorporated Act, 1968, sets out in a schedule provisions substituted for the deed (as amended previously) regulating the affairs of the mission. The Bill amends the Parkin Congregational Mission of South Australia Incorporated Act, 1968, to change the name of the association to "The Parkin Mission of South Australia Incorporated", to make alterations to the deed in the schedule necessitated or rendered desirable by union, and to enlarge the powers of the Governor. The Bill deletes entirely the provisions contained in the deed for the appointment of electors who in turn at present elect the governors of the mission.

Under the Bill the governors will be elected by the synod of the Uniting Church within South Australia. The Bill amends clause 8 (2) of the deed to authorise the governors to fill casual vacancies. At present either the governors or the electors may fill a casual vacancy. A person so appointed will hold office only until the next election and not as now until the term of office of his predecessor would have expired. The Bill deletes clause 18a of the deed (inserted by an amending deed made July 3, 1973, the validity of which the Bill confirms) which gives a qualified power to borrow and inserts a new clause 18a giving an unfettered power to borrow and give security.

The Parkin Trust Incorporated is, like the Parkin Mission, an association incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act, 1956-1965. The original deed of settlement has been amended from time to time by indenture and by an Act of Parliament, the Parkin Trust Incorporated Act, 1926-1967. The Bill further amends the original deed of settlement to make alterations necessitated or rendered desirable by union and to enlarge the powers of the governors. The Bill deletes clause 17 of the deed and inserts a new clause 17 authorising the governors to vary the deed with the approval of the synod. No alteration is to be made which alters the character of the institution as a religious and charitable institution. Clause 20 of the deed is amended to give an unfettered power to borrow and to give security. The fourth schedule to the Bill sets out the prescribed Congregational associations and the prescribed Presbyterian associations.

This Bill has been considered and approved by a Select Committee in another place.

Mr. WARDLE secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) 1977

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 31. Page 3085.)

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): It is very easy to see that the first part of the Treasurer's speech when introducing this Bill was written by the political section of his department. He has obviously given a direction "find everything you possibly can to discredit the federalism policy, regardless of its accuracy and regardless of whether I have said it before", and that is what they have done. Certainly, no responsible public servant would have written much of the first section. The Treasurer began his Appropriation Bill speech, submitting Supplementary Estimates for \$34 800 000, by saying:

Before turning in detail to the Treasury situation for this financial year, the unsatisfactory situation facing this State in respect of the Federal Government's federalism policy needs to be discussed.

He then went on to quote the same old remarks about the Federal Government which he made in February last year and in September last year while introducing similar measures, and for good measure this time he has added still more criticism of the Federal Government. In fact, there is very little he does not blame on the Federal Government, and for the Government this is a first-class opportunity to attack the federalism policy. Ever since December, 1975, there has been a marked change in the attitude of the Dunstan Government towards the Federal Government. In spite of occasional and deliberately colourful and publicity-catching outbursts, the State Government co-operated wholeheartedly with the Whitlam Administration. The Whitlam Government's policy of increasing the influence of central control from Canberra (that is, of centralism) was eagerly agreed to by the State Government on all occasions.

Look at the record on three major items. The Land Commission, the railways agreement and the Medibank agreement all gave at the least a measure of added control to Canberra, and, of course, in the case of the railways agreement, the State Government could not wait to sell out. Yet, at the same time, the Treasurer was making a show of attacking the Whitlam Government's tax reimbursement formula under uniform taxation, and publicly said it would lead to the destruction of the States. Of course, as a member of the same Labor Party as Mr. Whitlam, the Premier and his members were, and still are, committed to the long-term Party policies of destroying the States and of amalgamating local government into a small group of bodies subservient to an all-powerful House of Representatives.

Mr. Nankivell: The fringe system.

Dr. TONKIN: It is indeed the fringe system. As far as Australia is concerned, it is an Australian Labor Party system, a policy that has been delineated very carefully and very thoroughly by the present Leader of the Opposition on more than one occasion. Mr. Whitlam has been quoted many times in this House as having said that the best goal for State Labor parliamentarians was to work for the dissolution of State Parliaments. This was the man who was supported to the hilt by the State Government at the time of the Federal elections, and who was ignominiously disowned at the time of the last State election. From December, 1975, the State Government has held a clearly defined policy of non-co-operation with the Liberal Federal Government, beginning with a programme of deliberate

misunderstanding and non-comprehension, and extending through all stages to deliberate misrepresentation of the position.

Everything possible has been done to discredit the Federal Government and its Federalism policy, simply to try to prove that the Federal Labor Party should never have been voted out of office. I repeat "voted out of office", because it was the people who had their say in December, 1975. There have always been tensions between Federal and State Governments, and there always will be. Every State Premier wants the best possible deal for his State, and always will. Every Federal Government tends to be more conscious of its own priorities and less conscious of the States, and can be accused of not communicating enough and of not consulting enough, and there is no doubt these criticisms can be applied to the performance of the present Federal Government.

On a number of occasions I and my Liberal colleagues from other States have made these points very forcibly to the Prime Minister. I was personally not happy with the lack of full communication being accorded to all States by the present Government, but this is now being remedied. But in no way can the actions of this Federal Government be compared with the autocratic domination exerted by the Whitlam regime, a regime which used financial pressures through specific project grants to take away from the States the ability and right to manage their own affairs. Up until now, the Federal Government may have failed to explain adequately to the people of Australia exactly what is involved in or meant by its Federalism policy, and in some ways that is a pity, because, if it had explained it more fully, members of the Government opposite would not have been able to misrepresent the situation as much as they have done.

Mr. Mathwin: They would still do it.

Dr. TONKIN: They would still try, but the people of South Australia would see it for what it was worth. Although the Federal Government may not have spelt out the implications of this policy for the States clearly to the people, there is no doubt that it does support a Federalism policy which will return more power to the States to determine their own spending priorities and which certainly will not have the terrible effects on the States which the Treasurer and his Ministers repeatedly have outlined in the past few months. Faced with a choice between the disastrous Whitlam-Hayden Administration, which took autonomy from the States, and the Federalism policy, which aims to return power to the States, the great majority of people will have no hesitation in coming down decisively on the side of the States.

Whatever the faults of the present administration of the Federalism policy may be (and they are not nearly as grave as the Treasurer and his Government would have us believe, as I will show), that policy does give money, and the right to decide how to spend it, back to the States. Because I believe wholeheartedly in this State of South Australia, I will support any policy which will give and preserve this right and ability to decide our own affairs. What is quite incomprehensible to me is why the present South Australian Government is intent on sabotaging the Federalism policy, especially when we consider that the Treasurer in June, 1974, publicly advocated exactly the same policy as stage 1 of the Fraser Federalism policy now in operation.

Mr. Mathwin: Perhaps he has forgotten.

Dr. TONKIN: I am sure he wants to forget. It is very convenient that he has forgotten, but he advocated at the State A.L.P. Conference in June, 1974, exactly the same

principle as is now being put into operation in stage 1 of the Federalism policy. He said that the only fair solution to the position existing under the Whitlam Administration, was to tie the States' revenue from the Commonwealth to a fixed percentage share of personal income tax. It was quite clear and unequivocal, and that is what he was promoting at that time, but now this has been done, he bitterly opposes the scheme, presumably because it has been brought in by a Liberal Government. Obviously the Treasurer wants to see the Whitlam-Hayden age back again, regardless of the consequences. These two names are still floating around the Federal Labor Party, but I do not see them getting back in office for many years if ever. The Treasurer wants to see the Whitlam-Hayden age back again regardless of consequences, but most Australians do not. "Perish the thought" is what they are saying.

Although the Treasurer loudly proclaims his devotion to the State's interest, he puts political interest higher, and does all in his power to destroy confidence in a policy which benefits the State. Certainly, to quote him again, "the unsatisfactory situation facing this State in respect of the Federal Government's Federalism policy needs to be discussed," but it is becoming more and more clear that that unsatisfactory situation has been brought about by the reprehensible and recalcitrant attitude of non-co-operation and misrepresentation of the facts by this State Government.

Let us examine some of the distortions and misleading statements made in his speech. The Treasurer repeats his earlier remarks of February, 1976, that arrangements put forward at the February, 1976, Premiers' Conference were outlined "in the sketchiest of manners" by the Prime Minister. These remarks are merely a repeat of comments made by the Treasurer early last year: they are not applicable to the present position, although the Treasurer may have attempted to imply that the remarks are still valid.

The tax-sharing scheme was evolved over a lengthy period, and there was joint discussion at all times, including detailed joint officers' reports on technical and other issues. The proposals put forward at the February, 1976, Premiers' Conference, of course, were not detailed. Broad agreement only was sought, and the machinery was set up for officers' meetings and subsequent Premiers' Conferences to agree on the specific details. Since February, 1976, there have been two Premiers' Conferences, two Loan Council meetings, and six officers' reports submitted on State and local government entitlements. Had the Treasurer had any doubts, there was ample opportunity for him to air them at the April meeting, to which he tacitly agreed, and subsequently.

The remaining three matters to be settled in respect of stage 1 are to be considered at the next Premiers' Conference. These are: review of relativities; cash flow and budgeting arrangements; and pre Budget consultation. The report on arrangements for stage 2 of the federalism policy is also to be discussed in April.

Next the Treasurer refers to decisions to introduce full indexation of personal income tax in the first year, introduction of the Medibank levy, and change from tax rebates for dependent children to new child endowment arrangements as evidence of lack of consultation. I answered these allegations last year. They were the same allegations, and they were just as worthless this time as they were then. The intention to index personal income tax was foreshadowed long before May 20, 1976, and explicitly noted by the Prime Minister at the April, 1976,

Premiers' Conference. Perhaps the Treasurer was not there at the time, because he had just returned from a trip to Malaysia.

The States did not make any submissions or put forward any special arguments or suggestions in this regard at the time. The Medibank levy is clearly in the nature of a special surcharge, imposed for a special purpose, and, 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 agreement with the States to allow them to share in the additional revenue resulting from abolition of rebates for dependent children was clearly a concession to the States with which they, or course, could not possibly have had any argument. What a ridiculous situation to try to bring up those matters again. Somewhere, someone in the political department of the Premier's Department has been really dredging the bottom of the barrel, and not doing it very well. The speech complains of lack of assurances regarding State funds beyond 1979-80, and alleges uncertainty as a result. But the States are also guaranteed to receive in any year no less than their entitlement in the previous year, and this represents far more stability and certainty than existed before.

The States will automatically receive a share of increased revenue from income tax as the economy and incomes grow, and the Commonwealth has agreed to a review of the arrangements should any changes in tax laws significantly affect the States' entitlements.

It has also been 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. During the first year of the new arrangements the States are in fact estimated to have received substantially more (about \$90 000 000) than the former Whitlam financial assistance grants formula would have yielded, and 21 per cent more than these funds in 1975-76. In other words, the States are much better off, and South Australia is much better off financially compared to the situation under the old Whitlam financial assistance grants formula.

The Treasurer then suggests that the Commonwealth will not permit the States to enter the income tax field other than in a marginal way, but 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. Obviously, this must encourage the State's flexibility and independence in financial matters, and is the essence of the federalism policy. While it has been agreed to maintain a uniform income tax rate structure and assessment provisions, there is nothing in the agreed material to suggest that the Commonwealth will limit the State's powers with regard to surcharges or rebates.

There has been much emphasis on the surcharge question, but I point out that, if the Treasurer wants to stimulate the economy through tax cuts, under stage 2 he will be entitled to argue for tax rebates for all South Australians if he so wished. That is the freedom that will be given to him under stage 2 of the federalism policy. Having dealt with these statements, repeated from February last year, let us look at the validity of some of the more recent assertions. The Treasurer claims that the April conference is a "special" one forced by the Premiers "all of whom are gravely disturbed at the economic situation". That is not true: the April Premiers' Conference is the fourth of a series of conferences that will finalise the tax-sharing

arrangements in detail, and had been arranged that way. In detail, it was agreed at the April, 1976, Premiers' Conference that the target for introduction of stage 2 be July 1, 1977, and that intention has been well known for many months.

Budget paper No. 7 (payments to or for the States 1976-77) also states the intention to consider officers' reports and establish the framework for stage 2 so that it may commence on July 1, 1977. Where is the special nature of this forthcoming Premiers' Conference? It is a conference that is being held as part of a pattern of Premiers' Conferences to bring in stage 2 of the federalism policy. The officers have reported on outstanding stage 1 matters and arrangements for stage 2, and the Prime Minister has now called a Premiers' Conference so as to meet this deadline. Obviously this Premiers' Conference will again provide the usual opportunity for other consultations with the States on the general economic position, but that was not the only reason for its being called. The picture of doom and dismay painted by the Treasurer is obviously overdone, and overdone for a specific purpose, that is, to discredit the federalism policy, and to destroy confidence in Australia generally. The Treasurer claims lack of co-operation, little consultation and "sleight of hand" financial arrangements, but Government officers have considered the development of tax-sharing arrangements as a model of Federal-State co-operation and consultation. I am referring to officers from the Federal and State spheres. We get honesty from Government officers, which is more than we are getting from the Government opposite. I repeat that the States are receiving substantially more than the former financial assistance grants formula would have yielded, even although they may not be receiving as much as they would like. There is nothing sleight of hand about a deficit the size of that which was left by the Whitlam Administration.

The Treasurer further claims that consensus and stability in financial arrangements were "noticeably lacking in the treatment the States have received". In fact, this is not true. Tax-sharing arrangements were agreed to over three Premiers' Conferences in 1976, and the remaining matters are to be settled in April. There has, I understand, been spirited discussion and firm proposals, but the only matter on which there has been some disagreement (and that did not include all States or result from political differences) concerned the review of relativities, which will be discussed later this month. As for stability, the arrangements for a fixed share of personal income tax, together with the guarantees, should ensure greater stability than the former financial assistance grants, as the Treasurer himself argued in 1974.

Mr. Dean Brown: And 1969.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes. The cap-in-hand pilgrimage to Canberra is now a thing of the past. So why the complete about-face now, if not simply for political mileage and because he does not wish to accept the responsibility? Finally, the Treasurer referred to a number of what he calls cuts in real terms in a number of specific purpose programmes and in the capital works and housing programmes and alleges withdrawal by the Commonwealth from many fields "without providing us with the money to carry on the tasks". I nearly wept when I heard that. Deliberately, the Treasurer does not wish to understand the Federalism policy. Of course, specific purpose payments will grow more slowly than general purpose funds in 1976-77, and in some areas there will be decreases in real terms. However, after adjusting for prepayments for hospitals in late June, the Budget estimate of the increase in specific

purpose payments as a whole in 1976-77 is 9.4 per cent. That is another factor that is conveniently lost sight of by this Government.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The inflation rate is—

Dr. TONKIN: I agree with the Minister: they are extremely inflationary increases. Moreover, this follows increases of 92 per cent in 1974-75 and 34 per cent in 1975-76 under the disastrous Whitlam-Hayden regime. 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. Thus, these increases follow a 20 per cent increase in 1975-76, which raised the level of these funds to a significantly higher level in real terms. Over the entire period a steady increase has occurred. Overall, funds for the States and local government from Commonwealth Budget sources are estimated to increase by 12.6 per cent in 1976-77, after adjustment for prepayment in June of hospital funds for 1976-77. The increase is 14.6 per cent excluding non-recurring unemployment relief funds in 1975-76. This represents a significant estimated increase in real terms. I invite the Minister of Mines and Energy to work out the figures for himself.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Dr. TONKIN: Thank you, Sir, but I do not really mind, because members opposite are making fools of themselves.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am referring to interjections from both sides of the House.

Dr. TONKIN: The level of Commonwealth funds for the States is generally satisfactory, as shown by the States' finances. South Australia is now in a particularly favourable position, but I am genuinely concerned about our long-term financial status in relation to other States and the Commonwealth. Taking into account funds set aside last June for use in 1976-77, South Australia has been able to budget for significant further real increases in expenditure both on the recurrent and the capital sides, and the Government has been busily spending money to soften up key areas for the forthcoming State election. The level of funds available for the States and local government must also be viewed against the need to control inflation and, importantly, for growth in the public sector to slow down so that resources can be taken up again by the private sector. The Liberal Premiers recognise this, Mr. Hayden acknowledged the need for it to occur, but the Labor Premiers will not co-operate.

The Treasurer refers to the Australian Assistance Plan as a broken election promise and an example of apparent strategy "to hobble the States by reducing real income to the States and simultaneously increasing the number of State responsibilities". An important part of the federalism policy is for the Commonwealth to reduce its specific involvement in a number of programmes for which the States or their authorities should determine priorities. To criticise this is to deny the whole principle of the Federalism plan, but, of course, this is exactly what the South Australian Government aims to do. The Treasurer is clearly unacquainted with the release of the first report by Peter Bailey's task force on co-ordination and health, entitled "Proposals for change in the administration and delivery of programmes and services". The Treasurer may have known that the report had been released, but I am sure that that is all he knows about it. The report stated the following in its finding and recommendations:

In our discussions with Commonwealth and State officers, with representatives of local government and non-government organisations, and with individuals we found

acceptance of our approach which took the community health programme as a working model and which envisaged the possibility of programmes being administered or delivered differently in different States.

That is, allowing for State autonomy. The assumption of State financial responsibility along with privilege is implied in the following finding:

It must be recognised that devolution requires some risk taking, but we consider the advantages in the effectiveness and delivery of programmes outweigh the disadvantages.

In this aspect the South Australian Government is unable to comprehend totally and absolutely, let alone take responsibility for the arrangements which are necessary under the new federalism policy. The report continues:

We believe our recommendations, if implemented, should in general be received well by the States and local bodies, give better value for the welfare/health dollar and lead to improvement in the administration and delivery of the health, welfare and community development programme in which the Commonwealth is currently involved.

Projects initiated through the efforts of A.A.P. are appropriate for administration and financing at State or local government level. To give time for arrangements to be made, the Commonwealth is financing the scheme up to the end of this financial year, but already the State Government has decided on and announced an allocation of funds which will build up the State Community Welfare Department at the expense of some of these projects. This was a decision made by State Cabinet alone, and the State Government must take the responsibility.

The Treasurer refers to an attempt to deprive South Australia of the benefits of the railways agreement by backdoor means. The matter has been clearly discussed at the Premiers' Conference when considering guidelines for review, and South Australian officers have put forward a guideline designed to protect the railways agreement. Guidelines will again be discussed at the April Premiers' Conference. There is nothing backdoor about the Commonwealth's approach.

The fact is that, although the matter of exemption from review procedures under the old Grants Commission arrangements and the fact that South Australia was to cease being a claimant State but had a right to make application again was written into the principles of the railways agreement, it was not included in the agreement itself. This followed a suggestion to that effect in a letter from Mr. Whitlam to the Premier at the time. Obviously, the State's improved financial situation, following the railways transfer, would have been taken into account by the Grants Commission under the old arrangements, and the Treasurer should have made certain that any exemption was sewn up in the agreement.

It may be a valid, legal and binding document (as we have heard *ad nauseam*), but that aspect is not covered in the document. It is not much good crying over spilt milk now. The Premier has slipped up, and it is up to him to do the best he can to retrieve the situation at the Premiers' Conference. The Minister of Transport has recently provided another perfect example of how the facts may be distorted to try to avoid taking public responsibility for decisions actually made by State Governments. In answering a question here on the National Highway Programme in South Australia, he said:

Approvals for money to be spent must be sought from the Commonwealth Minister. No State is free to spend funds as it wishes. The States must ask the Commonwealth Minister, "May we spend money in this area?" and he must say "Yes" before we can spend it. Mr. Peter Nixon came in and said he was going to return the authority to the States, yet he has compounded the authority in Canberra.

The Minister then outlined the various programmes in South Australia, the South-Eastern Freeway, the Swanport deviation, work on the section between Port Pirie and Port Augusta, the Mount Barker Road and the Cavan overpass, all estimated to cost a total of \$16 900 000, and then said that work on the Stuart Highway was impossible anyway because only \$15 000 000 had been allocated. He then asked, rhetorically, whether Mr. Nixon would indicate which of those road projects should not proceed, so that funds could be spent on the Stuart Highway. "We cannot get an answer from them on that matter," he said, trying to put the responsibility on the Federal Minister, but the real responsibility is his. The Minister here announced Mr. Nixon's approval of the 1977-78 national roads programme for South Australia before the Federal Minister had even received the State Government's submission. Let him back out of that one if he can.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You support that arrangement?

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister is falling right in. The only thing the Commonwealth Minister can do is to approve the total sum available. It is the local Minister of Transport who must allocate the priorities. Decisions determining the priorities of project-spending are the responsibility of the State Minister concerned, once the overall fund allocation for the year has been decided on. Twice in the past two weeks the Minister has tried in the House to throw the blame on to the Federal Government again. Ministers do not care what they say, as long as they can distort the facts and try to blame someone else for their own decisions.

Members interjecting:

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

Dr. TONKIN: If the Minister of Mines and Energy really wants to know the position (and I cannot believe that he does not know that this is the real situation), I point out that the States normally submit a list of projects for approval by the Federal Minister when allocating total funds, but the amount to be spent on each individual project is the complete responsibility of the State Minister. If the Minister wants to spend all the available funds on certain projects or one project it is his decision. He could allocate funds to the Stuart Highway if he so wished. He does not believe that the highway and the people up there deserve money to be spent on the highway, and it is his decision to make. He would have to decide which other programmes were deferred or decelerated, and in this way he has misled the House in Question Time both last Thursday and yesterday. This is not the first time, nor will it be the last time, that he has deliberately misled the House by misrepresenting the facts. There is no way in which he can unload the responsibility on to the Federal Minister. The Minister must carry the can himself. Obviously, he is desperately anxious to avoid his responsibility.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: I am interested in bringing into the House the truth; I want to rebut the distortion and the misrepresentations that have been constantly peddled by Government Ministers since December, 1975, and I will do so. If ever evidence were needed—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must remind the honourable Leader that he must confine his remarks to the second reading explanation of the Bill, which is not so wide-ranging that he can take in everything that has been said, as he has claimed, since last December.

Dr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I shall return to the misrepresentations and falsehoods contained in the Treasurer's second reading explanation. If ever evidence were needed that the Dunstan Government is living in the past, and still subscribing to the Whitlam-Hayden philosophies, its attitude towards unemployment provides it, with funding directed towards the public sector and the private sector ignored. To add insult to injury, compulsory membership of a union is required before unemployed people can participate in those schemes funded through councils.

The Liberal Party has said repeatedly that these funds could better be used to counter inflation and provide employment by stimulating the private sector. Pay-roll tax concessions and other incentives, together with relief for hard-pressed small businesses, would provide a far more stable base for recovery in both areas than does the building of all the monkey houses in Australia. The Whitlam-Hayden trend is being carried through by their South Australian colleagues in yet another sphere—the Public Service in South Australia. While other Governments are pruning their expenditure as far as possible, in keeping with the stringent financial climate, the South Australian Government has continued to increase its Public Service at a rapid rate. In the past 10 years, while the Australian Public Service grew 24.3 per cent, South Australia's has grown 46.9 per cent.

Mr. Nankivell: Nearly all in the Premier's Department.

Dr. TONKIN: Not all, but a good proportion. In the year ending December, 1976, the Australian Public Service was reduced in size, by attrition, by 3 per cent, and further steps are being taken, whereas the South Australian Public Service increased by 5.2 per cent.

Regardless of productivity and the level of economic activity in Australia, the South Australian Government has continued on from where the Whitlam Government left off. It is determined not to prune its spending in line with accepted needs elsewhere, and evidence of this is one of the specific matters covered in the Estimates, namely, the creation of a new Economic Development Department. Obviously, the Government is quietly proceeding with the structure to co-ordinate the activities of the State Bank, the Savings Bank of South Australia, and other institutions, and we will be watching the situation with great care.

The provision of \$5 000 000 for further exploration in the Cooper Basin to determine the extent of gas reserves is a reflection of the importance which these fossil fuel reserves have taken on in our planning for the future of the State. What will be the outcome of the Government's negotiations to acquire the Federal Government's interest in the Cooper Basin remains to be seen.

Other matters will be discussed by my colleagues. I am most concerned about the future of South Australia under its present Government, for two reasons, the first being the fight against inflation and unemployment concerns us all, because these things affect us all. Unless they are controlled our standard of living will be affected. There must be a united effort, with everyone committed to increasing productivity and restoring confidence. This Government is doing very little except to promote the same disastrous policies of the Whitlam Government which put us in this most unfortunate situation. It seems committed to this course, determined not to co-operate in any way in a combined assault on our common problems. As for confidence, with Mr. Hayden's example on devaluation shining before them, the Labor Premiers have been doing their very best

to throw doubt and gloom on the economic strategy adopted by the Federal Government.

Mr. Dean Brown: That was a piece of economic vandalism.

Dr. TONKIN: It was indeed, and the Labor Party Premiers have done nothing to recover the situation. None of them has been really prepared to give the economic strategy a fair go, and they have actively worked to hinder its success. The Treasurer returned yesterday from just such an exercise.

The second point relates to the federalism policy. Regardless of the Government of the day, I will support any policy which returns financial responsibility and self-determination to this State. We have the right to manage our own affairs, and to determine how and in what priorities we will spend our money. That is the message I have for the Prime Minister, and I have that message for any Prime Minister. It has long been held by public finance theorists that the division of financial from expenditure responsibilities represented an inherent weakness in the structure of Australian fiscal federalism. A State Premier simultaneously calling for tax cuts to stimulate the national economy and screaming bloody murder at not receiving sufficient funds to finance projects of immediate importance is a perfect example of such political insanity.

People in all States, of all political persuasions, are utterly sick and tired of such regular political bun-fights. For years now responsible people have called for the end of the political financial buckpassing, of which public utterances by the Treasurer represent the most recent example. They demand this in the interests of good government. Indeed, the Labor Party has used this very point to argue for the abolition of the States altogether and to have direct funding from Commonwealth to local and/or regional bodies. Such a concept is in line with the simplistic obsession that permeates the Labor Party for uniformity, irrespective of regional, economic, geographic, political, social, and cultural factors.

The Fraser solution is to devolve responsibility for both finance and expenditure on the States. This is the federalism policy, and I would support it whatever Federal Government brought it in, because it is in the best interests of South Australia. The present Government of South Australia is doing all it can to sabotage such a policy. It is not prepared to accept the responsibility for making its own decisions; in fact, it is dedicated to returning these powers to Canberra as soon as it can return a Labor Government there. Fortunately, it will have to wait a long time, but meanwhile the State will suffer because of this attitude of non-co-operation with the federalism policy. The State will suffer as long as there is a Labor Administration in power in South Australia. I believe in South Australia, and I believe we can and should manage our own affairs. If the Labor Party will not govern for the good of South Australia, then, in the interests of all South Australians, it should be put out of office. We cannot afford this Government any longer.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): It is a pleasure to speak in this debate, not because I have any enthusiasm for what the Treasurer had to say in his long attack on the Federal Government, but because it is a pleasure to add to some of the remarks of the Leader who has, in a first-class speech, refuted completely the petty allegations of the Treasurer. The Treasurer is showing no vestige of statesmanship in the sort of outburst to which we were subjected earlier this week. He referred to the policies of the Fraser Government as the "idiot economic policies" of the Fraser Government.

Mr. Keneally: That's the—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He has the approval of the back bench of his Party. I am glad they were here to hear the Leader's speech. There is a clear division of opinion —

Dr. Eastick: There were fewer here when he gave it than there are now, and that's not many.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: They do not concern themselves unduly with the economic welfare of the State, as we notice by their regular inattendance in this Chamber. There is a clear polarisation between the economic policies of the Federal Government and those pursued by the Labor Government in South Australia. The phrase used by the Treasurer referred to the "idiot economic policies" of the Fraser Government. I did not see him on television, but I have been told that he worked himself up into such a lather that people were afraid that he might have some sort of a fit. I have heard this phrase from the Treasurer's mouth on radio, and it sounded to me as though he was about to have a fit.

The Federal Government is intent on putting this country back on its feet. I believe it will be a long time before the Australian public forgets the tragic, disastrous Whitlam years. It is often said, and there is an element of truth in the assertion, that the public has a short political memory, but I believe it will be a long time before the public in this country forget the spectacle and the disaster of the Whitlam years. If I can offer a bit of friendly advice to members opposite, the sooner the Labor Party unloads its present Leader, although it has no adequate substitute in sight, the better its chances of perhaps winning Government in about 50 or 60 years.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Speaking politically, he is an asset because he is a living reminder of the disaster of the Whitlam years. He was associated with a succession of Treasurers, none of whom showed the slightest competence or ability to manage the affairs of this country. There are clear signs of economic up-turn, and the Treasurer does not like it. He lacks any qualities of statesmanship, but for his own petty advantage he wants to see this country continue on the course charted by the Whitlam Administration and the Whitlam Treasurers. He has adopted the economic policy for this State that was enunciated and followed in Canberra. The Treasurer has clearly opted for the economic policies of his Federal Labor colleagues.

There is clear evidence of the contrary view, the view that we must stimulate the private sector if we are to do anything for long-term employment in this country. There is clear evidence that that recovery is under way. I do not know whether members opposite take time to read the sort of report in the daily press to which I shall refer; they are probably intent on other issues that may be of less moment. I wish to quote for their edification some of the reports during the last week or two that indicate clearly that the Fraser Administration is on the right track. On April 2, under the heading "Capital spending rises sharply", a report in the *Advertiser* states:

New capital spending by business rose sharply in the December quarter, according to seasonally adjusted figures issued by the Bureau of Statistics yesterday. Expenditure totalled \$1 442 000 000, an 8.3 per cent improvement on the September quarter and a 15.4 per cent lift on the level of spending a year earlier. This form of spending, which is regarded as tangible evidence of faith in the future and the source of improved productivity, is a heartening sign for the economy.

That report was written by the Economics Editor, Edward Nash. In case the members opposite missed that one, a report, under the heading "Business surveys lift the gloom", in the *Australian* of March 29, states:

Although 1977 is still going to be a rough year, two reports yesterday suggest that the economy is beginning to expand. W. D. Scott and Company, in their latest Economic Advice to Business, say this is in spite of grim surface figures of rising unemployment and inflation and the quarterly survey of the Associated Chambers of Manufacturers of Australia shows it is less pessimistic about business conditions in the next six months.

That is bad news for the Treasurer, who follows the economic policies of the Whitlam years. The Treasurer wants to see a reversal to that policy. Mr. Colin Branson, who is probably *persona non grata* to members opposite, is reported to have said:

New figures showing a surge in business investment in Australia were further evidence that the economy was on the recovery road.

Surely members opposite have picked up some of those reports.

Dr. Tonkin: There are none so blind as those who do not want to see.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: And those who close their ears and eyes to the economic facts of life; I agree with my Leader. On March 29, under the heading "Economy recovery, says Shrapnel", the *Advertiser* reported the following:

"Go home, have a celebration and stop worrying about the economy. Things are better than you think." That was the parting message economist and business adviser Mr. Phillip Shrapnel gave Adelaide businessmen at one of his regular economic briefings yesterday.

I suggest the Treasurer and his political advisers read that report. There has been plenty of criticism of Government from top economists in banks over the past 18 months or so and it is refreshing to read under the heading "Bank backs Government economic policy" in the *Advertiser* of March 31, the following report:

Criticism of the Federal Government's economic performance is unjustified, says the Commercial Bank of Australia in its latest economic review. It follows an optimistic report earlier this week by economist and business adviser Mr. Phillip Shrapnel who said "things are better than you think".

That article also mentions the W. D. Scott report that also indicates we have turned the corner. Obviously the Treasurer wants to ignore that trend and is disappointed that the Fraser policies are working in the long-term interests of this country. In his petty politicking way the Treasurer has stated on television and the radio that we are following idiot economic policies. I think the public weighed up the pros and cons of the situation at the last Federal election. In seeking to denigrate the Fraser policies, the Treasurer is doing himself damage.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you think he has forgotten that he said, "Don't blame me for Cameron's mistakes"?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The day of reckoning is coming fast in South Australia. The Treasurer has complained about the lack of consultation by the Commonwealth Government, and he also complains in his explanation about the tax indexation proposals implemented by the Federal Government. If ever there was a major economic reform it was the proposal to implement the indexation of income tax.

Dr. Tonkin: He was in favour of it himself.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No-one knows where the Treasurer stands. In one breath he said that we must have tax cuts to generate spending. He talked about anomalies when Labor was in office, because of increasing incomes

with tax not indexed, but as soon as the present Government does it, the Treasurer complains. What sort of economic hypocrisy is that? It is complete humbug and hypocrisy. The Treasurer is in direct conflict with the Fraser economic policies.

Dr. Tonkin: Who will suffer?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Treasurer will suffer in the long term. The public is not as gullible as the Treasurer would suggest. The Treasurer complains about the Medibank policy. Again on this issue there is a plain difference of philosophy between that of the Labor Party and that of the Liberal Party. The Labor Party has propounded the idea that you can get something in this life for nothing. It believes the public can be inflamed to expect, be it in education, health or welfare, massive increases in spending, and that people can be deluded into thinking that someone else is going to pay for it. The Labor Party is long on promises but short on the way in which revenue is to be collected. The Treasurer has stated in the past that the tall poppies will be taxed. He has said that there is always someone with more than you have and you will get some of what they have. That idea caught up with the Federal and State Labor Governments, and we do not hear much these days in this State about taxing the tall poppies.

Mr. Wotton: The Treasurer was never able to tell us who were the tall poppies.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No, but it is the insurance companies at the moment. We do not hear about it now when we learn we have the highest charges for water in Australia. We do not hear about taxing the tall poppies when a new tax is levied on the profits of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. All of my friends have electricity connected to their houses but I do not know many wealthy people. The Treasurer talks about taxing the tall poppies and then increases sales tax on motor vehicles to a record level. He conveniently forgot the old catch cry. In its heart of hearts the Government knows it has to tax the average citizen to raise the billions of dollars needed for its fancy schemes. The Government now complains that the public is paying for the Medibank scheme. The public has been given some choice in the level of medical care it requires. There is competition between Medibank and private health schemes, and the public is paying in a different way. The Government is trying to hoodwink the public into thinking it is getting something for nothing. It is paying one way or another whether from general revenue or by a levy. The public is not as gullible or as simple as members opposite think. The Treasurer can whinge as much as he likes, but the fact is that the Medibank scheme under Labor was costing the average citizen plenty. By financing it in a different way he now knows exactly what it is costing and what the benefits are. An element of competition and choice has now come into the scheme, so there are no grounds for complaint by the Treasurer.

The Treasurer also complained (and I heard this on radio when he was working himself up into that fit talking about the idiot economic policies of the Fraser Administration) that Mr. Fraser has broken every promise he had made. In plain language, that is a lie, a complete and utter falsehood. Time precludes me from outlining in detail all the Fraser Government has accomplished, but I will point out one or two promises that were made and kept. It promised to get the economy moving again. I have already outlined clear evidence that that is happening. Of course, the Treasurer conveniently ignores that. Specific help to the business community was promised and this was

given. An investment allowance was introduced (initially of 40 per cent), it relaxed conditions under which interest on convertible notes was deductible, quarterly tax payments were suspended, and so on. If those things had not happened, I believe the sort of reports that I quoted earlier would not have been possible.

The Fraser Government promised to end the secret tax rip-off caused by Labor's inflation. This was complained about by Labor before Whitlam came to office, and it is what the Treasurer complains about now; he complains about tax indexation as though it is going to affect the funds flowing to this State. What humbug, what nonsense! The Fraser Government promised that it would pay special attention to the disadvantaged and those in need. It has done that. Child endowment has been expanded and helps 300 000 low income families with 800 000 children who were not able to benefit fully under the previous arrangements. The allowance for the handicapped has been increased from \$10 to \$15 a week in the Budget. Handicapped children's benefits have been increased from \$3.50 to \$5 a day in the Budget.

In three years there will be \$121 000 000 for handicapped people. The Fraser Government introduced the home savings grant scheme for young people to help first home buyers to bridge the deposit gap. This was more generous than anything proposed by the Labor Government. The Fraser Government increased tax exemptions when an estate passed between husband and wife and helped single income families. It increased the level of tax rebates for spouse and sole parent. There is a long list. The Fraser Government said it would maintain the real value of pensions and other benefits, by indexation and that has been done. It said it would ensure that all Australians had access to primary and secondary schools and equal opportunity for personal achievement. There have been real increases in education spending, despite what we have heard from other sources. There were dramatic cuts during the last year of the Whitlam regime under Treasurer Hayden (who is the current hope of the side). I am sure from my own knowledge of what has been going on around South Australia that the public of this State is well aware of the fundamental economic facts of life. The list goes on, but I will not spend any more time on it. For the Treasurer to claim that all of the Fraser Government's promises have been broken is an obvious lie.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable Deputy Leader that the words "lie" and "lying" are unparliamentary.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; "falsehood" is the first word that then comes to mind, and "fabrication" is another one.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable Deputy Leader will acknowledge the situation.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Treasurer claims that every promise made by the Fraser Administration has been broken; I say that that is absolute and utter nonsense. Let me briefly canvass (and the Leader did this most adequately) the efforts of the Labor Administration in this State to ensure the long-term security and prosperity of South Australia. As the Leader has outlined, we have had a record build-up in the public sector—we are the pace-setting State. The figures for the public sector (not just the Public Service, but day labour and weekly labour) show a record growth in South Australia above the figures elsewhere in Australia. This is in direct contrast to what has happened in the Commonwealth scene.

Then we have the much vaunted unemployment figures in South Australia. The Government has launched its own version of the RED scheme, as it was called, the scheme of their former colleagues in Canberra. We are well aware that the Labor Party has surplus funds at its disposal in South Australia. It has a decided advantage over other States because of the railways deal that it concluded with its Federal counterparts. It would appear that that agreement is far from watertight. Past history indicates that other agreements that were thought to be watertight (for instance, the agreement to build a railway line to the Northern Territory back in the 1930's or 1940's or the agreement to build the Chowilla Dam) were not watertight. It would appear on observation that this agreement is even less watertight than those, neither of which was honoured. I think the Treasurer boo-boomed. South Australia is trading on the money that flowed to the State from the railways deal, and in addition the Government does not have to fund the railways deficit.

Mr. Venning: That's 30 per cent to 40 per cent.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is the deficit figure. There is also the money that flowed to the South Australian Government from the transfer of railway assets. The Government is using that money as short-term palliatives, for a short-term unemployment scheme that is doing nothing to create or to stimulate long-term employment in South Australia.

There is no end in sight to this build-up in the public sector in this State. If we are looking for long-term employment prospects in South Australia, it is my view that the much vaunted \$17 000 000 that has gone down the sink could have been spent far more wisely in creating long-term opportunities for employment by stimulating the private sector in this State. I am saying that the Government has opted (as it always does) for short-term palliatives. It has been able to pad the employment figures for this State. I inquired about the efficiency of one project. In the Tea Tree Gully District, a new works depot is being built for the council. One of the main problems facing this country is that of productivity, so I asked a person who knew the facts and who was involved with that project how much he thought it would cost if the work was performed by traditional means, by letting a contractor to perform the work. Under this Government scheme manual labour has to be employed, concrete has to be mixed by hand, etc. This person's estimate was that that project is costing five times as much by using this method.

I asked him about the workers who were employed on the job. He told me that they had taken on 55 persons and that nine had turned up for work the day before my inquiry. I believe that this money is not being spent efficiently and is doing nothing to improve productivity or to provide long-term employment opportunities that will do something to improve the long-term stability of this State. I have been referring to a way in which a tangible asset can be provided for the State. If the works could have been let on contract more would be achieved with the money and employment would be generated. No doubt the decision was made for political purposes in order to pad unemployment figures in South Australia. I quote economic facts that the Treasurer should consider. From 1970 to 1975 in Australia wages went up by 12 per cent and output by 2.3 per cent. The productivity gap is obvious, and it is a major problem. What we produce is what we sell, and that generates wealth; that is a fundamental economic ailment that is present in this country. In South Australia, a 3.2 per cent increase in

personnel in the public sector with a 6.5 increase in wages (and that is a conservative estimate) meant a 59 per cent increase in five years in the State Budget. No increase in personnel with a 6.5 per cent increase in wages means a 36 per cent increase in the Budget in five years. The difference between the two figures on the present Budget would be \$168 000 000. If we increase at the present rate, with a 6.5 per cent annual increase in wages but held the line in the public sector, we would achieve a saving of \$168 000 000.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: There seem to be plenty of "ifs" in that sentence.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: There may be, but there are also certainties, and this will not happen under a Labor Administration. I quote from the South Australian economist, Eckermann, whose report about a solution for our economic ills was sent to members. The Treasurer's solution is to reduce taxation and increase spending, a nonsensical proposition. Mr. Eckermann states:

The most significant way in which such huge deficits and consequent inflation rates can arise is through an increased reliance on Government spending to alleviate unemployment and stagnant production levels. By relying on ever-increasing spending by Governments, little of direct assistance is provided in increasing the output of productive goods and services in an economy and hence in providing increased long-term job opportunities.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That's not all he said.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No, but that sums it up.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What else did he say?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will give the document to the former Minister, but I know how long he will spend reading it. The Treasurer is not the least bit interested in the economic welfare of this country, in co-operating with the Federal Government, or in assuming the financial responsibility which, as Treasurer of this State, he should be willing to assume.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before calling on the member for Light, I have some comments to make. I have listened for some time to the Leader and Deputy Leader. This is a second reading debate on a Bill, and the Chair has so far allowed the debate to be very wide. I take it that the Leader and Deputy Leader are the main speakers for the Opposition, but I hope that all honourable members in future will come back to the Bill, as the debate seems to be developing into a grievance debate, and honourable members will have that opportunity soon.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The matters referred to by me and by the Leader were refuting points raised in the Treasurer's speech. The Treasurer did not direct his remarks to the Bill until the latter part of his speech, and the points we have used were those raised by the Treasurer when introducing the Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am afraid that most points being canvassed by the Leader and Deputy Leader have not had much to do with what the Treasurer had to say. I can only ask honourable members to confine themselves to the Bill. The debate has got wide of the mark, although I must say that the Deputy Leader at one stage referred to unemployment, which is part and parcel of a line in the Bill. The honourable member for Light.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): The presentation of this Bill by the Treasurer was reminiscent of the tirades we used to have to put up with during the early 1970's. There is much reiteration in this document. Indeed, the first four pages clearly relate to what was said in 1976 and

even back into 1975, and there are direct lift-outs by the Treasurer of statements he made then relating to his criticism and lack of appreciation of the Fraser Government. However, many of the tirades we heard from Government Ministers in late 1970 and through 1971 and 1972 suddenly ceased at the end of 1972 when the Whitlam Government came into power.

Mr. Wardle: Crisis in education!

Dr. EASTICK: That was a classic example. We have education involved in this Bill, and we will be considering increased funds for that purpose. We found that Government Ministers used this Parliament as a medium for whipping the Federal Government: one used to think that that was purely and simply because it was a Government of a different political persuasion. In great measure, that was the reason for their attitude and the manner in which they conducted themselves in this place. However, there was a deeper involvement, because they were seeking to promote a series of policies that were being put forward by the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Whitlam, and some of his shadow Ministers. As it turned out, as a result of the unfortunate experience of people in Australia from 1972 to 1975, they were promoting a myth which has left the finances of Australia, and indirectly the finances of this State, in a parlous situation and one which fortunately, with courage and much restraint in following the popular line, the present Federal Administration is bringing into a more realistic position and which, fortunately for the people who care in these matters, is being reflected in the attitude of the media. I refer members to the editorial in today's *Advertiser* which is relevant to our financial position, as outlined in this measure, and to the involvement of Government spending in this State for the foreseeable future. The editorial, which was headed "New Federalism", states:

The concern of State Premiers is growing as the time approaches for the new income tax raising powers which the Prime Minister is determined to thrust upon them. The Federal Government's programme provides for the second phase of its "new Federalism" plan, the granting to States of the right to impose an income tax surcharge or rebate, to come into operation on July 1. It is already clear that this issue, together with the proposed review of the allocation as between States of their percentage of Commonwealth tax receipts, will cause acrimonious discussion at next week's Premiers' Conference.

No-one could suggest that the leader writer was showing his colours, as has often been suggested by members opposite. He was stating a fact, sniffing the breeze and coming up with what we could all accept is a fair indication of what is likely to happen at the meeting next week. His comment that the meeting will be acrimonious is apt. His next comment is important: it is what other people in the community are saying. It is as follows:

Despite its being branded by the Labor Premiers as a form of "double taxation," the State surcharge provision in the new Federalism policy is a fair one. It means that Premiers will no longer find it easy to blame Canberra for the shortages of funds about which they never cease to complain. The remedy in future will be in their own hands. There will be at least a partial restoration of the principle that those who spend money should take the responsibility for raising it.

Those who raise money should accept the odium that goes with its raising. I suggest that all members read the entire editorial, the last paragraph of which states:

Mr. Fraser would be unwise to squeeze the States too hard, but he is right in insisting that they should share in the restraints imposed by economic necessity. Before long, it may be hoped, there will be agreement on a fair basis for the regular funding of States and an acceptance by them of their responsibility—

and I underline the term "their responsibility"—to raise whatever extra they feel they need.

The editorial is reasoned and reflects in great measure the feelings of most people, certainly people in this State. I cannot talk about the feelings of people in other States, because I have not visited them for any length of time recently. However, what is stated in the editorial is the type of statement that is coming from workers, farmers, businessmen and, indeed, a broad cross-section of the community. Those people accept the need for a total view of the economy by the people of this State. We must have a total view of this measure. I will now read several other extracts and then identify them. An article headed "National means" states:

To bring down inflation and improve industry's performance: this is the only way to create more jobs and raise living standards without going back to financial crises, runs on the currency, more foreign borrowing. Previous measures have restored financial stability. Firm control of public spending, money supply, etc., will maintain it.

That extract is from a news release from the British High Commissioner and is a summary of United Kingdom Budget proposals. In a document which accompanied that release and which is a background to the Chancellor's Budget statement, the following is stated:

Nothing is gained by increasing a country's power to spend faster than its ability to produce saleable goods. That leads to rapid inflation, a fall in the exchange value for its currency, low investment and fewer jobs. The Budget therefore goes as far as the economy will allow at present in safeguarding living standards. . . . The aim must be to keep personal living standards at around their present level and to set up the right conditions for an improvement next year. More cannot be done now without risking the financial and monetary stability achieved by the reductions in planned public spending and other measures announced in December.

Those statements are not made by a person of my political persuasion, but they are the statements, I suggest, of a person with his feet on the ground who recognises that, in an inflationary situation and the difficulties that beset the English population as, indeed, they beset Australia on a Federal and State basis, a need for reality exists. These excerpts show a realistic approach to these important matters. Earlier this week Mr. Branson, Executive Director of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, indicated in the media that there were signs of improvement in the well-being of our economy. The Chairman of the National Bank of Australasia Limited, in his address (a document that was forwarded to all members in the past 24 to 48 hours), under the heading on page 8 "A difficult period of transition", states:

We are all aware of the economic difficulties that have persisted over the past year. Wages and prices have continued to increase at an excessive, albeit somewhat reduced, rate and business activities have remained subdued. This hesitancy has been most pronounced in the vital area of new capital investment. It is, I think, fair to say that the economy has responded less quickly than many hoped to the various inducements provided by the authorities—and this is the important point—

However, it would be a pity if developments such as these were to obscure the progress that has been made during the past year in restoring a sounder economic and financial environment.

The passage "made during the past year in restoring a sounder economic and financial environment" is worth repetition, because it is something that members opposite and certainly the Treasurer should let sink in deeply, and it is important. Unless we have a stable financial and economic environment none of us, whether we are members of the Labor Party, Liberal Party or any other Party, whether we are members of Parliament, whether we be in business or whether we are toilers will advance our position. It is only on a sound basis of that nature that we will improve our position. One could say much more about that topic. I relate what I have said back

to the statements made by the Treasurer when introducing this measure. He has consistently said publicly and in his second reading explanation, "We will go on spending. We are going to do things which we know the people of the State want of us. The Federal Government can give us the cash with which to do it, or we will make use of our reserves." Naturally, we will make use of our reserves, which have accumulated because of the great over-taxing of South Australians during the past two years, at least; indeed, over an even longer period. The Treasurer is able to appropriate the large sums that will be directed into the various issues contained in the Bill because the money has been amassed in advance of his own planning. It is money that has been returned to the State at a much faster rate than we expected when the various taxing measures were introduced in the House for its approval.

Many of the funds we are now able to expend on South Australians' behalf have been provided by South Australians on a false premise. This money has come from pay-roll tax, stamp duty, land tax, and various other taxing areas, and goes directly into Consolidated Revenue at a speed far faster than was promoted to the House by the Government. The Government cannot stand off and say "Oh, but we were in an inflationary situation. It was beyond our expectations." On several issues, particularly land tax generally (not only rural tax), Opposition members, having taken an assessment of the valuations applying in South Australia, were able to say to the Treasurer and to the Government, "That will return you far more than the sum you are seeking."

I now return to the Bill in more detail. Other members who will speak subsequently will no doubt refer to certain statements contained in the second reading explanation, in which the following appears:

The Federal Government has withdrawn from all these fields without providing us with the money to carry on the tasks. If these policies are continued and if the Prime Minister pushes ahead with his attempts to deprive South Australia of the benefits of the railways agreement, demands on the State Treasury will increase far more rapidly than revenue collections.

I have seen nothing (and I have looked closely at the Prime Minister's statements and those of other responsible Ministers) which says that the Federal Government is seeking to back off or move away from its commitment under the railways agreement. I have seen statements from those responsible people in which they have said that, because of the experiences of having to look closely at several agreements which were entered into by the Whitlam Government (which did not achieve what they set out to achieve in the Commonwealth's interest and in the recipient's interest), it was necessary to reassess all of the documents so that hidden clauses that were beneficial one way or the other were identified before further commitment was entered into.

I believe that we are in that situation. We have had an unequivocal assurance by the Prime Minister that South Australia would receive no less than it was guaranteed under the agreement, but that it was important to ensure that the agreement was a correct document and did not provide less or more than was arranged for. The Treasurer said:

South Australia has been able to cushion the impact of the Federal Government's policies over the past 18 months.

I can only repeat what I said earlier, namely, South Australia has been able to do that purely and simply because it had extracted from South Australians massive sums in excess of its spending capabilities (heaven only knows, it has been a spender). It has amassed those sums and

has used them. What has happened simultaneously (and this is important to South Australia's economy) is that, during the same period, by becoming a trendy Government, it has loaded on to business in this State a whole series of additional costs, and that has had the effect of exporting to other States many of South Australia's jobs. No Government member can deny that.

No area of industry in South Australia that relies in great measure on the placement of its product on an Eastern States market has not been disadvantaged by the loadings which we have to wear today but which we did not have to wear in the past. I do not want it thought that I am suggesting that the worker should not get his just dues. I am fully in accord with a proper approach to those matters, but I believe that we have excesses in South Australia which have resulted in the export of job opportunity and which, although we may claim now to have a cushioning effect by virtue of the large reserves we have, will backfire against us soon, because we will not see, regrettably, the same degree of return to the State as it has had in the past because of the loss of business activity generated within the State.

Mr. Evans: Is the weekly-paid worker able to buy more with his weekly pay packet now than he was previously?

Dr. EASTICK: Anyone who takes on the weekend shopping in the local supermarket is able to appreciate that he cannot buy as much as he used to buy with the same sum in his pocket; this is the unfortunate position in which we find ourselves. We are currently in a beneficial position because of the previous high taxation, but this has subsequently forced business opportunity and job opportunity away and the immediate future is not so rosy. High revenue, without further massive State taxation, will not apply. I question seriously the statement made by the Treasurer that the South Australian Government cannot indefinitely try to pick up the pieces of the social and economic damage the Federal Government is causing. I believe that the Treasurer and Government members must accept that many of the problems we have resulted from their blind support of and subservience to the Whitlam regime when it was in power in Canberra from 1972 to 1975. The Treasurer goes on to speak of the "coercive centralism" in respect of the present Fraser federalism policy. I can say, without fear of contradiction, that I am far happier with the form of consultative discussion of federalism which is unfolding step by step under the Fraser regime than ever I was under the "dictatorial centralism" foisted on us by the Whitlam regime. One has only to go back to its attitude to regional councils, the complete removal of the States in its thinking, and the amassing of all power on the Canberra scene.

My only further comment is that the Supplementary Estimates, even though they are not the major appropriation proposal for the State for this year, are a sizable sum of money for us to be considering. In 1970 (the first supplementary proposal to which I addressed myself), the sum involved was \$2 800 000. Today, we are being asked to address ourselves to \$34 800 000. Inflation, during the period from 1970 until today, has not increased by the same proportion. The Government is admitting in some places that it failed to put adequate documentation before the House on an earlier occasion. It pinpoints that one massive sum of money, almost \$1 000 000, relates to an unexpected wage payment because someone miscued in the calculations and there happened to be three pay periods during June, 1977.

Mr. Becker: It's happening regularly.

Dr. EASTICK: It has been happening far too regularly. Finally, I question seriously the statement of the Treasurer in this House that he believed that we would be able to maintain a close balance. His words were, "Recent reviews by the Treasury and individual departments show that, in the absence of any large unforeseen items, a final result close to a balance would still be likely." The Government and the Treasurer are in a position to manipulate that situation, and the concurrence of this House is being sought with this measure to allow that balance to eventuate, because we are effectively salting away funds by the commitment we are asked to accept. Straight out, the \$9 000 000 being appropriated to balance off the Loan deficit is a salting away of revenue funds. Granted, the end result is to have the Loan Account in balance. However, it is effectively taking away from the view of the South Australian public, which looks only superficially at the statements of account put forward by the Government at the end of the various accounting periods, the fact that, if we have a balanced Budget at the end of June, 1977, it is actually a false balance, because the Budget should be \$9 000 000 in front; \$9 000 000 is being salted away in this way to rule off the debit in the Loan Account.

It could be said that this is taking from the right pocket to put it into the left pocket, and that it is in the interests of the State. One would not deny that situation, but it is the falsity of the promotion that I highlight, the fact that it takes away from the public view the fact that the Government has continued to obtain sizable and effective sums from the Commonwealth and that, over and above that money, it has extracted from the South Australian public large sums far in excess of its expected tax return. That is falsifying the situation because it is possible to come to this House or to go to the people of the State and say, "We can give you no effective reduction in this or that area because our previous proposals have been shown to be factual." I do not vote against the Bill, but I certainly hope that some of the facts relating to it are better understood in the public mind and that they will be promoted by the press to the public in precisely the way in which the press promoted a real, commonsense, and feet-on-the-ground attitude in this morning's editorial.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): As the three preceding speakers on this side have pointed out, the Bill before us is another example of Fraser bashing, particularly an attack on the Fraser federalism policy. In looking at the first few pages of the Bill and the associated documents, we see that the Treasurer is making play of his statement in February, 1976, when he said that South Australia faced a disturbing number of economic unknowns. He was referring, of course, to the Fraser Government. I suggest that there have not been (nor will there ever be) as many unknowns with the Fraser Government as there were under the Whitlam Government.

I suppose that the Dunstan Government, to boost the unknown element in the State's coffers, is thinking now about another rip-off that can be quickly imposed to bring in a large amount of revenue, preferably from non-Labor Party voters, and, before the cries of protest have been heard, the State Government will find it has enough for its purpose and, with a fair amount of propaganda on the big gesture it is making, it will lift the monetary burden. The people of South Australia should be waking up to this familiar pattern. In other States, South Australia has earned the reputation of being the socialist

State. The Labor Party, which is the mouthpiece of the trade union movement, is certainly running this State, and it is unfortunately showing up clearly right at this time. This State has one of the highest inflation rates. It has one of the highest costs of living, and anyone who has travelled to other States recently will agree that the price differential in other States is very much lower than that in this State.

The Treasurer also refers to the special Premiers' Conference which is to be called to discuss Federal-State relations, a subject he mentions when he is complaining of the deterioration of the State situation regarding Federal financing of the States generally.

I remind the Treasurer that he was making exactly the same complaints under the Whitlam Administration at a time when the Federal Labor Government was overspending wildly to the tune of thousands of millions of dollars, bringing the country to the brink of disaster. The sooner we realise that someone has to act responsibly and clean up the mess, the better. The Treasurer has had plenty of notice of a few years of unpleasant belt tightening. Reference has been made by others on this side to the improvement that has been noticed in the economy at present. Under the heading "This is the mood we want", the editorial in the *News* recently states:

What a refreshing and heartening change it is to hear a leading economist tell businessmen: "Things are better than you think." And it's more cheerful still to find immediate independent support for his assessment. Economist Mr. Philip Shrapnel told Adelaide businessmen yesterday that recovery is clearly under way.

The Associated Chambers of Manufacturers of Australia in its latest survey says there is now a more encouraging outlook than three months ago. Management consultants W. D. Scott, while being realistic about the difficulties of the immediate future, also report that demand is strengthening. The message is clear: we are on the move again. Australia's decision-makers are at last beginning to take new project and expansion plans out of their pigeonholes. Now that the austerity programme is beginning to show results (and the Fraser Government is responsible for that), the Australian Labor Party has started a campaign to upset the situation. It would appear that the stability of economies throughout Australia as a whole, the maintenance of our oversea markets (which will result in an improvement in employment figures), and the general welfare of all Australians are of no importance whatsoever to the Labor Party, and in particular to the Treasurer. These people have only a socialistic goal set on its relentless path, and it does not matter what is the cost to this State or to Australians generally, either mentally or financially. The Bill refers to the Premier's Department and new departments that are being set up at the present. I believe that this State is already administered by far too many departments. I believe the Treasurer is also a bit worried on this score, so he has had the Premier's Department take over recently various functions from other departments. I am told that the Premier's Department has taken over several functions. I will be interested to receive the reply to a question about this that I have on notice.

I am worried that the Premier's Department is having far too much say in the running of the State in a dictatorial manner. I believe it is extremely dangerous to have too much power in the Premier's Department of any Government and, should there be any further necessity for function shifting, I believe the jobs should be distributed amongst departments, other than the Premier's Department, that are already established. The Treasurer referred to our favourable financial situation at the moment. He did not say that as a State we are over-taxed, and

I believe we are over-taxed in an attempt to promote the Government at the taxpayers' expense.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You are over-taxing your brain.

Mr. WOTTON: We all appreciate that this State is one of the highest-taxed States in Australia. The Attorney-General might be interested to know that for every dollar paid to the Dunstan Government in 1970 we are now paying \$5.38, which represents an increase of 438 per cent. If the Attorney-General or the Treasurer is pleased about that, I am not.

Mr. Evans: That's even faster than the Whitlam inflation.

Mr. WOTTON: Yes. Pay-roll tax has been increased from 2½ per cent to 5 per cent. In 1973, \$34 000 000 was paid in pay-roll tax and in 1977 the sum will be \$136 000 000. When the Treasurer referred to the favourable financial situation in this State, land tax was included. Receipts from land tax have increased from \$7 600 000 in 1971 to \$18 600 000 this year. This can only be regarded (as it is being by the community generally) as a complete rip-off to help finance this over-taxed State. In the past 12 months the Opposition has attempted to do something about the land tax situation. We appreciate the fact that the Government has been able to remove (with a fair bit of nudging from the Opposition and from other groups) land tax on rural properties. In the past 12 months we have attempted to remove further the aggregation of land tax by suggesting that section 12 of the Land Tax Act concerning the aggregate taxable value of land be repealed. This is a glaring example of where the Government of the State is receiving money to put it into the situation it regards as favourable at the moment. Whilst it is generally recognised that this tax is extremely unfair, the Government does not seem to care.

We have been told that steps are being taken and much money has been spent to provide literature to educate people in this State about the necessity to save water. I suggest that this is a step in the right direction because we are in a dry State and special steps should be taken. In September last year, I asked a question of the Treasurer about the exorbitant increase in water and sewerage rates being imposed on some residents in my own district. The Treasurer's original reply to the request for him to look into the situation was that these massive increases were as a result of the rising value of land in the area, and he implied that nothing could be done about it. Towards the end of last year, some people in the area received most interesting letters from the Chief Revenue Office of the Engineering and Water Supply Department stating that it appeared there had been a discrepancy and the account originally rendered was incorrect. The letter went on to say that the error had been rectified and an amended account was being enclosed. The department apologised for the error and hoped the original account had not caused great concern.

The figures that resulted were quite staggering. I have two examples, one where an original account for \$148.82 was reduced in an amended account to \$70.77, and another where an original account for \$185 was amended to \$97.04. This is how this Government is able to be in the financial situation it is in at present. I asked a question in the House of the Minister of Works who informed me that 55 letters advising a discrepancy in the original account for water rates in the Hahndorf and Mount Barker areas were sent with amended accounts during October and November of last year.

The Government is concerned that the favourable financial situation might be affected by the Fraser Government. I suggest that this Government would not have these favourable conditions if it had not attempted (and it still is largely an attempt) to sell off part of the State's assets by selling the country railways. Another matter which causes me much concern and which is connected with the Treasury situation is that of succession duties, and the amount of money being raised by the State, an increase from \$9 000 000 in 1970 to \$19 500 000 in 1977. I have a report of a statement referring to succession duties made recently by the Chairman of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia in which he called for the State to abolish succession duties immediately to preserve the State's investment incentives and productivity. The report states:

The tax had become a major concern to all land and business, and property-owners, particularly rural land-holders, because of the increasing impact it was having on viability and solvency. "Succession duties cause misery to many families and the time is well past when so-called enlightened governments should get rid of such duties," Mr. Kerin said. The continuing belief by many governments that succession duties prevented large aggregations of assets in a few hands was ludicrous.

"Succession duties are nothing more than a medieval concept of taxing a nominal capital asset value," he said. "Many people have shown that it is possible, provided you have the money, to avoid the tax. A recent survey revealed the effective tax rate on a property with a net capital value in excess of \$300 000 was regressive. Therefore, the more wealthy farming families are able to reduce their death costs more effectively than the less wealthy."

Mr. Kerin said costs associated with estate planning had become prohibitive. They could run as high as the final succession tax. Despite recent modifications to the Succession Duties Act in South Australia, allowing the passage of estates between spouses to be free of duty, the South Australian Government expected it would collect more from the tax this financial year than in the previous year. The estimated revenue from the tax this financial year was \$19 500 000.

"That amount of cash could be more prudently used elsewhere, producing food and fibre for Australian and oversea buyers of our primary products", Mr. Kerin said. The report continues:

The Premier said last night the South Australian Government had made substantial concessions in succession duties in the past 18 months.

I believe that he needs to do much more in that regard. The Treasurer states that his Government cannot indefinitely try to pick up the pieces of the social and economic damage the Federal Government is causing. I suggest that the Treasurer is again attempting to hoodwink the people of South Australia. The damage that he is referring to is (as we on this side of the House know, and as most responsible people in this community know) a result of the chaos caused by the Whitlam Government.

We know what the people of Australia thought of that Government, because when they had the opportunity on December 13, 1975, they made clear what they thought of the chaos that was being caused by the Whitlam Government. This State Government is constantly seeking money from a Federal Government that is burdened by an inherited record deficit, and rightly is unprepared to undertake fiscal responsibility at a time when this State's revenue is sound.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That is not what Chipp and many of the back-benchers are saying; they are sensible enough to—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WOTTON: I have already pointed out why the Treasury is in its present position, and I have no need

to go into that any further. I support the Bill, but I regard it as nothing more than a complete attack on the Fraser Government and I do not appreciate the way in which it is presented.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): The explanation of these Supplementary Estimates is really an election speech. I support what the previous speakers have said about the Treasurer's criticism of the financial administration in Canberra, and the financial allocations that have come from the Commonwealth. I went to considerable trouble to read what the Treasurer had to say in September last year when introducing the Revenue Budget and Loan Estimates. I have checked the figures and find that the Treasurer has in this document adopted the same procedure as he adopted in September. In fact, it is almost a repeat; he has brought it up to date, however, as far as the figures are concerned. The Treasurer is obviously preparing the ground for whenever the balloon goes up. I take exception to the first section of this explanation. I have had the pleasure, if I can use that phrase, of reading and speaking to at least 21 of the regular financial documents that have been presented to this House, as well as to the supplementary documents. I take exception to the wording and phrasing used in the first section of this paper. If I were the Treasurer I would be ashamed of the language that is used.

In my opinion, the first section of this document is full of vituperation and personal venom. In fact, there is hate dripping from almost every paragraph. I do not lightly make statements like this, but it is perfectly true. It almost comes from a distorted outlook. If one studies the speeches that have been made by the Treasurer in introducing this type of document to the House one notices a certain fixation, especially in the past 12 months. I think that senior Treasury officers would not be happy about the language used in the first part. I notice that a certain amount of switching around in Government departments and sections within departments that has occurred. That is good if it promotes more efficiency or if it stems from the recommendations of the Corbett committee. This occurs from time to time, and it is not easy for members to appreciate department's switching around and to chase relevant previous figures. I notice that the Treasurer seems to be collecting an empire under his personal control, with sections, subsections, and divisions of departments.

Mr. Venning: How many would they number?

Mr. CUMBE: Those details were brought out recently by a question. Last year a table was prepared as a result of a Question on Notice, and it was staggering to note the growth under the direct control of the Treasurer, because he had assumed control of various sections of the Public Service, including the Tourist Bureau. The member for Light was correct when referring to transfers to Loan Account. One would assume, correctly, that the Government is fairly flush with revenue funds, and we know that their source is the railways transfer.

The member for Light pointed out that the \$9 000 000 being transferred now gives a full figure for the Revenue Account, but I remind members that in September last year we approved an additional \$15 000 000 transfer to Loan Account, so that in this financial year we are transferring from Revenue Account to Loan Account a total of \$24 000 000, which has nothing to do with the normal Loan allocations. We have been told that the Revenue Account is flush, but I have heard no acknowledgment that taxpayers in this State will be getting any relief from

State taxation. If \$24 000 000 can be transferred from that account into Loan Account, there is only one answer: that is, the people of this State are being taxed unduly by the Government. A plea was made in September when we were debating the main Revenue Budget, but what has been the reaction? There has been absolutely none: the Treasurer has a stony heart for taxpayers in this State.

Apart from the normal incremental increases that occur each year from revenue, we now find that, out of the buoyant Revenue Account, we are suddenly and without affecting the deficit transferring \$24 000 000 into Loan Account. It will be interesting to see, when the Loan Estimates are introduced next year, where the \$9 000 000 and other parts of the \$24 000 000 are to be spent. As members of the Public Works Committee, the member for Murray and I have expressed concern at the cost of some of the projects coming before the committee. Some of the projects would indicate that the State's Loan Account is getting considerable amounts, and we wondered where all the money was coming from. We realise that it will not all be spent this year, but now we know whence it has come.

Mr. Evans: Do you think there are Government excesses?

Mr. CUMBE: My colleague and I are concerned not only at the total cost of the projects but also at what we believe to be extravagance or lavishness, and in many cases we believe that, without taking away the aesthetic and utilitarian value, some of the final designs could be pruned more efficiently. It is staggering to note that most of the increases in this Bill are caused by increased costs of wages and services. Inflation is occurring, but a substantial amount of the whole allocation is to be spent on wages and services. On page 13 of the Treasurer's second reading explanation we find that \$14 200 000 is being spent on what is euphemistically called "normal departmental excesses above estimate".

When one examines the document in more detail, one finds that this sum is being used mainly for wages. Of the \$34 800 000 we have been asked to approve, that \$14 200 000 is more than 40 per cent of the total, and it is being used for increases in wages and services. From the next two items, which are difficult to dissect, we could add another 5 per cent, so that a total of about 45 per cent of the allocation is to be used for increases in wages and services.

Why are we expected to approve such a huge increase at this time of the year? I examined details about the inflation rate and compared the Australian rate to the rate in South Australia right back, so that there would be a complete picture. I went back to the first quarter of 1972, as these quarterly rates provide an annual inflation rate. From the c.p.i. index figures issued recently, Adelaide seems to have a higher rate than has been estimated in other capital cities. For the last quarter for which figures are available (December, 1976), 14.4 per cent was the weighted average of the six capital cities. I am quoting from a table of the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures prepared for me by the Library Research Section. What is the rate in Adelaide, because that is what is affecting the wage bill? Instead of 14.4 per cent it is 16.6 per cent, 2.2 per cent above the weighted average of the six capital cities. I thought I would go a bit further and ascertain for how long this had been occurring. I therefore went back to March, 1972. I will give the end of year figures, because they represent the annual rate in the December quarter. December, 1972, is a fairly significant

date because that is when the McMahon Government went out of office and the first Whitlam Government came into office.

Mr. Gunn: Heaven help us from then on.

Mr. COUMBE: The annual inflation rate in Australia in 1972 was 5.6 per cent.

Mr. Keneally: Then Whitlam proceeded to cause world-wide inflation! Everywhere in the world followed Whitlam. How ridiculous!

Mr. COUMBE: I am glad that the member for Stuart holds that opinion: I did not say that.

Mr. Keneally: That's what you were going to say.

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member does not like my quoting these figures, but they are definite and factual statistics, and I intend to proceed despite his encouragement. The annual inflation rate for Adelaide in 1972 was 4.3 per cent. Adelaide's increase was therefore lower than the weighted average of the six capital cities. In December, 1973, a change was occurring. The Australian weighted average figure was 12.6 per cent—a solid rise in 12 months. The Adelaide figure had risen to 13.5 per cent. In other words, Adelaide passed the Australian average in December, 1973, and, in one year, South Australians were faced with an increase in the annual inflation rate of 9.2 per cent.

The annual inflation rate for Australia in December, 1974, was 15.4 per cent. By that time, South Australia's figure had gone to 16.3 per cent. In December, 1975 (another significant period), the inflation rate for Australia was 13.5 per cent and, for South Australia, 14 per cent. It will be recalled that Medibank figures were included in the consumer price index for this period. In December, 1976, the average Australian inflation rate for the six Australian capitals was 14.4 per cent and the South Australian inflation rate had climbed to the all-time high of 16.6 per cent, so that Adelaide's figure was 2.2 per cent above the Australian average.

It can be noted from the figures that I have quoted that the Australian average had started to go down. The annual inflation rate for South Australia, however, is still moving up. In fact, the 16.6 per cent inflation rate for 1976 is the highest on record. It is a significant factor that must be noted, because the record inflation rate has been achieved by the present Dunstan Labor Government.

Mr. Evans: He should be ashamed.

Mr. COUMBE: It is a record of which any Treasurer would be ashamed. This is the background and the scenario against which we must view the measure we have before us. South Australia has record inflation: it is higher than the Australian weighted average. The inflation rate is having a direct effect on the sums of money that are required under the provisions of this Bill. The sum required is shown as \$14 200 000 for normal departmental excesses above estimate. Other lines are not affected to the same extent.

If that increase is combined with the \$24 000 000 going to Loan Account from the Revenue Account, my earlier statement is magnified. For the taxpayers of this State, that factor will have a crippling effect on capital taxation generated directly by State taxes imposed by this socialist Government, and the taxpayers will really suffer. I know that the member for Stuart appreciates what I am saying, because his constituents, along with others and possibly him, will pay this money to keep his Government in office at a time when the Government itself has generated effects in this State that have brought about a record

inflation rate—at a time when the rate in South Australia is climbing and the rate in Australia is going down. The figures I have quoted are from an impeccable source and are conclusive.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The Treasurer in his address relevant to this Bill seems to be speaking fire and brimstone. It is certainly a statement of fear. Almost every page of the 17 or 18-page document states that we should be fearful of something yet, in spite of all that, we are reassured at the end of this fairy story by the Treasurer when he says that, overall, we are likely to have a balanced Budget in South Australia. How much are the 17 pages of the Treasurer's statement worth? My colleagues have taken the document to pieces fairly effectively, so I will make only one or two points.

The Medibank issue is a glaring red herring. The Treasurer threw it in in September and again earlier this year, and now he has thrown it in for the third time. Regarding the Medibank levy, the Treasurer states that there is a lack of consultation on the part of the Commonwealth Government. Exactly how does the Medibank levy affect South Australia? Exactly how do the changed child endowment arrangements affect South Australia? The Treasurer was decrying that he had not been consulted because these decisions might affect South Australia's share of income tax revenue. As a result of these measures, South Australia will receive more. The Medibank levy is not tax deductible and therefore does not have a reducing effect on the amount of tax that will be collected by the Federal Government. On the contrary, it will increase that amount, because previously health insurance payments were tax deductible. I fail to see what the Treasurer is complaining about. The Federal Government will gain more money as a result of the Medibank levy and, therefore, the States' share will be greater.

The same applies to the child endowment arrangements. Instead of children being tax deductible against their father's income, that money is now paid directly to the mother, and the parents are not allowed to claim as great an income tax deduction. Therefore the Treasurer tried to make us fearful about two issues that will bring more money to South Australia instead of less. The South Australian Budget is funded annually. The Treasurer is complaining that the Federal Government will not give a definite statement on earnings after 1980. The period from 1977 to 1980 is a triennium. The Treasurer has declared that he very much favours triennial funding, yet he criticises the Federal Government for doing what he has asked to be done. The Treasurer would like the Federal Government to commit itself for longer than 1880, but he has himself sought a statement on triennial funding.

He has also said that it is unlikely that the Commonwealth Government will allow the States to enter the income tax field in any other than a marginal way. That statement seems to have been countered definitely by the Prime Minister's statement yesterday that the States are shying clear of personal income tax at the State level. The Prime Minister said that what has really happened is that the States are using this as an excuse and that, in fact, the increased Federal funding that was made available meant that South Australia got an extra \$90 000 000 this year over and above what it would have got under the Whitlam Government formula. Instead of looking towards raising personal income tax for themselves, the States have in many instances used their additional Federal funding to reduce taxation. Of course, we have had some tax reductions in South Australia; death duties spring instantly to mind. Some

remission of pay-roll tax is another one, but we cannot give away with one hand and claim from the Federal Government with the other hand; there must be a balanced approach. The Treasurer does not seem to be anxious to co-operate with the Federal Government in reducing inflation. He seems more anxious to decry everything the Federal Government does, and to increase inflation. We are managing to increase inflation in South Australia, but the obvious issue is that reduced inflation means a reduction in the salaries burden the State must carry for its Public Service. We allowed for a 16 per cent inflation rate in our Budget last year. As inflation, other than Medibank, is down to 10 per cent, the State's salaries bill is gaining a net 6 per cent. From figures the Treasurer has given in his second reading explanation, Federal moneys of \$670 000 000, given a 6 per cent reduction in inflation, mean that, of the \$670 000 000, we have actually had an increased spending power of \$40 200 000.

So, there is every reason why we should encourage the deflationary spiral instead of the inflationary spiral, and encourage the Federal Government to keep on that tack, instead of decrying everything it does. It pays a Labor-orientated Government to decry the Federal Government, because it is all for creating an anarchic state of affairs instead of a law-abiding one. Critical areas such as housing are referred to in the Treasurer's explanation, and I call attention once again to the fact that, for 1949 to 1968, 3 200 houses a year were built by the Housing Trust, whereas for 1970 to 1975 the number of houses dropped to 1 515 a year, or one-half. There again, the effect of inflation is all too obvious. An annual inflation rate of 28 per cent in the building industry here is far in excess of the rate anywhere else in Australia. Inflation between 1972 and 1974 was tremendously high as a result of the massive public spending encouraged by the Federal Whitlam Government. Another reason why the Treasurer is not anxious to see Federal policies work is that they would highlight even further the deficiencies of the previous Whitlam Government.

The statements by the Treasurer constantly attacking Federal policies do not seem to have much public support, despite what he may think. I was listening to a radio talk-back programme following the recent wage indexation announcement and was pleasantly surprised to hear trade unionist after trade unionist calling in and saying that he would not have minded if he had not had a salary increase. They were sold on the Federal Government policies of reducing inflation, and saw no future for pricing South Australian and Australian industries out of the open market. Perhaps there is hope for us all in that grass roots unionists are taking that approach and are anxious to see inflation curbed, and indexation taking place on a reduced scale.

Mr. Evans: And job opportunities created.

Mr. ALLISON: Yes, instead of people being put out of work. There is an interesting sidelight on that point of view. An industrialist to whom I was speaking a few days ago, immediately after the decision was announced, said that he employed 12 people—

The SPEAKER: Order! I fail to see how the honourable member can relate that to the Bill under discussion. I think that he is now getting far removed from the Bill, by discussing wage indexation.

Mr. ALLISON: I will use that later in the grievance debate, Mr. Speaker. The Treasurer, Senator Wriedt, and the Minister of Education have all referred to deficiencies at the Federal level for education, but these are not borne out, because there has been a 2 per cent increase in real

spending for primary and secondary education, a 7.5 per cent increase for further education, and a 4 per cent increase for full tertiary education during the current year, under Federal spending. In addition, the \$90 000 000 of Federal Government money that has gone to the States really puts the onus on State Ministers to allocate their own priorities. However, Ministers do not seem to want to accept the responsibility for lobbying on behalf of their own portfolio. They are anxious to take the \$90 000 000 yet at the same time to hammer away at the Federal Government, and not to make themselves responsible for fighting for their own portfolio.

I believe that the policies put forward for the Education Department, in particular, are somewhat deficient, because there are certain areas of need that have not been lobbied for by the Minister concerned. These issues were taken up this afternoon by Senator Wriedt, and they were unsubstantiated. South Australia's priorities are set by all Government Ministers. They are not set in Canberra and, therefore, if Ministers are not prepared to lobby and state what is required at the time the Budget and Supplementary Estimates are introduced, they have only themselves to blame. Many opportunities are available to them.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I shall take up the point of taxation in South Australia, first, in the area of tourism, by saying how that section of our industry has been denied the proper promotion it deserves and requires. This is an area in which there is an opportunity for expansion, but that expansion has not been given the support it should be given by the Government. When one compares it with the amount spent by the last Liberal Government in this State, one sees that tourism is not getting enough money allocated to it. Recently, a country newspaper report stated that the Treasurer had said that the last Liberal Government, the Hall Government, in 1969-70 allocated \$800 000 for tourism promotion in South Australia for the Tourist Bureau and for general promotion. He openly bragged in the same report that his Government was spending \$1 840 000 for the current fiscal year. In the final Budget of the Hall Government to the end of June, 1970, actual revenue to the State was slightly more than \$338 000 000, whereas revenue to the Dunstan Government this year will amount to more than \$1 171 000 000, or 245 per cent more. The Dunstan Government has increased the tourism allocation by 130 per cent compared to the Hall Government's last tourism allocation. Effectively, if the Dunstan Government were to consider tourism in the same light as did the last Liberal Government, it would need to spend \$2 700 000, whereas it is \$900 000 short of that figure.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Be careful of the figures you're using.

Mr. EVANS: The Treasurer used them and they are accurate. The Government is denying tourism the amount of money it needs for proper and effective promotion in South Australia.

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

Mr. EVANS: Before the adjournment I was referring to the sum the present Government is spending this year on tourism, compared to the amount spent in the last Liberal Party Budget in 1969-70. The Government should be ashamed of its failure to appoint a Director of the Tourist Bureau sooner than it did. That situation did not help the confidence of the tourist industry nor did it help the confidence of personnel employed in the bureau. I hope that in one small way, from money appropriated

by this Bill, the Government will help interstate and overseas visitors by painting the name "South Australian Tourist Bureau" on the facade that it is available on the verandah overhang, so that people walking on the eastern side of King William Street can see that it is the South Australian Tourist Bureau.

At present, a person walking north or south in King William Street can see the words "Tourist Bureau" in reasonable size letters, but does not know whether it is the Victorian, New South Wales or Tasmanian bureau. In the building alongside the bureau the "Taswegians" are alive to the situation and have displayed prominently that the Tasmanian Tourist Bureau office is in that building. Also, I refer to a problem existing at Cleland Wildlife Reserve. Because of contacts I have had with people lodging complaints about the reserve, I visited it to ascertain whether it had improved in recent years. I hope the Government can make money available to enable it to reach the standards that applied when Mr. Gaskin was in charge.

One person who spoke to me is of German origin, and regularly for several years he has taken German visitors (and he has many of them) through that reserve. He told me that the way that it had deteriorated was disgraceful. My first thought was that he had visited the reserve on a day when things were not operating as well as they should, and that I should check his complaint. Before I did, I received a letter from another person, and I quote the part of it relating to this reserve, as follows:

Ever since Mr. Gaskin started the Cleland Wildlife Reserve I have regularly taken interstate and overseas visitors to the reserve and, without exception, they have always been delighted. Recently, I took a New Zealander for an inspection and, to put it mildly, I was horrified and ashamed. I spent some time with one of the staff members trying to find out what on earth had happened and the following are some of that person's comments:

"A fortune is being spent on status symbols like the new tourist information centre which cost about \$30 000."

"There is no money for veterinary help; if an animal or bird is sick it is knocked on the head."

"I am so ashamed of the place I intend to leave."

"I wish I had had the experience of working under Mr. Gaskin."

Stan, the place is in an absolute mess and if you haven't seen it in the last few months you might like to pay it a visit and perhaps ask some questions.

A simple way to explain it, in asking the Government to use some of the money being appropriated, is that the overall reserve has deteriorated. It is nothing like the tourist attraction now that it used to be. We have tried to set up new methods of display, but we have forgotten the wildlife that exists in the reserve. I ask the Minister to inspect this reserve and ascertain whether veterinary aid is available to birds or animals when they are sick or whether they are destroyed and, for his own purposes and for the benefit of tourism and the park itself, he should see how it has deteriorated. I hope this matter can be dealt with this year.

One would not have to spend much money to improve some of our transport services. I am not referring to most drivers, but to individual cases in which a complaint has been lodged. Apparently, someone makes a mild investigation and states that everything is all right. I received a complaint about a bus that was operating from the Glen Osmond terminus. In a letter to me about this incident, the Minister stated:

The operator of the bus concerned in the incident referred to has been interviewed. The operator states that, on the day in question, he left Glen Osmond at the scheduled time and denies emphatically that the bus left the terminal ahead of schedule. He states further that,

when he entered Portrush Road after leaving the terminal, he was required to stop at the traffic lights at the Glen Osmond Road intersection and, while waiting for the lights to change, a young female knocked on the bus door indicating that she wished to board the bus. He said that he did not open the doors because in his opinion this would have caused a dangerous situation.

In view of the statement of the operator indicating that the incident did not take place at an authorised bus stop, the actions of the operator are understandable and correct if any possibility of danger existed. As there appears to be some conflict between the statements of the operator and your constituent, I regret that I can take no further action on this matter.

That letter was written on December 17. Subsequently, I discussed the matter again with the Minister and, in his letter to me, he referred to my letter of January 24 in which I referred to a letter of January 20 from the person involved in the incident. I shall read that person's letter because it should be incorporated in *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: Before the honourable member proceeds, I must tell him that I am at a loss to find anywhere in this Bill any reference to buses. I could have missed it, but I remind the honourable member that he is supposed to be debating the Appropriation Bill and, unless he can convince me that this is a relevant matter, I will rule that what he has been saying is out of order.

Mr. EVANS: The Leader has suggested to me that I am speaking about a matter concerning his district, and I will therefore finish references to this matter at some other time. I shall not argue with you, Mr. Speaker, about whether this matter is included in the Appropriation Bill and whether the Government is likely to spend any of the \$34 000 000 on buses. I assume the Government will spend some it on education staffing, and I refer to a problem in my district about facilities that perhaps could be provided by the Public Buildings Department, which is covered by this Bill. I refer to the lack of facilities at the Eden Hills school. It is within the province of the Public Buildings Department to make the provisions, and I ask the Minister when he replies to say whether the department's allocation includes a sum for additions to that school. On Thursday, October 31, 1961, the member for Mitcham, whose district then included this area, raised this matter and was told that a new administration block would be erected in 1972, but that did not satisfy the school's need for an activity room. The honourable member was seeking to have an activity room provided at the school. A letter to the Minister from the school states:

Over the past years, correspondence has been entered into by the school committees and principals with reference to an activity room, but, apart from a promise of consideration, no further action appears to be taking place. Whilst conscious of the fact that priorities must be given to schools requiring classrooms, the necessity for this building at Eden Hills has been so obvious for so many years, that we the school council, representing the parents of the school, now press our claim for the additional building most strongly. In a letter dated September 28, 1976, to Mr. Stan Evans, M.P., member for Fisher, in answer to a question asked in the House on September 7, 1976, you state that "An additional room has been listed for Eden Hills and will be provided when available after more urgent cases have been supplied." In essence, this has been the stock answer since 1963.

The letter explains the concern of the school and the parents about the lack of facilities. Unfortunately within a short distance of this school a new school has been built with all the facilities. That fact is appreciated by the community, but it is a typical case where the Public Buildings Department and the Education Department give new schools everything and forget about the older schools, and it is important that older schools be considered.

I put the Happy Valley school in the same category as I do the Belair, Aldgate and Bridgewater schools, as well as other schools in my district. I hope that the Government, the Minister of Works, through the Public Building Department, and the Minister of Education through his department attempt to pick up the leeway with older schools, which really suffer the disadvantages of not being rebuilt to present standards in one go and so have been left behind. That situation is unfortunate and it affects the morale of parents and staff, who work so hard for such schools.

One does not advocate an increase in rates and taxes in the State field to pick up the leeway. South Australia has carried funds over in its Loan Account for several years and has spent funds wildly at times and has not considered whether that expenditure was in the best area or on the right priority. The Government has spent funds at times to try to preserve a voting pattern or to increase the number of votes for its own political purposes. That is not the proper use of public money.

If the Playford Liberal Governments had done that in the past I would have no problems in my district because all these schools would have had the facilities provided, and they would have had other benefits of sewerage and water services, but that did not happen. The Minister can smile if he wishes, but that is true. People in my area still suffer because another Government has come into power and has not given any priority to the matters to which I have referred.

I am saying to the Government, "Start drawing the right priorities; forget about slugging more and more taxes and employing more and more people in the bureaucratic system; go back to private enterprise systems with contracting through the Public Buildings Department; get away from day labour as much as possible for Government employees; and, in the Highways Department, start letting out as much contract work as possible; save money and you will not need a supplementary Budget for the amount of \$34 000 000."

At the same time, the Government should be willing to stand up as a Government and say that it believes that wages in this State have reached the stage where, with penalty rates, over-award payments, 17½ per cent annual leave loading, long service leave payments and workmen's compensation payments, we have exported jobs from South Australia, and now South Australia has the highest building costs in Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member is getting away from the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. EVANS: Sir, I will bring those points together by saying that we are now allocating \$34 000 000 in an Appropriation Bill to provide funds to the Government. I claim that the need for this allocation partly results from the high cost of building. The Public Building Department's costs are high, as I pointed out earlier, and a similar position applies in relation to the Housing Trust. If we saved funds in those areas, we would not be looking at such an amount today as is involved in the Bill. These matters are linked and, to show how far that cost structure has gone in the housing industry, I point out that the average size of houses built in South Australia is the smallest in Australia. We have decreased quality to get down to a price that people can attempt to afford. The Government's track record in looking after money is bad.

Dr. Tonkin: What about looking after the people?

Mr. EVANS: If a Government cannot look after the State's funds there is no doubt it cannot look after the people, because it places a financial burden around the community's neck. Commitments cannot be met and

the standard of living drops. Further, I do not believe that the average person's wage in South Australia is buying as much today as it did six or seven years ago in actual real purchasing power.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: You must be joking!

Mr. EVANS: I am not joking. I support the Bill because, without it, the State could not operate, but that is the only reason for my support.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): In considering the \$34 800 000 provided in the Appropriation Bill, I am worried about where the funds are coming from. I am concerned by the Treasurer's statement that certain steps were being undertaken by various departments to curb unnecessary expenditure when, in fact, the bulk of the funds being appropriated is for Government departments which are unable to operate within their budgets. Although I do not want to reiterate what the previous speakers have referred to, some of the Treasurer's statements in introducing this Bill need clarification, and I wonder why they were even incorporated in his speech. In introducing the Supplementary Estimates in February, 1976, the Treasurer stated:

South Australia faces a disturbing number of economic unknowns in the rest of this financial year. The consequences of some of these problems will greatly influence the State's budgetary situation in ensuing years.

I believe that is part of the crux of the issue. The State Government has embarked on an extensive programme in health, welfare and social improvement, but these areas are mainly unproductive and expensive to maintain. Because of the great manpower required in those areas, the State is now finding difficulty in continuing to operate and maintain a reasonable standard of service in those areas. To some extent this is reflected later in the Treasurer's speech. The State Government is starting to find itself, in the long term, facing a situation of fear. It is afraid of what the mounting costs will be and that, regrettably, the only way in which it will be able to finance its programme will be to increase taxation or to seek additional grants from the Federal Government. I suppose, then, we can understand why the Treasurer said the following in his second reading explanation:

The decision of the Commonwealth Government, announced on May 20, to introduce full indexation of personal income tax in the first year, to introduce a Medibank levy, and to change child endowment arrangements and income tax rebates for dependent children, was an example of that Government's departure from what I believe was a responsibility to consult with the States on matters that might affect their share of personal income tax collections.

So, we find that the Treasurer is concerned that the Federal Government has made arrangements. It has given the people certain benefits through personal taxation, and it has imposed the Medibank levy. The Treasurer says that that was done without the States' authority, as the States wanted the right to a share of personal income tax collection. The Federal Government collects personal income tax, and the authority to do so was given to it by the States. A formula was worked out whereby a certain amount would be returned to the States, the remainder being chopped up by the Federal Government and spread throughout the nation. After all, the States gave up the income taxing powers. However, the States now want to be able to tell the Commonwealth Government what should be done with the money.

We find ourselves in a complex situation in respect of the State and Federal Governments. What is the situation leading up to? I still believe that this State Government supports centralism, and I gathered, from the tenor of the

Treasurer's explanation, that that is what he would prefer to see rather than the Commonwealth Government's giving back to the States the pieces of cake that they deserve and letting the States set their own priorities. That is where the State Government wants to opt out of is its responsibilities: it does not want the responsibility of setting priorities that may prove unpopular in the long term. It wants to be able to go cap in hand to the Federal Government with all the other States and, wherever possible, attack it for areas of its own folly.

I can sum up the Commonwealth Government's federalism policy by saying that it is the States' responsibility to disburse the money that they receive from the Federal Government under the formula. This then makes the State Governments answerable to the people. Their accountability is answerable to the people, as are their priorities, and, if a State Government is not careful in its forward and long-term planning and financing of these issues, it will find itself in a situation in which it must go to the people to get authority to do certain things, one of which is to raise money.

I believe that politically it is extremely dangerous, and a difficult bill of goods to sell, if one has to go to the polls to seek authority regarding certain money. That, I believe, is why the State Government wants to opt out of its responsibilities. It does not want to have those responsibilities in this State. The State Government must own up: it must be honest with the people of South Australia, and have the courage of its convictions.

Any State Government worth its salt should be able to set out its programme and explain to the people how it will finance that programme, and not be timid regarding it. I think we in this State have found that the Government has had it fairly easy. It has been able to sell a false bill of goods on occasions. Indeed, it has been able to package its goods colourfully, and it has got away with it. However, I think the day of reckoning has arrived, and it must now be responsible and own up to what is happening.

In one part of his explanation, the Treasurer referred to the Australian Assistance Plan. Obviously, he had great delight in referring to a former member of the Liberal Party, Mr. Chipp, and his beliefs regarding the continuation of the Australian Assistance Plan. I believe that, before anyone makes a judgment on that plan, there should be a detailed investigation and an in-depth study into the sum of money that has been made available to that organisation, and into the tremendous amount of duplication and waste that we have witnessed in some areas under the plan. I think that it has been an interesting exercise for a few academics, who run around telling everyone what to do: there are too many chiefs and no Indians, and the order of priorities that they have established does not stand up in many areas. I think, therefore, that it has been a tremendous waste of public money, but, before it is completely scrapped, the scheme should be examined.

The State Government should be responsible for welfare programmes and for assisting the various proposals that were incorporated under the Australian Assistance Plan. The State Governments can do it far more successfully because they are on the spot and because it works in with their health and social welfare programme, which is one area in which we can get away from centralism. Obviously, the State Government does not want to do so, because it can see that, once one adopts certain organisations and responsibilities, one must provide the money to meet the increased costs. I believe that those who have to date been involved with the Australian Assistance Plan,

particularly the State Government, should be answerable to an authority for what they have done, regarding why they have duplicated many different services and why they have encouraged organisations and services that have not been of tremendous benefit to the community.

I am concerned for South Australia. I suppose I find myself in agreement with the Treasurer in relation to his statement and the doubt that has been expressed that the Commonwealth Government could well renege on the rail-ways agreement. I hope that that does not happen. I could not support any backing-off on that agreement which was debated in this House and over which there has been an election. We have now lost South Australia's country railways, which were transferred to the Federal Government and, as far as I am concerned, that is final. There is a financial agreement involving South Australia, under which there is a definite benefit for this State. Whether it was a good or a bad document—

Dr. Tonkin: Its a pity that he didn't get those clauses into the agreement.

Mr. BECKER: I will not argue about that. Whether it was a good or a bad document, I will not stand by and let it be changed or let anyone renege on it.

Dr. Tonkin: What if it's not binding?

Mr. BECKER: I think it ought to be made binding, and the money coming to South Australia is ours.

Dr. Tonkin: He made a boo-boo.

Mr. BECKER: He could well have done so. The Treasurer should do something to rectify the error, because we are entitled to that money. I am concerned about some of the other allocations of money that have gone from the Revenue to the Loan Account. In the last two years, we have seen \$44 000 000 go from Revenue Account into Loan Account. This is a cheap way for the Government to finance its capital works programme. At the same time, the South Australian taxpayer will have every right, as the member for Torrens said, to say that he is being over-taxed. There is also the tremendous amount of money that has been made available by the State Government for unemployment relief. The Treasurer said that we were spending \$14 000 000 on unemployment relief, and another \$3 000 000 is being set aside to carry out the programme into the early months of 1977-78, making a total allocation of \$17 000 000 for the 12 months. He also told us that he had asked the Federal Government to assist South Australia in funding the scheme and had been refused, despite the fact that the Federal Government was getting returns by way of increased income tax, sales tax and excise duty, and from a lesser call on unemployment benefits because the State had been able to create certain employment. I do not argue with that arrangement, although I argue whether we are getting value for money. The sum of \$17 000 000 in the past 12 months to employ, unfortunately, only a few hundred people seems a large sum to have to pay.

One can be concerned, and various examples have been pointed out. Whether Max Harris was correct or incorrect in his article in last weekend's *Sunday Mail* will not be known until the answer is given next week. Money has been made available to one Government department to assist senior citizens in cleaning up and maintaining their properties; that is a worthwhile scheme, and it has created some employment. However, I wonder whether employing nine men working for two and one-half days to clip trees and clean out a shed is worth while, and \$1 000 to clean up a small backyard seems ridiculous. That is what is going on. We have to get to the bottom of some

of these schemes in order to find out whether the money is being wisely spent.

While this employment is doing some good, the State Government is also involved in propping up small businesses and other businesses to keep employment going in South Australia, and it is proving a costly business. I believe that the State Government is fobbing off the day when some large employers here may find themselves in an embarrassing situation so that, again, we will find that the cost to the State will be far more than the few hundred thousand dollars already allocated.

What worries me is the allocation of \$5 000 000 for the Cooper Basin and for natural gas in South Australia to augment the funds for the pipelines authority and where the \$34 800 000 will come from. The Treasurer's explanation refers to the Governor's Appropriation Fund, and I have tried to find out how much is in that fund and where it is. I hope we will be given some satisfactory answers later this evening. Under the appropriation, of the 1 per cent of the amount provided in the Appropriation Acts for a particular year, the Treasurer tells us that one-third is available. We know that there have been small allocations in the past from the fund.

The SPEAKER: Order! The private conversation between the benches must cease, because it is out of order.

Mr. BECKER: I doubt whether \$34 000 000 is available to finance these projects, yet we are told that it is hoped that the Revenue Account will balance for this financial year. When dealing with an appropriation of this size, we can easily come out in the black or red by between \$3 000 000 and \$5 000 000. I think that we are being fed something of a sop, because I believe that we will have a deficit situation. I believe that the Treasurer wants to get his hands on the \$27 500 000 in the Consolidated Revenue Account, and the only way in which he can do that is to take the Revenue Budget into debt. He will not tell us, and it is dangerous, under the present economic circumstances, to try to assess accurately what is happening. Page 10 of the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1976, under the heading "Governor's Appropriation Fund", states:

Section 32a of the Public Finance Act provides that the Governor in any financial year may appropriate revenue by warrant to the Public Service within the State not more than an amount equal to 1 per cent of the total of the moneys appropriated from the general revenue of the State of which not more than one-third shall be appropriated for purposes other than previously authorised purposes.

This is the first time we have delved into this matter to any extent. The report continues:

During 1975-76, in accordance with this section, payments totalling \$2 251 953, of which \$791 237 were for purposes not previously authorised, were appropriated from the Governor's Appropriation Fund. Details of the latter are shown in Appendix IV following the Treasurer's Statement A herein.

Page 472 of the report sets out brief statements of the appropriate authorities for actual payments. There we see the amounts of the Governor's Appropriation Fund, the Public Finance Act, and from where moneys have been taken, but we still do not know exactly what is in that account or where it is. I want to know where that money will be. I also want to be assured that we are not going to dip heavily into the State's reserves, that the taxpayers have not been grossly overtaxed, and that we can meet this appropriation within our limits. If we find that the Government is planning to dip heavily into our reserves or preparing the community for further increases,

I think we ought to be critical of the Government. As with all Appropriation Bills, I support the measure, but I do so reluctantly, because we have not been told whence that money will come.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): In presenting to the House a Bill to appropriate \$34 800 000 of the taxpayers' money, the Treasurer is asking Parliament to endorse the Government's actions. I believe that many of the Government's actions leave much to be desired, the first of which is the contents of the Treasurer's explanation. On reading the explanation, it is clear to me that the Government wants financial independence but is unwilling to accept financial responsibility. It is like a spoiled child who wants to spend all his money on lollies and, when the money has gone, he yells for more, and that is what the Government is doing. It spends money as if it is going out of fashion. It believes that money grows on trees and that the taxpayers are to be milked as it sees fit. In other words, the Government clearly believes that it can spend the people's money far better than they can spend it and that they have no right to administer their own affairs. The Government wants to put its greasy hands in the people's pockets and take more and more of their earnings every week. We, as a Party, totally reject that proposition, and it is something that we will rectify when in government, because we believe that the people can spend their own money better than the Government can spend it.

The first point in the speech is interesting. The Treasurer refers to tax indexation, and it is clear that he totally opposes it. However, tax indexation has saved the taxpayers of Australia \$1 000 000 000. The Government believes that the people should not receive that benefit: that is clear from the Treasurer's speech. He has said that the people should not have tax indexation: they should be paying more taxation. It is shown from other remarks by the Treasurer that he believes tax should be higher, and it is obvious that the Government is a Government of high personal income tax, something that we totally reject.

The Treasurer made an unjustified and vicious attack on the Prime Minister and the policies of the Federal Government. A few years ago we had a Federal Government that set about a course of action to viciously punish all people in country areas. One of the first decisions of that Government was to increase fuel costs drastically by taking away the fuel equalisation subsidy, affecting people in country areas, and those people will not forget that. Next, that Government massively increased postal and telephone charges, and it massively increased taxation on several other items.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Eyre that this is hardly within the ambit of this Appropriation Bill.

Mr. GUNN: The Whitlam Government, in the Hayden Budget, reduced education spending by about \$109 000 000, so the honourable member is talking nonsense again. Another matter in the Treasurer's speech to which I refer now is an attack on the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon). The South Australian Minister of Transport has sole responsibility for allocating the funds that the Federal Government provides for roads. It is for that Minister to decide the priorities. Obviously, he has not carried out that responsibility. He sent to the Commonwealth Government his priorities, the Commonwealth Government accepted them, and one of the most disturbing aspects of those priorities was that the State Minister

gave low priority to the Stuart Highway. The person to blame because the Stuart Highway sealing has not been commenced by the Highways Department is Mr. Virgo. He has put back the priority for that road, and he must accept the responsibility. Yesterday, I received from the Minister replies to questions that I had asked about national highways, and my questions and the Minister's replies are as follows:

1. How much was allocated to South Australia for national highways for the next financial year?
2. Where will the money allocated to South Australia be spent?
3. How much does the Government intend to spend on the Stuart Highway?
4. Does the South Australian Government intend to use any of its own funds on national highways?

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

1. National Highway construction—\$15 000 000.
National Highway maintenance—\$1 900 000.
2. (1) Construction:
South-Eastern Freeway (Crafers-White Hill), Swanport Deviation of National Route 1, including Swanport Bridge, Port Pirie to Port Augusta main road, Port Wakefield Road, Cavan railway overpass, Mount Barker Road (Eagle-on-the-Hill to Cross Road).
(2) Maintenance—various.
3. Construction—Nil. Maintenance—Normal.
4. Yes.

Clearly from those replies, the Minister gave no priority to the sealing of the Stuart Highway, and he is to blame. He did not include it on the list, which the Federal Minister approved without question.

Mr. Whitten: Can't you be honest?

Mr. GUNN: I am being honest, and that is what the member for Price does not like. The Minister has been caught because of his own skulduggery and dishonesty. He must accept full responsibility, and the people will be told the facts. The double standards adopted by the Minister and his vicious personal attacks on the Federal Minister indicate that the Minister in this State is covering up, and every time he starts shouting in this House we know that he has something to hide. The South Australian Minister is trying to cover up.

One could say many other things about the Treasurer's speech. In conclusion, I say that I make no apology for my support of the Federal Government. The people of this country wanted financial responsibility, responsible Government, a Government that was prepared to put the house in order. A big problem that people have had to face over the past few years is that politicians have gone around this country promising more and more and more and have raised the expectations of the Australian people to such a degree that the Whitlam Government, by making these wild promises, was able to fool the people for a short time and get into Government. Now all the people who have lost jobs have lost them because Whitlam Government politicians promised more than the country could afford, and they bankrupted the country. It is taking good management by the Fraser Government to improve the position. I am confident that, in the next 18 months, Australia will return to sane economic management and that the people will have a stable and decent place in which to live, where their savings will be worth something. I reluctantly support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Minister for the Environment) moved:

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

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): For the second day in succession, we have the privilege of exercising our undoubted right of ventilating matters of importance.

Mr. Millhouse: I hope you make it worth while.

Dr. TONKIN: I am grateful to the member for Mitcham. He said, "I am sure it will be well worth while." I am pleased to get that seal of approval. First, I wish to raise the matter of planning control. Last Monday, a press report stated that the planning controls would be reviewed. The report states:

A wide-ranging review of planning controls in South Australia is to be carried out for the State Government. The Minister for Planning (Mr. Hudson) said yesterday the review would examine the whole range of objectives and methods of controlling private development in South Australia.

Once again, as with so many other things that the Government has announced recently, like announcements under big banner headlines such as "Dunstan warns on porn" and things of that kind, I thought that finally the Government had seen the error of its ways, had seen the ghastly mess that the State's planning legislation has been allowed to drift into, and was going to do something about updating it. I thought that probably it intended to appoint an independent inquiry. Although the Government has appointed many inquiries recently, as shown by reports in the newspaper, I thought that this would be one inquiry with which I would not disagree, because there is much to be inquired into.

Then I went further in this report and found that the inquiry, which would take at least a year to conduct, would put it well after the time for the election, and therefore the Government would say that it was having an inquiry and that it was doing something. The report stated that the inquiry would be carried out by the State Director of Planning (Mr. S. B. Hart). That part of the report states:

Mr. Hart was expected to make progress reports and recommendations to the Government as the inquiry proceeded. During the first stage, Mr. Hart would try to determine what the community considered were the objectives of controlling how private individuals developed their land. He would then consider the effectiveness of controls and make recommendations on any changes in the law or methods of administration that were necessary.

That is a ridiculous and utterly absurd state of affairs. No-one would dream of criticising Mr. Hart as an individual or as a man of great ability in the position he holds.

Mr. Vandeeper: He has been put in an invidious position.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes; having to conduct an inquiry into affairs that are largely governed by the activities of his own department and into decisions that he himself must make in the course of his duties is ridiculous; indeed, it is irresponsible.

Mr. Vandeeper: He is going to inquire into whether he has been doing a good job.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, an extremely well qualified and efficient public servant is placed in the position where either he has to criticise his own actions and those of his department or he will uphold the actions taken by himself and his department. What a dichotomy of interests here! It is impossible.

Mr. Vandeeper: Absolutely.

Dr. TONKIN: How can he with the best will in the world and with all the honesty he can muster efficiently carry out the task allotted to him?

Mr. Allison: He cannot be both subjective and objective at the same time.

Dr. TONKIN: He cannot, and that is the measure because I cannot believe that the State Government was ignorant of these difficulties in its concern about this entire matter. There is urgent need to review the 1962 development plan; it must be reviewed in accordance with population forecasts. There is not to be a size limit set on the growth of metropolitan Adelaide, but it must be based on a logical expression of quality of life standards. It cannot be a figure picked out of the air. The whole role, efficiency and authority of the State Planning Authority must be reviewed most carefully. This State Government has been grossly negligent in not reviewing the 1962 development plan, as it promised it would do in 1972 and again in 1977—that is, after the five-year period. This was an undertaking given to this Parliament, that the State Planning Authority would review the metropolitan development plan of 1962. It is an undertaking that has not been honoured; and, because of that and because there has been no review of the development plan, the whole situation has become totally unworkable. It is a situation that has been criticised trenchantly by Justices of the Supreme Court, by members of the community, by members of the housing industry and by people in the planning field. There is no doubt that our entire planning situation is in one great big mess.

This shows gross irresponsibility of leadership in urban development affairs. I understand the Government is well aware of the difficulties and that it is frantically now trying to make up lost ground; it is having meetings and committees are discussing the various problems that have arisen. We as a Party have done the same thing. The Liberal Party has a committee of inquiry under the chairmanship of the member for Chaffey, and it has been in operation now for nearly 12 months.

Mr. Millhouse: With what result?

Dr. TONKIN: It has heard a great deal of evidence and, as a result of that, we have a policy that will be announced soon, and one of the fundamentals of that policy is the conclusion that the 1962 development plan unrevised is totally inadequate and that the entire Act and planning legislation will have to be written again.

Mr. Millhouse: Surely it does not need 12 months to find that out.

Dr. TONKIN: Why did the Government not revise the metropolitan development plan, as promised? Why did it not axe Monarto sooner than it did? The Premier's own population forecasts for 1975 were well within the target population of 1 384 000 people by 1991; that was the figure set out in the 1962 development plan. The Jordan report set an arbitrary limit of 1 000 000. That was a poor logical basis for justifying Monarto. Adelaide already has fine qualities that add to our entire way of life. As a result of this lack of forward planning and this obsession with Monarto, we have seen funds committed there for expenditure on roads, schools, etc., at a time when metropolitan Adelaide, and particularly the newly developed areas, is suffering from want of expenditure in those areas. There are still wide areas of the metropolitan area unsewered and with inadequate school accommodation, simply because funds have been poured into Monarto—and for what? For no good reason at all.

There has been an overall picture of confusion and waste on a massive scale. Service authorities over the past five years have been marking time trying to cope with the unrealistic planning requirements of Monarto

while ignoring the fundamental improvements needed to implement the 1962 development plan, especially planning for facilities in newly developed areas. Look at Noarlunga and see how painfully slow that development has been. Not only have we not an up-to-date land use plan, but we have no transportation policies either. There is another vast area of neglect: when shall we see a clear statement of priorities for action to revise comprehensively our transportation system and make it more adequate, efficient and economic to meet the demands of the people of the metropolitan area? Why has the Government not called for reports from the State Planning Authority? Why is it being by-passed in the hasty action of recent months to revise the 1962 plan? The whole situation comes down to massive incompetence. The Premier cannot avoid the fact that he has pursued Monarto without the advice of the main statutory planning authority in this State and without justification of need and, furthermore, without a developed case for metropolitan Adelaide planned and controlled as a suitable alternative. Whatever the Government does in this field, it had better do it quickly. All I can say is that I think it has left it too late and we shall have to start from scratch again.

I wish to talk now about another matter which greatly concerns the people. Not very long ago, there appeared in the press on March 19 a report headed "Crippled student loses big claim; faces \$10 000 costs after crash". The story described a postgraduate student who received crippling mental and physical injuries when his motor cycle collided with a tow truck and who was refused damages in the Supreme Court. Mr. Justice Sangster, who heard the case, later said in his written reasons for judgment that the student had been unable to give evidence on the accident. A later report, on March 23, relating to Mr. Justice Sangster, was headed "Third party outmoded, says judge". The article stated:

Third party insurance was an outmoded way of compensating road accident victims, Mr. Justice Sangster said yesterday. He is chairman of the South Australian Third Party Premiums Committee. Mr. Justice Sangster said he had reached that conclusion after reading material from all States, New Zealand, the United States and Canada during extensive inquiries and research as chairman of the committee. "My own view is that I should not answer that question of how to compensate road accident victims, but that I should ask the question of whether the people really want the present law to continue," he said. "The case last week in which I was the judge, and of course I cannot comment on the case itself, does show the difference between an injured motorist who recovers a large award and an injured motorist who loses his case and indeed has to pay the costs of both sides. The difference depends on the court's view of the rather technical subject of negligence."

Members and, indeed, people throughout South Australia will vividly remember the Cooma bus disaster, involving a party of pensioners and old people, many from the Glenelg District and the Brighton District. Many of these people were injured when a bus ran backwards down a hill. The results of that tragedy are still being felt today.

Mr. Millhouse: Without all this historical narrative, what are you proposing, if anything?

Dr. TONKIN: This has caused the Liberal Party much concern. As a result, many suggestions have been made to us. Having thoroughly investigated the situation, we have decided to announce a policy of no-fault insurance for people injured in motor vehicle accidents, based largely on the Victorian Government's scheme, which has been operating since February, 1974. The scheme is intended to reduce the delays and high costs of legal and litigation procedures concerning victims of motor vehicle accidents.

It provides a limited no-liability cover for road accident victims which operates in parallel with the normal common law tort system. Benefits would be payable to any South Australian resident injured by or in a motor vehicle registered in South Australia, or by an unidentified vehicle.

The benefits are as follows: 80 per cent of average weekly earnings lost (after tax) for up to 104 weeks, subject to a limit of \$200 a week; all reasonable medical, ambulance and hospital expenses incurred through injury; 80 per cent of reasonable therapeutic and other relevant costs, including household help incurred within five years of the accident; on death, as the result of an accident, up to 80 per cent of reasonable funeral expenses, and 5/8 of the person's net income (to a maximum of \$156.25) to certain dependants for up to 104 weeks. Special provisions relate to payments to guardians of dependent children.

Under our policy, persons still retain the right to sue at common law for any loss sustained because of the accident, and they will thus seek to recover the balance over and above the benefits payable, and any appropriate sum as damages. However, with the benefits payable under the no-fault scheme, no-one will have to wait until common law actions are settled before meeting hospital, ambulance and medical bills, and no-one need be financially disadvantaged or embarrassed in the interim.

Certain safeguards will have to apply under such a scheme. No loss-of-income benefits will be payable: (a) where the net loss is less than \$50, or for an incapacity of two days or less; (b) where worker's compensation applies; (c) where the person injured was driving a motor vehicle under the influence of alcohol (0.08 or more) or a drug, and is subsequently convicted. The Motor Accident Board will be empowered to take action to recover benefits paid to injured passengers from such a driver, that board being responsible for administering this scheme; (d) where the injured person was driving a motor vehicle without ever having held a driving licence, or where the licence was suspended or cancelled before the accident; (e) where the injured person was using a motor vehicle in the course of committing a serious crime; (f) where the injured person was in an uninsured (that is, unregistered) motor vehicle owned by him; (g) where the injured person was taking part in a race, competition or trial in a place other than on a highway, etc. These exceptions do not apply to applications made by dependants in the case of death, since those people should not be penalised by the activities of the person involved.

The scheme is administered by a Motor Accidents Board of three members, at least one of whom shall have considerable experience in the law. Appeals from decisions of the board are made to an appeals tribunal of one. Under the Victorian system, an experienced lawyer currently constitutes the tribunal. Surprisingly, he does not have much to do, because the board is functioning very efficiently.

Regarding finance, there will be no actual cost to the Government. The board's activities will be financed from third party premiums by levy on approved insurance companies on a similar basis to the nominal defendant provisions, that is, on a pro rata basis according to premium income. At present, because the State Government Insurance Commission is the sole third party insurer in this State, this will relate only to the State Government Insurance Commission. Third party premiums will continue to be fixed by the committee which now exists for this purpose.

Obviously, the question will be asked: how much is this likely to cost the consumer? On the basis of figures that have come from the operation of the Victorian scheme and

depending on the method of funding the scheme and supposing that cost-flow methods are used, the scheme is likely to add about \$10 to the average cost of \$90 for third party insurance. This figure could vary, but that is the average. A person will be paying \$10 more, based on today's values, for immediate cover. He will get funds paid to make up a good proportion of his income, and he will have his medical and hospital expenses paid. Further, he will not have to wait for the interminable period that litigation now takes in these cases; this is not entirely the fault of the courts. It is difficult to establish final disabilities in some cases without waiting for two or three years, but there is certainly a long delay. Many people have been disadvantaged in the past as a result. I guess that many people will be disadvantaged in the future until such a scheme can be introduced, but we will introduce such a scheme at the first opportunity.

This is a firm policy of this Party. The advantages are obvious. First, all victims who are eligible (because they have not been disqualified for not complying with the requirements), whether or not they later pursue a common law action will immediately receive payments which will enable the household to continue at a reasonable level of subsistence; all hospitals and medical practitioners and other like creditors will be paid without delay; this occasioned many of the old people involved in the Cooma disaster much embarrassment and worry. Small common law claims would be greatly discouraged by virtue of the fact that many of the victims not suffering permanent disability might be satisfied with their out-of-pocket expenses and perhaps a small lump payment. This might be expected to result in some lessening of congestion in the law lists. Many common law actions which involve reduction of damages on account of contributory negligence might be expected to give way to acceptance of benefits under such a scheme, by virtue of the certainty of full payment of out-of-pocket expenses. Obviously, the scheme needs to be in operation for some time before it can be assessed as to its effectiveness.

With the passage of time new facts will emerge to assist the making of a real assessment and an analysis of costs of such a scheme to enable possible extension of benefits or to apply modifications. The scheme has been working well in Victoria, and it may be that with such a scheme it may be possible to arrange reciprocal arrangements with that Government for benefits for injury sustained in Victoria by South Australian citizens and vice versa.

Ultimately, I trust that the scheme may spread and apply in all States and Territories of Australia. We believe that this is a significant piece of social legislation, and that it will relieve many people of hardships and difficulties that they now experience many times through no fault of their own, because they have been involved in an accident. I commend the policy to members, to the Government, and especially to the people of South Australia. This is one more of the policies that have been developed by the Liberal Party during the past few months, and I assure honourable members and the people of South Australia that it will not be the last policy that will be announced: far from it. This is our latest policy, and we are proud of it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I refer to a matter that has had a brief airing publicly concerning Labor Party candidates at the next State election (whenever that may be) masquerading in the guise of sitting members in districts now held by Liberal Party members.

Mr. Becker: They've been doing it for years.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: This situation has introduced a new dimension to politics in South Australia. I asked my colleagues who have been members longer than I have and they cannot recall this sort of activity. The fact is that, although the Treasurer and Cabinet aid and abet this activity, they are denying that they are politicking. We are aware of the well-worn track made to Mount Gambier by Ministers seeking to buy the seat, and we do not complain about that. I was in Mount Gambier recently and saw this big bruiser, a close shadow following the Treasurer everywhere he went, and I thought the Treasurer has sacked Steven Wright as his bodyguard.

I asked somebody who he was, and was told that he was the Labor Party candidate. He went everywhere with the Treasurer. One conspicuous by his absence was the legitimate member for Mount Gambier, Mr. Harold Allison, M.P. I noticed that on all public occasions he was not acknowledged. I was interested to read in the local press that the Minister of Health was to visit Mount Gambier and that, if the public wanted to meet him, they had to queue up at the Labor Party office and make an appointment via the Labor Party candidate. The member for Mount Gambier knows that the Labor Party candidate there is regularly and frequently making announcements of Government initiatives in the district and the spending of large sums, as though he was the member for the district.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He soon will be.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is pretty shonky and dirty tactics by the Labor Party. I was interested to know that the member for Pirie, none other than yourself, Mr. Speaker, sent letters into the district of the member for Rocky River. The letter was distributed widely throughout the district, and even to Crystal Brook. The letter states:

Edward Connelly, M.P.,
Speaker, House of Assembly and
Member for Pirie,
5 Norman Street,
PORT PIRIE. 5540.
(Phone: 32 1405)

Dear

As the endorsed A.L.P. candidate for the seat of Rocky River I wish to inform you that I shall be visiting your area in the immediate future and trust that I shall have the opportunity to meet and talk with you. If, however, I can assist you in any way please contact me at the above address.

In the meantime, I take this opportunity to inform you that on Tuesday 1 and Wednesday 2 March, I shall be visiting the towns of Crystal Brook, Gladstone and Jamestown accompanied by the Premier, Don Dunstan. If you or any organisation with whom you are associated would like to meet our Premier personally or as a group, I would be happy to make the necessary arrangements.

Yours sincerely,
(signed) TED CONNELLY

I make this reference not in your capacity as Speaker, but as the member for Pirie. The member for Pirie was seeking to muscle in on the district of the member for Rocky River, and carted the Treasurer around with him to further his campaign.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader that in no way can any member of this House criticise the Speaker unless speaking to a substantive motion, no matter whether it is described as a reference to the member for Pirie or otherwise.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will leave the reference to the Labor candidate for that area, but the Treasurer

sought to disguise the fact that he was in the district for political reasons. I complained publicly, to which the Treasurer replied:

As for this trip being political, last night I met members of the District Council of Crystal Brook and the council of the Institute of Crystal Brook at the arrangement and request of the Liberal member for Rocky River, Mr. Howard Venning.

Then he said that the member for Rocky River had given him a meal. The member for Rocky River had to write twice to the Premier's Department and then make a telephone call before he was acknowledged. Perhaps the Treasurer thought that it was politic to meet a deputation, and the member for Rocky River managed to present it during the "Royal Tour" of his district. The member for Rocky River received a telephone call saying that the Treasurer would be in Crystal Brook with the Labor candidate and did not know where to get a meal. The member for Rocky River thought that two wrongs did not make a right, and said that he would give the Treasurer a meal. This sort of thing has introduced a new dimension into South Australian politics, because it is also happening in the District of Frome. The Premier has had the gall to say that he is not politicking; he is out and about the countryside to find out the needs of the people and to hand out money with a largesse that is phenomenal. What is happening in the seat of Frome? I have the news sheet of the Labor candidate for Frome showing his address and telephone number, and it states:

Campaign Report:

During February, the campaign committee's activities centred around the Premier's visit to Burra, Terowie, and Peterborough. On his visits to schools, councils, industries, and hotels, he was accompanied by the Campaign Director, Mike Mulvihill, and myself.

Yet the Treasurer says they are not politicking.

Mr. Langley: What are they doing?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am pointing out how shonky this crowd is. I again quote from the newsletter, as follows:

Problems taken up with the Premier:

One of the principal aims of the first round of campaigning was to draw up a profile of needs for the electorate. The result was staggering. I was amazed by the number and magnitude of the needs, most of which revolved around the absence or shortcomings of amenities which people in more densely populated areas take for granted, for example, adequate supply of water, electricity, and television reception.

It seems that the Labor Party is learning something. That district has been represented ably, as has been acknowledged by the Minister of Mines and Energy, by my colleague, Mr. Claude Allen, M.P. He has been chasing these things for seven years. I again quote from the newsletter, as follows:

Having sorted the needs into some order of priority the next task was to bring them to the attention of the respective Ministers concerned. I also brought them before the notice of the Premier.

We have this clown acting as if he were the member for the district, aided and abetted by the Treasurer, who is not politicking! The document continues:

Other issues raised:

1. The upgrading of power supply at Quorn—

The council has been chasing that for years. The next issue concerns the provision of an electricity supply for Olary, but the member for Frome has a file half an inch thick on that matter. He has been following that up for years but suddenly we find a new Labor candidate has bobbed up and we have instant action and the Treasurer is not

politicking. The third issue is the improvement of the water supply at Mannahill and the fourth issue is the sealing of the public swimming pool at Hawker. The next issue is a subsidy for the community hall at Yunta, but a subsidy for that scheme was refused earlier under the rural unemployment scheme. The final issue concerns the provision of an adequate fire fighting unit for Yunta. This situation is laughable. The Treasurer is on record—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I finish with the quote of the night from the Treasurer, "As for these trips being political"—it is cheap politicking and has brought a new dimension to politics in South Australia. It is unfortunate that one cannot refer to you, Mr. Speaker, even as the member for Pirie, and the amusing part about it all is that the public is not as gullible as the Government and its Ministers think. The public thinks the situation is a huge laugh.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I found the speech of the member for Kavel amusing and entertaining for once, but I must tell him that the tactics being employed by the Labor Party now are not new. Ever since I have been in politics, and I think for 150 years before that, the same tactics have been employed. It is in relation to the last area referred to, the North of the State, that I found great amusement because in the so-called shadow Cabinet of the Liberal Party there is now a shadow Minister for Northern Affairs, who is none other than the candidate for that area. Apparently they did not know what to do with him, so they made him Minister of the electorate they hope will be his own in due course.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He will probably not be here as a member, so they will not have to make any appointment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will not take any bets with the Minister on that. If the Labor Party is working as effectively as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition implied it is, perhaps he will not be here. However, I want to change the subject and deal with something—

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE:—and I am not sure that members on either side of this House will laugh when I raise this matter. Certainly, it has not made me particularly popular in this place, as the matter concerns Parliamentary salaries. I have protested both in this place and then before the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal against any increase at this time in Parliamentary salaries. I wrote to my colleagues, the leaders of the Labor Party and the Liberal Party in October, inviting them to join with me in an approach to the tribunal to the effect that we do not desire an increase in Parliamentary salaries so as to set an example because, after all, we are in a position of some leadership in the community.

I had intended to address my remarks more particularly to my self-styled enemies in the Liberal Party. I received a reply from the Leader of the Opposition (October 5) in which he said this:

One of the factors contributing to continuing inflation in Australia over the last few years has been excessive wage demands. This has been overcome by the system of wage-indexation which has been introduced, and generally accepted by the great majority of the community. In my view, members of Parliament can best give a responsible lead to the community by accepting the indexation guidelines which apply to everyone.

Then he said that he intended to convey his personal views to the tribunal. I do not know whether he did or not. I also received a letter from the Premier, which was even briefer, saying he had already given his views in a debate in the House. I looked at that and he had not said anything about that at all.

The tribunal did not meet for another three months and, when it did, I appeared before the tribunal and opposed any increase. So far as I know, no other honourable members appeared in person, either to accept an increase or to advocate the rejection of an increase. My view is that all other honourable members were hoping like hell that, if they said nothing, the increase would go through and in fact an increase did go through, and I immediately said that I had been prepared for that to happen and that I did not intend to take an increase in salary, at least until the second half of 1977. True, a gesture though it may have been, I believed that that was the least I could do to show that in my view there should not have been any increase in Parliamentary salaries.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has the floor.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not think I would make myself popular with this. I had my accountant work out a scheme for me—

Mr. Goldsworthy: What is so different about July?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham must be given the opportunity to speak.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Deputy Leader complained about interjections taking up his time when he was speaking and now he is trying to do the same to me. I had my accountant, McDonald Laing and Co., take out figures for me and their letter to me is as follows:

Further to our discussion with you today, we enclose a schedule setting out details of the additional income tax you will have to pay as a result of the increase in salary from the House of Assembly of \$1 250 per annum.

I was surprised to find out how little I was giving away.

Mr. Becker: I think you knew.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. I did not, and I still intend to do it. Indeed, I intend to invite other honourable members to follow suit. The letter continues:

If your taxable income is greater than that used in our calculation, the additional tax you pay will not differ, since, for every \$1 earned above \$25 000 p.a., 65 cents is payable in tax. Furthermore, if any of the gifts to charities are tax deductible, then the additional tax you pay will be reduced by 65 cents for every \$1 donated to those charities. The additional tax we have calculated is the primary income tax payable and does not allow for any adjustment in provisional tax as a result of having insufficient tax deducted from your salary. We advise, therefore, that of the increase in salary, \$317 p.a. is available for distribution to charities and that \$189 p.a.—and the remainder of the letter does not matter.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: All right, I will read the remainder of the letter, which states:

. . . \$189 p.a. is the additional income tax payable personally, above and beyond the group tax deductions made by the House of Assembly.

Let me tell the member for Hanson, who has suddenly taken an interest in what I am saying, that his Federal colleagues in Canberra, the Federal Government, which he and his Leader delight so much in toadying to and following slavishly in everything, have asked their own

members not to take any increase in salary at all for the very reasons I have advanced in this place and outside it.

If these people in the Liberal Party are to be consistent and not be utter hypocrites they will join me in not accepting their increase in salary, at least for as long as I intend not accept it, that is, until July 1. Let me see whether we have any genuine people here or not. As a matter of comfort to them I can tell honourable members that I have had much support in the community for the stand I have taken on this matter.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me just read out one letter—
Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham must be given an opportunity to speak.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me read out one letter I received from one of the Misses Casely I have in my district dated January 23, as follows:

Thanks to you and your wife for your stand against an increase in salary. I was not surprised that you failed to get support from others when I saw that the Bank of Adelaide directors intended to ask for an increase of \$10 000 in directors' fees.

Now, the member for Hanson is pricking up his ears. The letter continues:

I went to the annual meeting and pointed out what a service the directors could do for the community if the *Advertiser* could report that the directors had asked for a reduction in their remuneration instead of joining the trade unions in demanding an increase. With a male audience, all hoping to be directors some day, I got no support and you can imagine the look on the Chairman's (Sir Arthur Rymill) face! My sister and I do appreciate your stand. This country has such need of statesmen brave enough to give a lead.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask members on both sides to take this matter seriously and on this occasion at least to follow my lead in the interests of the whole community.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I am sorry, Sir, that I missed my call. I am sure that it must hearten the people of South Australia to know that there is a benefactor in the community who is at least willing to work for nothing. When one is a disciple of nothing, I suppose one would be a hypocrite if one took something for doing nothing. I am pleased to see the Minister of Mines and Energy in the Chamber, because he is the target. I think he is a disappointed man. Indeed, he must be the most disappointed man in the Cabinet. The Minister announced in the South-East yesterday (to be correct, I think it was reported in this morning's press) that a power station will be erected in the Tantanoola district. It would have been courteous for the Minister to advise the member for the district, Mr. Vandeppeer, accordingly.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why should I tell the member for Millicent, because you are going to knock him off, aren't you?

Mr. RODDA: Why should not the Minister tell him? I should have thought that we were entitled to a little common courtesy. The member for Millicent learnt about what was happening in this district by reading this morning's press. This is merely a continuation of what the Deputy Leader said was happening in the North of the State. I would have given the Minister of Mines and Energy

credit for a better attitude than that. I am sure, however, that he was pushed into this foul act, as he was into a few more such acts earlier in the week. We are seeing a patronising display emanating from the Government benches.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You'd be interested to know that the member for Mount Gambier wrote—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is out of order.

Mr. RODDA: I have a copy of the letter that the member for Mount Gambier wrote to the Minister, to which he did not receive a reply, drawing attention to all the things regarding this power problem which was being taken care of by the Minister and about which the Minister must have known. However, the Minister obviously sat on it like the little brown hen that was keeping the eggs warm. The last thing he was going to do was to tell the far-seeing member for Mount Gambier; and he left the poor member for Millicent to go hopping. I do not wish to quote from this letter, which belongs to my colleague. I do not want to steal his thunder, as members will hear from him later.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Tell us how you fixed the Penola electric supply undertaking. That's a good story.

Mr. RODDA: The Minister has become an expert at drawing red herrings across the trail. What happened regarding Penola was no credit to the Minister. I suppose there is no harm in my telling tales out of school: I thought it was smart of the Minister, in his capacity as the then member for Glenelg, to get the entrepreneur to produce his statement of account. The Minister will remember that, as will his erstwhile colleague. The Minister has learnt much recently, and of course, he is keeping his light under a bushell. This is part and parcel of the campaign that we saw last Tuesday evening, when the distinguished member who has just entered the Chamber was distributing the goodies to his colleagues and giving them their riding instructions for next week.

The Deputy Leader pointed out the tactics to which the Government has had to resort as a result of the prospective redistribution that it has in the melting pot. We are seeing its activity in those districts that it hopes to hold. This points to the concern that the Government must have about its position in the city.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You're slaughtering each other; we don't have to enter into it.

Mr. RODDA: I thought that, because of the way in which the honourable member was handing out those books the other evening, he was going to slaughter some of his people. It seemed that he had, judging by the looks on their faces when they read the contents. The Opposition hopes that next week, despite what I am saying to the Minister now, he will dispense some of that good cheer to it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It is a difficult matter that will require a long and complicated study, I can assure you.

Mr. RODDA: Looking back on the Minister's record, I accept that it will be a long and difficult decision to make, with great emphasis on "long". The Opposition is concerned about the Government's attitude and about what it is doing in relation to the number of its members in the House at present. If a big conference is being held, it emphasises the concern that the Government has. This Government is treating the Opposition with scant regard. The Government is getting on with the business of staying in business for which, perhaps, it cannot be blamed. However, the Opposition will not be stopped from chiding the Government. I understand that the Minister is about to announce the

construction of another power station somewhere north of Kalangadoo. I see the puzzled look on his face.

Mr. Allison: Is it a nuclear power station?

Mr. RODDA: No, I do not think so. Plans are afoot to put this grid there, and rightly so, because of the production in that part of the South-East. We cannot be other than disappointed that the member for Millicent had to learn of the announcement of this important development in his district in the press. I am disappointed that the Minister should have pulled such a swift one on the South-East, and I hope that we will see an improved performance from the Government next week.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): Yesterday, in the grievance debate, I indicated my concern at the way in which the property, lease and staff of the National Coursing Association had been taken over by the new Dog Racing Control Board. Subsequent to that and to members reading the detail in yesterday's *Hansard*, someone stated to me that it must have been a spur-of-the-moment decision, and hence the problem in relation to having the courtesy of indicating to the association how its facilities would be taken over. Obviously, it was not a spur-of-the-moment decision, but one that had been contemplated to the extent that a letter I received, bearing the signature of the Secretary of the board, and dated February 2, was forwarded to me on a letterhead which bore the board's insignia and the address that was previously the association's address.

I wanted to make that point to clear up any misconception members may have had that it was not a premedi-

tated action that allowed the new body to walk in and take over the assets of an existing body.

I have indicated previously and I reiterate it for fear that anyone should have the wrong idea that I fully agree with there being a Dog Racing Control Board and look forward to a worthwhile contribution by the members who have been appointed to the board. I trust that the could-not-care-less, walk-over-the-other-person attitude that prevailed at the start of its activities is not conduct that will be followed by a subsequent new body in this State.

The second matter I draw to the attention of the House relates to a Question on Notice appearing at pages 2951-4 of last week's *Hansard*. In particular, the question sought to obtain from the Minister an indication of the enrolments on the electoral rolls during the period from June, 1976, up to the present or, particularly, up to a computer print-out time. That information was regrettably provided in two sections, so there is no immediate opportunity of comparing the two. However, I have taken the opportunity of combining the two sets of figures, namely, those relating to the print-out as at June 1, 1976, and the print-out as at December 31, 1976. I have also extracted the numerical change in the numbers associated with each of the electorates (indeed, with each of the subdivisions within the electorates), and I have then taken a percentage variance that applies in each case. As I believe that this is interesting detail which members would want to have, I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it, as it is purely statistical detail.

Leave granted.

STATE ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS—ENROLMENT

District	Subdivision	June 1976	December 1976	Numerical Change	Percentage Variance
	Adelaide	3 433	3 318	-115	-3.35
	Marleston	4 930	4 715	-215	-4.36
	Thebarton	9 189	9 004	-185	-2.01
ADELAIDE		17 552	17 037	-515	-2.93
	Albert Park	15 053	15 161	+108	+0.72
	Beverley	3 835	3 940	+105	+2.74
ALBERT PARK		18 888	19 101	+213	+1.13
	Alexandra	13 775	13 982	+207	+1.50
ALEXANDRA		13 775	13 982	+207	+1.50
	Ascot Park	16 991	16 869	-122	-0.72
ASCOT PARK		16 991	16 869	-122	-0.72
	Bragg	16 571	16 285	-286	-1.73
BRAGG		16 571	16 285	-286	-1.73
	Brighton	20 263	20 353	+90	+0.44
BRIGHTON		20 263	20 353	+90	+0.44
	Chaffey	12 853	12 938	+75	+0.58
CHAFFEY		12 853	12 938	+75	+0.58
	Coles	21 721	22 473	+752	+3.46
COLES		21 721	22 473	+752	+3.46
	Davenport	17 975	17 923	-52	-0.29
	Leabrook	1 537	1 570	+33	+2.15
DAVENPORT		19 512	19 493	-19	-0.10
	Elizabeth	20 311	19 787	-524	-2.57
ELIZABETH		20 311	19 787	-524	-2.57
	Eyre	10 170	9 993	-177	-1.74
EYRE		10 170	9 993	-177	-1.74

District	Subdivision	June 1976	December 1976	Numerical Change	Percentage Variance
	Fisher East	5 497	5 558	+61	+1.11
	Fisher North	11 580	11 937	+357	+3.08
	Fisher South	1 492	1 572	+80	+5.36
	Fisher West	3 381	3 382	+1	+0.03
FISHER		21 950	22 449	+499	+2.27
	Flinders	12 113	12 115	+2	+0.02
FLINDERS		12 113	12 115	+2	+0.02
	Florey East	10 688	10 767	+79	+0.74
	Florey West	10 977	10 979	+2	+0.02
FLOREY		21 665	21 746	+81	+0.37
	Frome North	8 400	8 297	-113	-1.35
	Frome South	395	396	+1	+0.25
FROME		8 795	8 693	-112	-1.27
	Gilles East	11 307	11 260	-47	-0.42
	Gilles West	8 269	8 150	-119	-1.44
GILLES		19 576	19 410	-166	-0.85
	Glenelg	18 603	18 301	-302	-1.62
GLENELG		18 603	18 301	-302	-1.62
	Gouger	10 763	10 780	+17	+0.16
GOUGER		10 763	10 780	+17	+0.16
	Goyder	11 123	11 145	+22	+0.20
GOYDER		11 123	11 145	+22	+0.20
	Hanson East	8 579	8 090	-489	-5.70
	Hanson North	3 251	3 300	+49	+1.51
	Hanson South	8 139	8 062	-77	-0.95
HANSON		19 969	19 452	-517	-2.59
	Henley Beach	21 165	21 521	+356	+1.68
HENLEY BEACH		21 165	21 521	+356	+1.68
	Heysen North	8 932	9 063	+131	+1.47
	Heysen South	4 507	4 519	+12	+0.27
HEYSEN		13 439	13 582	+143	+1.06
	Kavel	11 101	11 086	-15	-0.14
KAVEL		11 101	11 086	-15	-0.14
	Light North	10 575	10 683	+108	+1.02
	Light South	2 101	2 123	+22	+1.05
LIGHT		12 676	12 806	+130	+1.03
	Mallee North	7 957	7 985	+28	+0.35
	Mallee South	2 969	2 959	-10	-0.34
MALLEE		10 926	10 944	+18	+0.16
	Flagstaff Hill	4 115	4 220	+105	+2.55
	Mawson	29 751	31 321	+1 570	+5.28
	Moana	2 808	2 894	+86	+3.06
MAWSON		36 674	38 435	+1 761	+4.80
	Millicent	11 823	11 764	-59	-0.50
MILLICENT		11 823	11 764	-59	-0.50
	Mitcham	17 290	17 060	-230	-1.33
MITCHAM		17 290	17 060	-230	-1.33
	Mitchell	18 049	17 583	-466	-2.58
MITCHELL		18 049	17 583	-466	-2.58
	Mount Gambier	12 787	13 068	+281	+2.20
MOUNT GAMBIER		12 787	13 068	+281	+2.20
	Murray North	10 702	10 744	+42	+0.39
	Murray South	1 900	1 870	-30	-1.58
MURRAY		12 602	12 614	+12	+0.10
	Norwood	8 818	8 626	-192	-2.18
	St. Peters	8 825	8 746	-79	-0.90
NORWOOD		17 643	17 372	-271	-1.54
	Peake	17 398	17 094	-304	-1.75
PEAKE		17 398	17 094	-304	-1.75
	Pirie	11 086	11 117	+31	+0.28
PIRIE		11 086	11 117	+31	+0.28

District	Subdivision	June 1976	December 1976	Numerical Change	Percentage Variance
PLAYFORD	Playford	26 410	27 069	+659	+2.50
		26 410	27 069	+659	+2.50
PRICE	Price	16 792	16 427	-365	-2.17
		16 792	16 427	-365	-2.17
ROCKY RIVER	Rocky River	10 599	10 570	-29	-0.27
		10 599	10 570	-29	-0.27
ROSS SMITH	Angle Park	4 188	4 076	-112	-2.67
	Ross Smith	12 715	12 256	-459	-3.61
		16 903	16 332	-571	-3.38
SALISBURY	Salisbury	20 398	20 630	+232	+1.14
		20 398	20 630	+232	+1.14
SEMAPHORE	Semaphore	19 077	19 250	+173	+0.91
		19 077	19 250	+173	+0.91
SPENCE	Spence North	6 836	6 767	-69	-1.01
	Spence South	9 735	9 615	-120	-1.23
		16 571	16 382	-189	-1.14
STUART	Stuart	15 372	15 317	-55	-0.36
		15 372	15 317	-55	-0.36
TEA TREE GULLY	Highbury	21 659	21 584	-75	-0.35
	Modbury North	11 296	12 125	+829	+7.34
		32 955	33 709	+754	+2.29
TORRENS	Torrens	17 544	16 935	-609	-3.47
		17 544	16 935	-609	-3.47
UNLEY	Goodwood	10 147	9 671	-476	-4.69
	Unley	6 638	6 498	-140	-2.11
		16 785	16 169	-616	-3.67
VICTORIA	Victoria	11 178	11 017	-161	-1.44
		11 178	11 017	-161	-1.44
WHYALLA	Whyalla	11 661	11 780	+119	+1.02
		11 661	11 780	+119	+1.02
STATE TOTAL		790 068	790 035	-33	-0.004
METROPOLITAN AREA TOTAL		565 226	564 722	-504	

Dr. EASTICK: From that detail, it is interesting to note that, when the Electoral Commission brought down a series of new electorates, only the electorates of Norwood, Unley, Mitcham, Ascot Park, Adelaide, Torrens, and Price had unchanged boundaries. I have taken out the variance that applies in respect of these electorates, which are the only ones where a comparison is of any value. I find that in each case there has been a reduction of some extent in those electorates, of up to 3.47 per cent in the electorate of Torrens, and 3.67 per cent in the electorate of Unley. So, there is a marked shift. As this material is also statistical, I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

VARIANCE IN CERTAIN ELECTORATES

Electorate	June 1, 1976	Variance from State Quota	Additional percentage decrease
Norwood	17 610	+4.92	-1.54
Unley	16 733	-0.31	-3.67
Mitcham	17 265	+2.86	-1.33
Ascot Park	16 973	+1.12	-0.72
Adelaide	17 522	+4.39	-2.93
Torrens	17 497	+4.24	-3.47
Price	16 771	-0.08	-2.17

Dr. EASTICK: From the detail available to us, it is possible to take out in descending order the percentage variances that apply to the State's current 47 electorates.

We find that the State figure had reduced by 0.004 per cent, and that the maximum increase in the State was in the electorate of Mawson, where there had been a 4.8 per cent increase; 23 electorates were above the State percentage change; and 24 were below the State percentage change. Again, this illustrates the fact that Torrens showed minus 3.47 per cent and Unley minus 3.67 per cent. As this material is also statistical, I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

ELECTORATE VARIANCES

Descending Order of Percentage + Variance	Electorate
4.80	Mawson
3.46	Coles
2.50	Playford
2.29	Tea Tree Gully
2.27	Fisher
2.20	Mount Gambier
1.68	Henley Beach
1.50	Alexandra
1.14	Salisbury
1.13	Albert Park
1.06	Heyson
1.03	Light
1.02	Whyalla
0.91	Semaphore
0.58	Chaffey
0.44	Brighton
0.37	Florey
0.28	Pirie

ELECTORATE VARIANCES—(continued)

Descending Order of Percentage + Variance	
0.20	Goyder
0.16	Gouger and Mallee
0.10	Murray Bridge
0.02	Flinders
-0.004	State figure
0.10	Davenport
0.14	Kavel
0.27	Rocky River
0.36	Stuart
0.50	Millicent
0.72	Ascot Park
0.85	Gilles
1.14	Spence
1.27	Frome
1.33	Mitcham
1.44	Victoria
1.54	Norwood
1.62	Glenelg
1.73	Bragg
1.74	Eyre
1.75	Peake
2.17	Price
2.57	Elizabeth
2.58	Mitchell
2.59	Hanson
2.93	Adelaide
3.38	Ross Smith
3.47	Torrens
3.67	Unley

Dr. EASTICK: The value of this information is that the people of the State, certainly members, will have the opportunity of comparing shifts in the State's electoral figures. The information also highlights an overall decrease in electors enrolled in South Australia for about 12 months. From figures provided by the Electoral Commission in February, 1976, there were decreases in subsequent releases made. We find that there is an even further decrease, so that at present there are only 790 035 electors in the State. I believe that, as a result of the work that has been undertaken by the Commonwealth Electoral Office, considerable duplication of persons on the rolls is being found, and that many people who have moved to other States have been eliminated from the roll. It is interesting to note that the degree of variance is not balanced across the whole of the State but that the shift is marked in a number of electorates, as opposed to others. In the figures I sought leave to have included, it becomes obvious that there is this variance. Members can do what they like with the information and determine what significance it may have, but I believe that it will be of general interest to them.

I will now take up the final point I made yesterday, namely, that of news vendors who use motor vehicles to deliver newspapers. I said that the wearing of a seat belt made it almost impossible for them to throw out the newspapers from one side of the street to the other across the hood of the vehicle, an operation recognised by all members as being normal in that occupation. A seat belt worn by the person causes physical discomfort as the arm throws over. These people have made a legitimate request to the Government that they be not required to be in the harness while they are delivering newspapers. I understand that the request has been refused. It should be reconsidered, and I hope I have the support of all members in that matter, on behalf of people who provide a worthwhile service to the community.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I wish to bring before the House a matter that is causing concern to people in my district, that is, the future use of the bulk loading wharf being constructed at Port Lincoln. The wharf is the gantry

for the loading of grain from the silo complex, and it is mounted on the new deep sea wharf. Construction on the wharf commenced in 1971, and since then there has been a long construction period. The period of construction has not been unblemished, as there have been handicaps about details of construction and design and there have been work force problems.

The reason why I bring the matter before the House is that some time ago the Waterside Workers Federation gave notice that it did not intend to man the wharf when it was completed, because it seemed that the employment of about nine men would be lost when the new loading facilities came into operation. This assessment that man hours will be lost is based on reasonable grounds. With the old loading facilities, 36 Waterside Workers Federation members have been engaged, and they are concerned that, when the new installation is in operation, the number will be reduced to 25, basically because of the increased output of the new loading gantries. Another reason is the faster rate of loading and the larger ships that will be involved: fewer men will be required.

Ultimately the loading gantries will be able to handle 4 000 tonnes an hour. They have an immediate capacity to handle ships of up to 48 000 tonnes. The ultimate programme is that ships of 100 000 tonnes could be handled, but it is not likely that we will see such ships in Port Lincoln, because no one market in the world is likely to purchase 100 000 tonnes of grain at any one time. Further, the deep sea port of 100 000 is workable only when there are ports of equal size at which to unload and there are equal facilities to unload vessels of that magnitude.

The United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia and the Stockowners Association have expressed much concern that we should have operation of an \$11 000 000 project held in jeopardy by the Waterside Workers Federation, but we must also be fair and say what arrangements, if any, will be made for the employees who are likely to be displaced. For a long time it has been known that job opportunities will be lost. When the Port Lincoln bulk loading facility was reported on by the Public Works Committee (the report was tabled in this House on February 23, 1971), the committee went into detail about its assessment of the needs for the area, the likely effect on the area, and the expected cost, and the committee had taken evidence from 18 witnesses. I should like to name the witnesses, because I believe they have significance in that not one representative of the Waterside Workers Federation approached the committee. The committee heard evidence in Adelaide from the following people:

Mr. J. R. Sainsbury (Director), Mr. B. I. Moyses (Engineer for Planning and Development), Captain W. H. Hilder (Ports and Traffic Manager), Mr. R. F. Kinnane (Acting Chief Engineer), Marine and Harbors Department; Mr. J. D. McAuliffe (Senior Agricultural Adviser), Agriculture Department; Mr. T. M. Saint (Chairman of Directors) and Mr. P. T. Sanders (General Manager), South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited; Mr. C. G. Semmler (South Australian Manager), Australian Wheat Board; Mr. D. C. Martin (General Manager), Australian Barley Board; Mr. J. S. Carter (South Australian Manager), Cresco Fertilizers Limited; and Mr. H. Maddocks (South Australian Manager) and Captain C. Thomson (South Australian Stevedoring Superintendent), British Phosphate Commissioners.

In addition, the committee heard evidence at Port Lincoln from the Mayor at that time (Mr. H. J. Freeman); Mr. K. C. Kelly, a councillor of the Port Lincoln Corporation; Mr. N. L. McGowan, Regional Manager of the Electricity Trust of South Australia; Mr. C. Chilman, a farmer of Butler Tanks; and Captain I. F. Jeffries, Harbourmaster.

There was presented to the committee on behalf of Mr. T. J. Trezise, a statement advocating construction of the new facility at Kirton Point instead of on the site chosen.

When one considered the future of the employees concerned, one would expect that when work becomes operational there would be natural wastage of men and retirements to avoid the displacement of men now engaged on the wharf. Unfortunately, it seems at this stage that that will not be the case. The grain loading facilities are about to be tested. A newspaper report last week indicated that it was expected that testing would commence in about April, and we will have to find out what arrangements the Marine and Harbors Department will make with the Waterside Workers Federation for the future employment of these men.

The men are paid by the hour for work for a quarter, on the basis of payment three quarters preceding. That sounds complicated, but the payment received now for the quarter of April, May and June this year would be based on the hours worked three quarters ago, namely, the quarter of July, August and September last year. Therefore, the wages earned by those employees now would be satisfactory for a nine-month period after the complex came into operation, but from that time on the employees' work time would suffer because the three quarters lapse eventually would build up. One could not be critical of the waterside workers for what they are doing, because there is a loss of employment, but they cannot stand in the way of progress especially in the construction of a complex of this magnitude and importance to the State. After all, we have to progress and somewhere someone has to cater for the large shipping facilities. It would not matter whether it was Port Lincoln, Port Adelaide, or any other port in South Australian waters—somebody would be affected by it. So we cannot single out any one port and say that one group of men is affected in this way. At the time this project was being contemplated and all throughout the negotiations in which the facilities were being designed and constructed, not one word was mentioned about the welfare of the waterside workers.

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

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

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

Motion carried

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): Last night, in a similar debate, I commenced by referring to the funding for roads from the Federal source and said I would say something later about that matter. I now take the opportunity to say something about the grants being received for roads in South Australia. I realise that many members have spoken on this, but I should like to be a little different in my comments. This has been prompted mainly by some of the comments of the Minister of Transport, particularly last Thursday, in answer to a question by the member for Stuart. In that answer, the Minister rebuked the Federal Government and abused it in a tirade that is normal for him. When we endeavour to put the record straight we are challenged with the fact that we are not supporting South Australia, that we support only the Government in Canberra; but I say here and now, so that there will be no misunderstanding, that I should like to see as much money as possible come to South Australia from the Federal Government for the purpose of roadworks, but what I will not accept and what I endeavour to correct

now is that, in my opinion, the Minister is making misleading statements concerning this aspect of funding from the Federal Government. I have before me a table of the proposed funds for 1977-78 and also the figures for 1976-77. There are eight categories—national highways construction, national highways maintenance, national highways for national commerce, and then, for State purposes, rural arterial roads, rural local roads, urban arterial roads, urban local roads, and miters, which is to do with minor engineering works such as traffic lights, etc., or the reconstruction of traffic intersections.

In 1976-77, the Federal Government made available to South Australia \$38 800 000; for the ensuing year, 1977-78, that figure will be \$40 400 000, so there will be an increase in money terms of \$1 600 000. As a percentage increase, in money terms, it will be 4.1 per cent, but in terms of real increase, taking into account inflation, it will be a decrease of 7.9 per cent on last year. The Federal Minister is not denying this fact. The figure for Australia will be \$475 000 000 this year for this purpose whereas taking into account the inflationary increase to keep abreast of inflation it should be \$495 000 000 but, as the Federal members have said (those responsible—the Treasurer, the Prime Minister and the Minister for Transport) they must reduce spending where they possibly can, and that is what they have done. Therefore, we are getting, in money, an increase, not like the previous year. When the Whitlam Government took office, there was \$31 000 000 for two successive years. No consideration was given to the inflationary trend. I want to put the record straight there.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What about houses?

Mr. RUSSACK: I am speaking specifically about roads; there will be an increase. In South Australia, the area that will suffer will be urban arterial roads but, as far as local government is concerned, there will be a definite increase. For rural local roads, there will be an increase from \$5 300 000 this current year to \$6 700 000 next year, a real increase, taking inflation into account, of 11.9 per cent. The provision for urban local roads will go from \$1 100 000 this year to \$2 200 000 next year, a 100 per cent increase in money terms and a 77 per cent increase in real terms. Therefore, local government should benefit markedly during the coming financial year. I asked several Questions on Notice, one of which yesterday was:

What amounts have been allocated by the Commonwealth Government and the Highways Department, respectively, for 1976-77 in the following categories: (a) rural local roads; (b) urban local roads; and (c) minor traffic, engineering and safety improvement?

The answer I received was that in 1976-77 for rural local roads the Commonwealth gave \$5 300 000 and the State made a contribution of \$3 100 000; for urban local roads the Commonwealth contribution for 1976-77 was \$1 100 000 and the Highways Department contribution was \$500 000; for miters the Commonwealth in 1976-77 gave \$1 500 000, and the contribution from South Australia was nil.

The second part of the question was as follows:

Is it anticipated these amounts will be increased for the financial year 1977-78?

The answer was as follows:

It is anticipated that the Commonwealth Government allocations in these categories will be increased. The State contribution to rural local and urban local roads will be decreased.

The picture is markedly different from what the Minister has been saying. As far as the Federal Government and the funding for roads are concerned, there is in money

terms an overall increase. The provision for national highways has been reduced from \$17 300 000 to \$15 000 000; however, we have only two national highways this year, whereas we had three last year. The salient point is that the Minister in South Australia is informed of the overall amount; then he bases his priorities on that amount and, if he considers that one road has a greater priority than another road, that is how the money is spent. If the Stuart Highway this year misses out, the Minister has said the priority is not great enough. There is another point. I venture to say that, if the Minister in South Australia felt during the year (and this is in answer to the accusation he makes that he is under the thumb of the Federal Minister in this respect) that he should request a priority on a certain road and he saw that during that year the money would be better spent on another road or that the priority of another road had gone higher, I am sure the Federal Minister would be flexible enough to give approval for the Minister to alter his priority.

Mr. Dean Brown: The Minister is keen on playing politics.

Mr. RUSSACK: Yes. Yesterday the member for Flinders asked a question about a road in his district, but he has not received the reply yet; all he got was political abuse about what the Federal Government was doing. I challenge the Minister to state the truth, without misleading this Parliament and the public of South Australia as regards the allocation of Federal funds. He should not give the impression that there is a reduction.

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

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I wish to raise the question of emergency procedures at Adelaide Airport in the event of an accident occurring. At Adelaide Airport, the planes usually take off in a westerly direction over the coast; indeed, at many airports this kind of flight pattern is observed. In the case of an emergency at the airport, a fire-fighting service is available. The most dangerous period is when a plane is just taking off. If it went down in the sea, it would be a problem to get out sufficient rescue craft. We would have to get rescue craft out of the Patawalonga and they would have to travel, say, 5 km into the gulf. In present circumstances, it would take perhaps half a day before we could get rescue craft out there.

The solution is to adopt the policy followed at most great airports, which have a small hovercraft that can take off immediately at a speed between 120 km/h and 160 km/h. Such a hovercraft could be at the scene of the crash within minutes, to start rescue operations. Reluctantly, I point out that the provision of this hovercraft would come under the control of the Minister of Transport, whose record is not good; all he can boast about is the Bee-line bus service and the failure of the dial-a-bus system. The purchase of a hovercraft at a cost of between \$15 000 and \$20 000 is certainly warranted. The armed forces of America, Indonesia and European countries use hovercraft instead of the motor torpedo boats that were used during the Second World War. The navies of those countries use hovercraft as gun-boats; they cannot be torpedoed. In failing to provide a hovercraft for Adelaide Airport, the Government has failed to move with the times. I hope the Government will act on my suggestion.

I turn now to the Premier's outburst this afternoon, when he questioned the practice of the Opposition in putting many questions on notice. He said that last week there

were more than 100 questions on notice, while this week there are more than 70 questions on notice. Whose fault is that? It is the Government's fault, because it halved the length of Question Time. When the Opposition had two hours for Question Time, an Opposition member could ask three or perhaps four questions a day. Yet the Premier this afternoon tried to beat the Opposition down.

Mr. Venning: Government members ask Dorothy Dix questions of Ministers.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes. The Minister of Transport today took eight minutes to answer a Dorothy Dix question that could have been answered in the Caucus room. When we put a question on notice we have to split up the question to ensure that we get the type of information we want. If we asked the question here, we could deal directly with the Minister and more easily make our meaning clear. The Premier is trying to strangle the Opposition. He moans with a sardonic leer on his face while he complains about the number of questions on notice. His performance this afternoon was disgraceful when he criticised the Opposition for trying to get decent replies from Ministers.

Following the establishment of the Morphettville bus depot, many bus drivers did not know what to do. However, I refer to other aspects of transport. I understand that no second division is being provided on the Overland at Easter, but last year at the same time this train carried about 280 passengers. However, because of the ban on wooden carriages, no extra division is being allowed this year. Victoria will have three divisions for Thursday evening bringing people into this State, but this Government will not supply extra carriages to take people from this State to Victoria. I understand that the Government is supporting the use of steel carriages, probably because of its concern about the Granville disaster. However, when 200 tonnes of concrete fall on a carriage, it would not make much difference if it were built of timber or steel. I also understand that the Government is selling four steel carriages to the Commonwealth railways at a time when this State is short of rolling stock. I want to know how the Government can encourage the public to use State transport, especially the railways, when an extra division cannot be provided at Easter on the Overland.

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

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I refer to several matters affecting my district in order to bring them to the notice of the Ministers concerned. The first concerns the Strathalbyn district reticulated water scheme. This matter was raised as long ago as 1973, when my predecessor, Mr. McAnaney, asked two questions. In February, 1975, he also asked another question, and was told that a scheme was being prepared. In September, 1975, I wrote a letter to the Minister and was informed that advice was being sought from the public in regard to this matter. In January, 1976, I sent a letter to the Minister seeking advice and further information about this scheme. In March, 1976, I received a letter from the Minister advising that Callington would be supplied with water, a decision that was much appreciated. I was also advised that a feasibility study was being undertaken as a survey had reported to the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

I was told that the department was preparing a plan and a report to be considered by the Government. In April of that year a letter was sent to the Minister from the district concerned, with a petition with 491 signatures complaining about the poor quality of water. Meetings

were held in Strathalbyn and the surrounding districts, and at one that I attended representatives from the Engineering and Water Supply Department were present when the Minister who was invited was unable to attend. In August of that year another question was asked, and the Minister's reply referred to an interim report. In reply to a question in November last year, the Minister stated that an interim report on the Hartley-Woodchester-Strathalbyn reticulated water scheme would be released early this year, and pointed out that he had not had the chance to read the report but would release it after he had read it.

Yesterday, in a Question on Notice I asked why the report had not been made available as had been promised in November last year. The reply was that the results of the investigation carried out by the Engineering and Water Supply Department were now being evaluated by departmental officers and a firm date about the release of the report could not be made at this stage. An identical reply had been given 12 months ago, but we are no further advanced than we were then. People in my district want to know what is going on and when they will get water: they deserve water.

I want to know whether the Minister and the Government are stalling. Whilst I realise that the project may not be economically viable, I believe there are many other services provided in this State that are not economically viable. Water is desperately needed in that area, and it is not just a matter of wanting it. It is a question of need. The water there is of extremely poor quality, and I believe that people deserve a better standard. Also, it is a health hazard, because the Bremer River is completely polluted. As the Minister is aware of that, I ask him to do something about it.

I asked a Question on Notice yesterday regarding the need for pre-school facilities at Euchunga. I pointed out to the Minister of Education the untenable situation in which 32 children meet in a private home at Euchunga because of the lack of suitable facilities. Actually, 76 children are involved in the Euchunga district, and that does not take into account the need for facilities at Meadows. We have 32 children attending the pre-school at present because the parents of the other children are so fed up that they have lost interest. They have worked hard as a district and as a community, but have now lost interest as a result of the lack of support of this Government. In his reply the Minister referred to the needs of the small number, and I should like the Minister to say how he determines what is a small number. I do not regard 32 or 76 as being a small number. The reply also referred to an equipment grant for this area. The parents concerned have been told that they can have more money for equipment, but I believe that equipment is not worth while when there is no place in which to use it.

The children are forced to meet in a private house, not two days a week as the Minister said, but for three days a week. The demand is there and land has been made available in the recreation ground: that was pointed out to the Minister. The parents in the district have reached the stage where, because of the work they have already put into it, they intend to erect a building. I should like the Minister to clarify whether, if these people erect their own building, the Education Department will provide assistance when finance becomes available, if it is not available at present.

The Education Department was willing to support a pre-school, if it were held in the building on the recreation ground at Euchunga. The building that these parents intend

to build is on a similar scale and plan, so that I presume the Minister would agree that the department will subsidise the cost of the building that is intended to be erected by these people. Another point was that the Minister said that the primary school offered to accommodate the group in the activity room. The school was willing to do that, but it encountered problems regarding equipment. Reference is made also in the answer to a meeting being organised between parents, the Kindergarten Union and the Education Department. The residents, with whom I have checked by telephone this evening, know nothing about the convening of the meeting suggested by the Minister. I ask the Minister to look into the situation and I urge the need for activity in this area.

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

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I appreciate the opportunity once again to raise a matter of concern in my district. This debate gives me the opportunity to bring to the Government's attention a matter that concerns councils in my area. The subject relates to the operation of the Fire Brigades Board of South Australia. I have taken several deputations on this subject in the past and have spoken in this House on several occasions about the operations of the board.

My comments are directed not as a criticism of the board but as a criticism of the Government itself. I refer to two letters from councils in my district regarding fire districts. This is important to all metropolitan members, as I am confining my remarks to the metropolitan area. The first letter states:

The council has received notice of the board's intention (subject to the Governor's consent) to dissolve the Elizabeth fire district and to reconstitute the northern fire district by adding to it those portions of the city of Elizabeth and the District Council of Munno Para which constitute the Elizabeth fire district. This is proposed to be effected as from July, 1977. This council strongly opposes this move which, in its opinion, only bears out the fact that the whole of the metropolitan area should be one fire district, with the exclusion for special consideration of the city of Adelaide and the city of Port Adelaide.

It is appreciated by this council that with one fire district for the metropolitan area it would probably pay a higher contribution, but at least the system would be equitable, with no juggling of district boundaries to spread the cost as now applies under existing legislation. We have also had the strange experience of additional costs being apportioned to the northern fire district because of "support from North Adelaide", and "support from Rosewater" in endeavours to spread costs. The council deplors the inadequacies of the present legislation and requests that:

- (1) the proposed enlargement of the northern district be not proceeded with; and
- (2) that the existing Fire Brigades Act be amended to provide for the making of one fire district for the metropolitan area, excluding the cities of Adelaide and Port Adelaide (which require special consideration).

The board itself has requested approval for changes to be made to enable the creation of one fire district, with resultant benefits to its own administrative and accounting procedures.

The second letter to which I refer states:

I refer to your notice of February 18, 1977, in terms of section 7 (2) (b) of the Fire Brigades Act, 1936-1976, of intention, subject to the Governor's consent, to amalgamate the existing Elizabeth fire district with the northern fire district of which this council area forms a part. The proposal was discussed at a meeting of council held on March 14, 1977. Council resolved to object to the proposal on the following grounds:

1. That it is a piecemeal attempt to spread costs of fire services when these costs should be spread equitably over the whole of the metropolitan

area of Adelaide. Council supports the contention of the board as set out in its 1975 report that there should be one such fire district.

2. That it will result in a disproportionate increase in costs for those councils in the present northern fire district. An inflation factor of 15 per cent added to the 16 per cent increase set out in your (the board's) explanatory letter of March 4, 1977, would mean an increase of one-third in contributions for 1977-78 which contributions have already risen by some 137 per cent since 1974-75. In any case fire protection cost increases have far outstripped living costs as determined by the consumer price index.

This council would support further moves to rationalise contributions, if they are to continue to be made by local government at all, so that all metropolitan councils are brought on to a comparable or equitable footing.

I have argued this case previously and the Government, through the Chief Secretary, has refused to grant this change. True, if the change were made, some councils may have to pay more and others may have to pay less, but I believe that I have the support of other metropolitan members in saying that the cost should be borne on a population basis throughout the metropolitan area. Some metropolitan councils get off lightly in their contribution, whilst others pay more heavily.

For example, Woodville council probably has to pay a high contribution, whereas Glenelg council probably does not pay such a large sum. I am exempting from my comments the special needs of the cities of Adelaide and Port Adelaide. My postulate is that all councils in the metropolitan area should form one metropolitan fire district and all the councils should be treated the same on a pro rata basis. After all, councils are one of the contributors to the fund, and the councils in South Australia affected by this situation, whether they be corporations or district councils, contributed last year \$1 000 000 to the maintenance of the fire brigade. I am assured that their costs in the forthcoming year will increase dramatically.

The board has made several requests to the Government to institute this change, and I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, as the member for Pirie, are well aware of the operations of the board because of the peculiar problems encountered in your own district. I refer to the 1976 report of the Fire Brigades Board which is addressed to the Chief Secretary and which states:

The board lodged further representations through the Chief Secretary for Government approval to establish one metropolitan fire district (instead of the several existing) which it considers would facilitate its operations, simplify accounting procedures and result in a more equitable sharing of the proportion of fire brigade costs levied on local government authorities in the metropolitan area. The review, in the previous annual report, as a result of the Government's deciding to appoint Mr. J. R. Dunsford to undertake an in-depth review of the activities of the Fire Brigades Board, was received.

I know that the board has made representations to the Government on this matter; it recommends that the whole metropolitan area be treated as one fire district. Certainly, such an arrangement would simplify the board's administration. Why have this area split into numerous districts in the metropolitan area?

The problem is exacerbated by the fact that the northern fire district will have added to it the city of Elizabeth and the Munno Para District Council. In the district that I represent, some councils are served not only by the large fire station at North Adelaide and those at Gepps Cross and Rosewater but also by the station in the Tea Tree Gully District, which can be called on at times. These councils must contribute to all these stations. This is a farcical set-up, as the whole metropolitan area should be treated as one area.

I make this plea on behalf of the councils and the residents of my district and of other parts of the metropolitan area. Of the contributions made to the Fire Brigades Board, 12½ per cent are made by the Government, a similar amount is contributed by local government, and 75 per cent by the fire underwriters. So, the citizen pays not only taxation but also rates. He is penalised through the insurance that he takes out to protect his home against fire. In many cases, citizens are unfairly treated in this regard because they are paying in multiple ways. I sincerely trust the Government will get off its tail, conduct an urgent investigation into this matter, and deal with it.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The question of replacement of the railway sleeping car on the Adelaide to Mount Gambier line seems indeed to be a sleeping issue as far as the State and Federal Ministers of Transport are concerned. Over the past several months since the railcar was burnt out in Mount Gambier, I have approached, individually and collectively, the Federal Minister for Transport, the Federal member for Barker, the State Minister of Transport, the South Australian Railways Commissioner (Mr. Doyle) and several minor luminaries throughout the railways system of Australia and South Australia, in an attempt to get a replacement railcar. I have been told repeatedly by the Minister and others that the old railcar was too old and badly damaged to be replaced, that the alternative railcar that was in existence was also unfit to be renovated, that Federal railcars need an additional railcar as a power unit because the Overlanders are air-conditioned, and that to supply one of these would be impracticable because spare power units are in short supply and are not available for the Adelaide to Mount Gambier run.

So, we seem to have reached an impasse, while travellers, from the very old to the very young, must spend 11 or 12 dreary overnight hours sitting up in the existing railcar. There is no sleeping accommodation at all. We are told that it is highly unlikely that a replacement will be found, and I for one find this intolerable. Many citizens from the South-East have petitioned our State and Federal Ministers on several occasions, either through me or the members from Millicent and Victoria. They are anxious that we have an adequate overnight railcar service.

The disadvantages to Mount Gambier must be pointed out. There is one other remote city in South Australia, Port Lincoln. However, it has a much better air service with several flights daily, whereas Mount Gambier has one flight a day on three days; for three days it has two flights a day; and on Saturday it has no air service at all. So, Mount Gambier needs additional rail transport. Apart from that, unionists are concerned. I have been approached by individual railway union members, who are upset at the prospect that the overnight service may be curtailed or taken off altogether. They are not pleased at all in Mount Gambier or Adelaide, or at the stations between those places, because this will affect overnight portage facilities and the jobs that are involved. I have also taken up this issue with the State Transport Minister.

One thing that I cannot comprehend is that somewhere either the State or the Federal Government should have been involved in covering property with insurance. This State has the State Government Insurance Commission, which might well have been involved in covering the railcar at the time it was burnt out, because the car was then in the caretaking of the South Australian State

Transport Authority. Therefore, someone should have got sufficient insurance coverage to ensure that this car could be replaced. There is no indication that the Government is willing to acknowledge that it was carrying its own insurance, or that it is willing at least to renovate the old railcar. We cannot afford to be without this service altogether. I have been approached, as has the Minister, by elderly people who have had to travel from Adelaide to Mount Gambier and who have been severely inconvenienced by not being able to sleep overnight. So much for that. It is an issue that I would like the Minister to examine.

In the railways transfer agreement debate, my first debate after entering this House in July or August, 1975, I said that one of the reasons why I opposed the transfer of the country railways to the Federal authority was that country people would be neglected, simply because Mount Gambier has a fairly strong voice in State politics but a weak one in Federal politics. I made the point then that I sincerely hoped that, when the transfer went through, the State Minister would lobby strongly on behalf of country people.

I am beginning to feel a little like the lone ranger in this issue because I do not think, at least from information that I have had fed back to me, that the State Minister is attacking the Federal Government on this issue. Nor is he showing any willingness to spend some of the \$800 000 000 that the Treasurer says we are making as a profit by selling out our country railways. He is showing no inclination to put at least a little bit of that back into country rail services in providing this railcar. This is not an unreasonable request in light of the tremendous benefit that the State Government has gained as a result of selling its country rail services to the Federal Government.

I therefore respectfully ask the Minister of Transport to examine the matter, to take it up with the Federal Minister if he is not willing to do anything himself, and to try to get some sleeping car service back on the Adelaide to Mount Gambier run. That service serves people at many different places between Adelaide and Mount Gambier. In addition, it also concerns employment and the unions.

Mr. Abbott: Have you approached the Federal Minister?

Mr. ALLISON: I said that I have done so through the Federal member for Barker, and I get the same story back each time. I should appreciate it if the State Minister would lobby strongly on our behalf, and at least try to do as much as I have done.

Mr. Abbott: Tell us who's running the country services.

Mr. ALLISON: We are still caretaking until the agreement is signed. I therefore have no compunction about taking up the issue in this House. The next issue to which I refer is one that the member for Victoria fleetingly brought up. I refer to the question that I raised with the Minister of Mines and Energy a month or more ago on March 3. I realised at the time that the contract had not then been let for replacement of the power station facilities at Mount Gambier although the Minister had said that two automatically controlled generators would be installed on the Casterton road site in Mount Gambier. I pointed out that I was concerned at the prospect of a break-down cutting off our service altogether. I asked whether an adequate service would be provided to ensure complete electrical supply to the South-East in the event of break-down from Adelaide.

I have also asked that the question of low frequency vibrations be considered because of the situation at Dry Creek, where two generators running parallel to each other tend to give an undulating pulsation which annoys the residents in that area and particularly those in the residential areas adjacent. Thirdly, some consideration should be given as a result of that to the sight problems experienced by residents of the residential areas of Mount Gambier.

The Minister acknowledged that letter very quickly on March 9. He said that he was looking into the matters I had raised and that he would write again as soon as possible. However, the "writing again as soon as possible" did not transpire, and this morning in the *Advertiser* members will have seen that an \$11 000 000 power plant is to be constructed at Snuggery. The questions that I raised with the Minister have been satisfactorily answered.

Mr. Becker: In the press?

Mr. ALLISON: Yes. However, my secretary tells me that no letter has arrived in Mount Gambier (nor, I can assure the Minister, in Adelaide) advising me of the results.

Mr. Becker: That's typical of Hudson: real rough.

Mr. ALLISON: This is not the first time that press releases have been made by the Minister of Mines and Energy around the honourable member. I want to get the record straight that I have at least taken some considerable interests in this matter, and I probably accelerated the Minister's decision to let the contract for an additional unit and to provide adequate service for the South-East.

Another issue I will have time to raise only fleetingly concerns the provision of accommodation for the elderly in Mount Gambier, but I believe that, because of the effluxion of time, I shall have to take up this matter next week in another grievance debate.

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): It is of no great concern to me that the Minister of Mines and Energy did not notify me of the Government's decision to erect a power plant at Snuggery.

Mr. Venning: It's the year of the snake.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I realise that.

Mr. Langley: It's not a matter of its being the year of the snake because, when we were in Opposition, Sir Thomas Playford did not do it.

Mr. VANDEPEER: The Government must have a guilty conscience this evening. It would have been mannerly for the Minister to notify me as the local member that the Government was intending to make an announcement, even if I had received it belatedly.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: He'll probably send it next week.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Perhaps. The people of Millicent were pleased to hear of the supply of this power unit in their area, because an \$11 000 000 project must contribute something to the economy of a district. An \$11 000 000 project is a large one, and much of that money will be spent on the unit. Many of the people working on the erection of the power plant will no doubt be technical experts, but the plant will mean a boost to the economy of the district. When erected, the plant will be automatic and operated from Adelaide, thus contributing nothing to the economy of the area. It would be of interest if the Minister could inform us where the maintenance crew for the automatic plant will be stationed, whether at Millicent or Mount Gambier; that will be the only employment necessary for this plant. Perhaps I shall place a Question on Notice for next Tuesday to obtain that information.

Although I did not speak in the second reading debate, I was concerned, when reading the Bill, to see how much of the money involved was appropriated to cover increases in wages and salaries of employees of the State Government. This is a typical story in the inflationary period that Australia is experiencing. Increases in wages and salaries feed inflation. This Government should gain the strength to join with the Commonwealth Government to restrict wages and costs in an attempt to reduce inflation. While inflation continues, and Governments continue to spend money at the rate at which this Government is doing in many areas of unproductive effort, inflation will continue, similar to the way in which a dog or cat increases weight if it is fed more food than is necessary and does not get sufficient exercise.

Mr. Becker: It becomes like the socialist pig.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes. While inflation continues, there is little expansion in industry in the State. Industry is finding it difficult to show a profit over and above the cost of production. Although the Government has tried to entice large industries to the State, it has completely failed. At the same time, small industries have been struggling to survive. A small abattoir has been established in my district, close to Mount Gambier, during this inflationary period, and that is an achievement. It has grown from a small butchering works. The abattoir has adopted a policy of walking before it can run, and that is a typical example of what free enterprise with good management initiative can do in difficult circumstances. It started off by the butcher employing five employees. The abattoir now employs about 60, and it has developed over the past three or four years. Imagine the difference it has made to the small community in that area, because many dairy farmers there find it difficult for their sons to obtain work. Employment at the abattoir has created an asset for that area. At present, the abattoir is hoping to receive, or it may have received, assistance from the Primary Industry Department and, I hope, from the State Government department to expand its works. I think that \$250 000 has been requested and, if the abattoir receives this sum, it will continue to expand in the future.

I now express my concern for the dairying industry in my district. It is going through one of the worst periods it has suffered in its entire history, caused largely by the lack of increase in the price for its product over the past 27 years. Few industries in South Australia suffer problems of the magnitude the dairying industry is suffering at present. In 1950, it was receiving about 60c a pound of butter fat for its product, whereas at one stage in the early 1950's it received 71c a pound in a peak period, or about 5c above the average price for the previous few years. At present, it receives between 63c and 65c a pound, and about a year ago it received as little as 51c a pound. One can readily understand from those figures the situation in which the industry finds itself. Costs over the past 27 years have risen. General costs on the farm, such as superphosphate, fencing, tillage, tractors, machinery, dairy shed improvements, regulations requiring stricter hygiene and calling for new works and sheds, and refrigerator tankers, have all increased. The figures I have given show the real story of the basic problems of the dairying industry. They will not be solved overnight: it will take a long time to solve them. The price is largely governed by export prices. We in the South-East are engaged mainly in cheese production, and much of this is exported to Japan. We compete with other nations, particularly New Zealand, which has an excellent and efficient dairying industry that is well supported by the Government.

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

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I am disappointed at the announcement by the Premier this afternoon that certain questions or Questions on Notice may not be replied to in the week for which they are placed on notice.

Mr. Rodda: This is more of the stifling.

Mr. BECKER: Yes. The Premier is embarking on a dictatorial role as the Leader of the State. He believes that he has sufficient numbers and strength to dictate not only to the people but also to this Parliament.

Mr. Whitten: How many hundreds of questions a week do you want?

Mr. BECKER: If I was given the replies and if the Government practised open Government as it told us it would do when I came to this House seven years ago, I would not worry. If I could telephone public servants and know that they could give me information without fear of reprisals, it would not be necessary to ask Questions on Notice. I have no difficulty with certain Government departments, but other departments are involved, and the department of the Minister of Transport is a classic example. No-one in the department, from the road gang workers up, will speak to me on any issue. The Minister runs the tightest ship and has put the fear of God into the staff of his department. It is a disgrace when the Minister can stand over his officers like that and get away with it.

We want to ask questions of the Premier, and we have the right to seek information when we are representing taxpayers who pay hard-earned money. We are entitled to know what the Government is doing with their money. We are entitled to know about expenditure incurred when people, particularly Ministers, go overseas, and we are entitled to know what entourage they take with them. A series of questions was asked towards the end of last year about a certain visit that the Premier had made. He will not answer the questions or give the information the taxpayers are entitled to have. It is not personal information. The taxpayers are entitled to know and it is about time we were given replies.

I had another Question on Notice yesterday addressed to the Minister of Local Government in relation to the loans that each council had borrowed and the ratio of interest and repayments to income. The Minister refused to answer, saying that it would take too much time to write to the councils. The Minister's department must have the information, because no council can borrow money without the Minister's authority. This shows the typical arrogant attitude of the Minister, and this is how he runs his department. Is he backed up by the Premier? We know the Premier has not the numbers within the organisation. We are seeing quite a shift in Government leadership in this State, but the Premier's attitude is determined, arrogant, and somewhat dictatorial.

I am pleased that the Attorney-General is in the House this evening. Last evening in a grievance debate I referred to a matter, and I hope that he or his department will pick it up and that I will be able to contact him later with a question. I will not put the Question on Notice: I will write a letter and hope that I get a prompt reply, although his department is not one of those about which I have complained regarding courtesy and attention. The matter I want to bring to the Attorney's attention may be difficult to handle, but I believe there is an answer.

A report appeared in the *Sunday Mail* last week suggesting that people should invest money in postage stamps as

a buffer against inflation. People interested in collecting stamps or coins doubtless have a chance of making some money, but the chance is slim. It concerns me to read reports of the kind published in the *Sunday Mail*, particularly from a person who claimed to be an authority, stating that now is the time to buy Australian stamps, that the price has gone up, and so on. Let me warn the people of South Australia (and I hope that the Attorney's department will back this up after further investigation) that there is a risk in investing money in stamps.

Further, there is a very high profit margin in selling Australian stamps. The profit margin between buying and selling is at least 100 per cent. That is a terrific rip-off, and it is about time someone examined the matter. People will get their fingers burnt if they think they can make a reasonable investment in purchasing stamps now and disposing of them in a few months. If they do that, they will have to take a discount of up to 50 per cent or 100 per cent to get rid of the stamps.

Stamp News, a journal published in another State, for March, 1977, contains a report about the matter. This journal is widely read, and the issue to which I have referred contains a report by Mr. Robin Linke of Perth, referring to O.S. forgeries. Early Australian stamps known as the Kingsford Smith twopenny and the Kingsford Smith threepenny stamps apparently were overprinted "O.S." and issued by Government departments. Linke claims that about 28 000 sets of these stamps were printed and it was generally agreed that only 5 000 to 6 000 sets were sold unused, or "mint", as stamp collectors term it.

He has found that about 600 sets are in the hands of a forger. In other words, someone has been able to purchase ordinary Kingsford Smith stamps for a few dollars, crudely overstamp them "O.S.", and offer them at \$45 a pair. These stamps first came to the notice of Mr. Linke at an auction conducted by a stamp dealer in South Australia, and I believe that the person had the report in the *Sunday Mail* last week. He has apparently got hold of some of these stamps and is selling them. Obviously, forged stamps have no value and the forgery is difficult to prove. Unsuspecting people could purchase them. The Attorney-General makes claims about consumer protection and, if he is going to champion the cause of the little man and the consumer in this State, he must look at every area to bring in total consumer protection. Therefore, it is our duty to bring matters to his notice if we believe that people are exploiting a situation or doing something that is not covered by law. Much has been said about consumer protection, but not much has been done.

I ask the Attorney-General whether he is prepared to investigate the matter. I do not know whether he is prepared to examine the matter of licensing second-hand stamp dealers in South Australia. They turn over thousands of dollars. I can show members a stamp catalogue containing a report that the gentleman concerned had an auction in December involving thousands of dollars in value. There was no guarantee that anything sold has been genuine. Postal lots are sold but there is no guarantee that only one item is being sold. No-one knows the actual price, or anything else. There is no doubt that the whole system is open to suspicion, so I hope the Attorney-General, if he is fair dinkum as far as consumer protection is concerned for those who are genuinely involved in the hobby of stamp collecting, will take appropriate action. There are many thousands of youngsters, adults and all the stamp dealers in South Australia concerned. Unfortunately, there

will always be one who will exploit the current situation; the rest of them we have no problems with as far as integrity and credibility are concerned.

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): I wish to continue from where I left off in a similar debate yesterday evening and refer to the problems I have in my electoral district about the changes in rental of Crown lease land. I begin by reading part of a letter that one of my constituents has received:

I am directed by the Minister of Lands to inform you that the Land Board has fixed the annual rental for the seventh period of 14 years from October 3, 1978, in respect of perpetual lease 3129, at \$755 per annum. However, the Minister of Lands has approved of the rental fixed being reduced to \$220 per annum for the first three years of the period, provided that you continue to hold the lease during that time. In the event of transfer of the lease to another party the full rental as fixed would apply. In accordance with section 41 of the Crown Lands Act, this revaluation must be accepted within six months from this date, otherwise, on expiry on October 2, 1978, of the current period of 14 years, the lease could terminate and the land could revert to the Crown. It would then become necessary for the land to be offered for general application. The letter goes on with the normal wind-up details of filling out the attached forms, etc. I ask members opposite how they would feel if they were renting a house and they received a letter like this informing them that their rental would be increased by 18 times in one hit.

Mr. Dean Brown: They would go crying and screaming to the Attorney-General.

Mr. BOUNDY: Of course they would. How would they feel if that same letter said, "If you do not comply with what is written in this letter and the terms and conditions that we have laid out for you, you could be kicked out"? It is as plain and blunt as that. They would not like it very much and I guess they would accept, too, that my constituents do not like it, either. It is fair to say that other members on this side of the House have ventilated this problem at great length. I do not apologise for raising the matter as well, because it is of great concern. I raised this matter again today in Question Time when I asked the Minister whether he would determine for me just how this rental of \$755 a year was arrived at for a lease of this nature. I shall be interested to know, too, how the rentals are arrived at for all leases. I know the true perpetual lease never changes, and probably that is as inappropriate as the \$755 leases as well.

A further point is that the Minister of Lands, out of the goodness of his heart, says that for the next three years, if he stays there, he will reduce the rent to only \$220 a year. Sure, that is a concession, but what if the person wants to hand it on to his boy? The letter states: "In the event of a transfer of the lease to another party, up she goes." If he decides he wants to sell the land, up she goes. He has been paying only \$41 a year. The Crown has only a nominal interest in this type of lease; it has done nothing at all. The owner has done everything that has been done to it. When he dies, succession duties will be levied on him on the market value of the land, and the Crown will not pay the succession duties for him. I submit that it should always be the case that the Crown rental on these sorts of leases particularly should be only nominal. I shall continue to hammer this point until the Minister and the Government see reason in this matter.

This is not the only case; I have two other cases like this where a 1 000-acre holding has been rated at \$8 a year rental, which is a pittance, but it has been increased

to \$120 a year and \$163 a year, respectively, for no real involvement in the land at all or in the improvements on the land. So it is completely inappropriate and people in this area are wondering whether the Government is not jacking up the rentals in the hope of making further additions to the national parks in the area.

I refer now to a question I had on notice, which was answered yesterday regarding the need to take action to declare jetties, wharves, and an area around them out of bounds for the practice of shark fishing. In passing, I say that I refuse to plead guilty to wasting the time of the departmental officers in answering questions on notice. I gave the Minister of Works' officers a two-part question and the reply I received to the first part, asking whether anything had been done, was "Nil". I then asked:

If no action has been taken, will the Government take heed of public concern and implement immediate action to ensure public safety in this area?

The reply to that question was:

The matter will be kept under review.

So I do not plead guilty to wasting the time of Government officers in answering my questions. However, I refer to a letter I have had from the District Council of Yorketown in this matter, and another letter to the editor in the *Advertiser* of March 23 of this year, referring to this problem. On the Wool Bay jetty, during the holiday period, some children were swimming and a group of men came from another part of the State, pitched their tent on the end of the jetty, which was illegal, and proceeded to throw baits over the side to attract sharks. They set a series of set lines overnight and waited for the sharks to come. They caught a shark and landed it on the jetty and the end result was that the children of the community were too scared to swim from that jetty for a considerable time. The letter to the editor to which I referred is too long to read at this stage but it cites a similar incident in another part of the State.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: Were the police called?

Mr. BOUNDY: The police were called and an investigation was undertaken, but no charges were laid. This sort of thing happens all over the State all the time. I believe there is a real need for the Government to act immediately and to declare all jetties in the State, whether under the control of the Government or under the control of local district councils, to be out of bounds for the purpose of shark fishing and the related matter of tossing baits over the side. Similarly, a press release from the Minister of Fisheries says that signposting is defective on jetties. In this case nothing was said about not camping on the jetty. I hope the Government acts to eliminate a distressing situation for swimmers and children at holiday time.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: Who controls the jetty?

Mr. BOUNDY: The council.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: Then, why didn't you take up the matter with it?

Mr. BOUNDY: It asked me to take that action. Currently the Premier is offering goodies as he travels around the State. I am told that the Hon. Mr. Foster will be bringing the Labor Party's candidate for Goyder around in the next few weeks.

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

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I wish to refer to the Bus and Tram Division of the State Transport Authority, because of continuing dissatisfaction among many of its employees. Last February, I said that

several employees had many "off days" cancelled, and they were required to work overtime. They had had so many days cancelled that it was interfering with their marriage and their home life. They did not wish to work the long hours of overtime. I understand that subsequently they were called to explain their actions. The State Transport Authority has recently advertised for bus drivers, yet I have before me three cases of people who applied to become drivers with the authority but were rejected. All three people to whom I am referring have had considerable experience as bus drivers. The first of these is a gentleman in the northern suburbs. He applied twice to be a bus driver with the State Transport Authority. At the time of his application he was employed part-time with Lewis Brothers.

He has a grade 5 driver's licence and Lewis Brothers are willing to give an excellent reference, yet his application was rejected by the authority, even though it is continuing to advertise for bus drivers. I suspect that this gentleman and the second gentleman whom I have in mind had previously had back injuries. So, the authority rejected their applications because they were high risks under the Workmen's Compensation Act. Therefore, the Minister of Labour and Industry should never again claim that people are not refused employment because of the Workmen's Compensation Act. Such a refusal has been given by his own Government. The third person who has been to see me is mystified as to why he has not been re-employed by the State Transport Authority. Part of his letter to me is as follows:

I am writing to you because, after reading recent remarks in the press, I think you would be best suited to help me. I was employed by the State Transport Authority (then the M.T.T) between October, 1975, and May, 1976, as a bus driver.

This gentleman wrote to me. He did not go to the Minister of Mines and Energy because he would not have got any action. The gentleman's letter continues:

I resigned because of domestic reasons and was assured by the Traffic Superintendent that, as I had had a very good record, the authority was sorry to lose me and they would re-employ me if I wished it at a later date. I applied for a position in early February at a time when the authority was extensively advertising for bus drivers, and subsequently received a reply stating that "We are unable to offer you a position with this organisation."

I wrote to the State Transport Authority on February 16 requesting that, as I had been assured of re-employment, could they reconsider their decision. To date I have not received a reply. To me, the situation is most strange. Usually when applying for a job the first question one is asked is: "Do you have any experience?" The attitude of the authority, for no apparent reason, seems quite the opposite. After spending time and money training a new driver, any responsible organisation would be only too pleased to have him return. Surely it must be realised that a person wishing to return to the authority's employ knows of all the long out-dated and Victorian attitudes of the management and is prepared to put up with them. So, an experienced driver with the necessary qualifications could not get a job with the State Transport Authority. Of the seven points I want to make, the first is that drivers are currently complaining about excessive overtime and about cancellation of their days off. Employees have pointed out that sometimes their days off are cancelled only one hour or two hours before they knock off. Secondly, the State Transport Authority is still advertising for drivers. Thirdly, the authority is currently using drivers as ticket sellers in Adelaide; surely that is a waste of a qualified person, particularly when other employees are on overtime. This reveals how illogical and incompetent the Minister is. Fourthly, there is a high level of unemployment in our

community at present and, although employees do not wish to work overtime, they are forced to do so, while qualified people are unemployed. Fifthly, the authority will not employ experienced people who have applied and who have been previously employed with the authority or are currently employed with other operators.

Sixthly, the Government, because of its own Workmen's Compensation Act, will not employ anyone who has previously been injured. Seventhly, the Minister, at the time of taking over the private bus companies, said that the new set-up could do the job as well as the private bus companies could. Recent complaints about the State Transport Authority have shown that the authority is doing a shabby job that is not comparable with the job previously done by the private bus companies. Of course, the Government will try to pass the blame on to the standard of the buses, etc. The point is that we should examine the way in which the authority is run. This is confirmed by the men who work there. Morale in the authority is at rock bottom. It is staggering how many people have offered information about the authority. They are doing so because they are sick and tired of the management and of the Minister. I ask the House to pay attention to this dilemma and the standard of management offered by the Minister, because it is time his standards were improved.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): In this State the Succession Duties Act taxes people who have been thrifty throughout their lives, but succession duties have been abolished in Queensland, and the Western Australian Government intends to abolish them over a three-year period. Recently, the President of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated (John Kerin) discussed this matter at some length, and pointed out that the Treasurer had claimed that this was an enlightened Government and a pacesetter. In this respect it falls behind other progressive States.

I believe that the Succession Duties Act contradicts the legislation we passed last evening concerning assistance for rural industries. In that legislation a section referred to farm build-up, allowing people to increase the size of their property and providing funds at a low rate of interest. If something happened to one of the persons who owned the property, half of the property would have to be sold to pay massive succession duties. Under our legislation a property valued at \$180 000, if left to a stranger, draws succession duties of \$62 000, and Federal estate duty would probably be between \$6 000 and \$12 000 on the property as then valued at about \$120 000. The rates are not so excessive if the property is left to a blood relation. The Federal Treasurer has introduced substantial reductions, but I will again approach my Federal colleagues on this matter, because it is time that that Government vacated this field.

Following the publicity given to this matter by Mr. Kerin, I wrote a long letter to the Treasurer, and have received an acknowledgement informing me that it will be replied to in due course because the Treasury is examining the matter. I hope the Treasurer will soon make a concrete announcement of what the Government intends to do. If Queensland and Western Australia can vacate this field, why cannot South Australia do the same? The conclusion to be drawn is that the Treasurers of those States are better financial managers than is the Treasurer of South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The simple reason is that in Queensland services are not provided and money is not spent, and Western Australia receives large mineral royalties.

Mr. GUNN: I expected that reply. When I visited Queensland I found the people happy with the Government, and I heard no complaints. People in Western Australia are fortunate because they live under an enlightened Government. When introducing the Budget this year, I hope the Treasurer will do something about this problem, which is causing much concern to many people.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Schedule.

Economic Development, \$925 000; Services and Supply, \$700 000—passed.

Treasurer, Miscellaneous, \$9 816 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Treasurer say what conditions were placed on the money allowed to Riverland Fruit and Products Co-operative, and what finally occurred in regard to the interference (that would be the most appropriate word) with the management of that co-operative?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): It was not a question of interfering with the co-operative, which signed an agreement with the Government. An investigation was made by the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation into the management of the Riverland cannery, which was in a difficult financial situation and which was unable to meet payments to growers. The conditions that I laid down to S.A.I.A.C. was that it had to ensure maximum benefits obtained to growers from the assistance we were giving to the co-operative. S.A.I.A.C. is still engaged in that function.

Line passed.

Engineering and Water Supply, \$500 000; Public Buildings, \$2 200 000; Education, \$6 000 000; Further Education, \$1 530 000—passed.

Minister of Labour and Industry, Miscellaneous, \$3 100 000.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Treasurer say whether or not there has been an alteration to the basis of employment for people on unemployment relief? Earlier this session I obtained from the Minister a complete schedule of the criteria used in the employment of people on relief schemes and it clearly indicated that the Government was satisfied with a scheme whereby people were paid 20 per cent above the award. The Government looked on them as casual employees, but in fact it is a different type of casual employment from normal casual employment. Therefore, by continuing to use that approach, the Government is effectively reducing employment relief by one job in every six.

The alternative position is that, where a person is employed at normal salary, he becomes eligible for payments in relation to holidays, sickness and so on.

Many councils that have had the responsibility of managing these schemes have learned from bitter experience of the unrest amongst their own work teams and in the community generally about people employed on a salary plus 20 per cent. This has not been in the best interests of unemployment relief. Has there been a change of heart by Government so that people can be employed at the normal rate, especially as employee benefits are included within that payment as they arise?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of any change of policy on this matter. I will inquire of the

Minister concerning it, but I point out to the honourable member that the basis of payment on this score is that it is within normal definitions that are used in these matters for casual employment.

Line passed.

Minister of Community Welfare, Miscellaneous, \$480 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I refer to the Government's giving a rebate for water, sewerage and council rates to people with a concession card. Has the Government considered introducing a graduated rebate so that persons just failing to obtain a concession are not in a worse position than those with a concession card? Will the Treasurer look at the possibility of introducing a graduated scale so that those near the cut-off level will not be a lot worse off than people with a concession card?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will ask my colleague to have a look at the matter. The problem is that then we would have to run a complex administration to run a graduated means test of the kind the honourable member outlines. Frankly, the administration of pensioner concession cards is in itself difficult enough. I frankly quail at the thought of having to run a constant graduated means test for this area of concession alone. It would mean an enormously heavy administrative cost, but I will examine the matter.

Line passed.

Hospitals, \$2 600 000—passed.

Housing and Urban Affairs, \$1 949 000.

Dr. EASTICK: As Mr. Hart of the State Planning Office is to undertake a review of planning, as announced earlier this week, will the number of effective man hours in that office during the period of review be reduced? One bottleneck in the subdivision system concerns the obtaining of permission for subdivisions from the State Planning Office. Both that office and the Lands Titles Office were understaffed to cope with the loads placed on them as a result of changes in legislation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I understand that it is unlikely that the arrangement will make any longer waiting time at the State Planning Office. In fact, the reorganisation and creation of the Housing and Urban Affairs Department has been devised in order to relieve the State Planning Office of its existing workload so that it is able to get down precisely to the area about which the honourable member complains.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Treasurer obtain information about the policy division of the new department? What persons are to be employed in the division, what are their qualifications, and what are their tasks? Is it intended that the Minister will undertake an overseas trip in the current financial year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get information on the policy division. As far as I am aware it is not expected that the Minister will be making an overseas trip this year. I point out that that provision was a takeover from the previous line in the Estimates.

Line passed.

Minister of Mines and Energy and Minister of Planning, Miscellaneous, \$5 000 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: What exploration will be done with the \$5 000 000? What wells will be drilled? To what extent will they be developing wells or exploration wells? I am looking for specific information about the areas and the types of well to be drilled.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will ask the Minister for the information.

Line passed.

Schedule passed.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Treasurer to pay the orders of Governor and discharge by receipt of party."

Mr. BECKER: Will the Treasurer say what is the Governor's Appropriation Fund and what is the balance in it? The best answer that I can find is on page 10 of the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1976, as follows:

Section 32a of the Public Finance Act provides that the Governor in any financial year may appropriate revenue by warrant to the Public Service within the State not more than an amount equal to one per centum of the total of the moneys appropriated from the general revenue of the State of which no more than one-third shall be appropriated for purposes other than previously authorised purposes. During 1975-76, in accordance with this section, payments totalling \$2 251 953, of which \$791 237 was for purposes not previously authorised, were appropriated from the Governor's Appropriation Fund. Details of the latter are shown in Appendix IV following the Treasurer's Statement A herein.

Will the Treasurer say what the fund is, whether there is any money in it, and how it operates?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not a static fund. There is authority under the Public Finance Act and this Act for the Government to appropriate revenue that is held in balance in the Treasury in accordance with the authorisation and, when a specific account must be authorised, it is included in the total of a warrant, and is simply signed out in that way. The provision of the Governor's Appropriation Fund is to allow flexibility for variation above the lines for authorised purposes.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 7) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from April 5. Page 3143.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): This Bill has come to us from another place, where it was the subject of inquiry by a Select Committee that sat and took evidence. There were no objections to the form of the Bill as it was presented to the Council and as it is now presented to this House. During the past six or seven years the Lyrup Village Association has found itself in difficulties over the administration of its affairs, because the Crown Lands Act has conferred overriding powers on the Minister, who has many times found himself sitting in judgment over matters of dispute between members of the association and the association's board.

The amendments contained in the Bill will quite properly hand over the authority to the local board. I say "quite properly" because the present structure of the Lyrup Village Association bears no resemblance whatsoever to the original association. Indeed, I think there is only one settler in the present village association area who is a descendant of one of the original settlers. Although

these amendments now transfer the authority to the Lyrup Village Association to amend its affairs, it is important that the new rules that have been submitted to the Lands Department for approval be speedily approved; otherwise, the board's authority will be restricted.

I have, as recently as yesterday, spoken to the Assistant Director of Lands and asked him what is the position regarding these rules, because I have many times recently been asked this same question by the present Chairman of the board. So, on behalf of the Opposition, I support the second reading, and draw the Minister's attention to the need for the rules governing the management of the

Lyrup Village Association to be speedily put into force so that the authority being transferred in this legislation can be implemented.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.31 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, April 12, at 2 p.m.