

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 11, 1977

The **SPEAKER (Hon. G. R. Langley)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**PETITION: EDILILLIE WATER SERVICE**

Mr. **BLACKER** presented a petition signed by 28 citizens of Eyre Peninsula, praying that the House would urge the Government to establish water services to the Edilillie region as a matter of urgency.

Petition received.

**PETITION: CHILD PORNOGRAPHY**

Mr. **BLACKER** presented a petition signed by 5 527 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to introduce, without delay, stringent laws with appropriate penalties which would protect children from abuse by pornographers, and take action to prohibit the sale of all pornographic films, books and other material which included children.

Petition received.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MAGISTRATE'S TRANSFER**

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Last week I promised the House that, in relation to the matters concerning Mr. Wilson, S.M., I would make a statement today. Following the events to which the Attorney-General alluded in his reply to the member for Mitcham last week in the House—

Mr. **Millhouse:** You replied to my question.

The **SPEAKER:** Order!

The **Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I said "the events to which the Attorney-General alluded," which he did.

Mr. **Millhouse:** Not in reply to me.

Mr. **Goldsworthy:** In reply to me, actually.

The **Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I am sorry—in reply to the Deputy Leader.

Mr. **Goldsworthy:** He sat down under interjection.

The **SPEAKER:** Order!

The **Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Following the events to which I have referred, I received a letter from Mr. Wilson, S.M., dated August 17, 1977, as follows:

I have made repeated attempts to see you this week about a matter which has caused me considerable concern and distress. But the appointment which I was eventually able to make for this afternoon has had to be cancelled by your Secretary. I am therefore obliged to write this letter to you in your capacity both as head of the Government and head of the department in which I am employed. I regret the necessity of doing so, particularly when you are so preoccupied with matters of State.

In a radio broadcast on August 11, which was reported in the national news later in the day, and also in the *Advertiser* on August 12, the Attorney-General saw fit publicly to find fault with penalties imposed by me in three prosecutions under the Health Insurance Act.

This unprecedented departure from the principle of the complete independence of the courts (to which the Minister somewhat inconsistently gave lip-service in the next breath) is all the more astonishing by virtue of the fact that in these

cases I was exercising federal jurisdiction with which the State Attorney-General had not the slightest concern. From those who were concerned, there has been not the slightest criticism on my penalties, and I have no doubt that I could justify them completely if I felt called upon to do so.

Not content with merely criticising my penalties however, the Minister went on to assent to the proposition, specifically in relation to the abovementioned cases, that there seemed to be one law for the rich and another for the poor. This was a clear assertion that in the exercise of my judicial duties I had been guilty of partiality and a lack of integrity, and had violated my judicial oath.

Such an assertion is in startling contrast to the observations of several judges of the Supreme Court concerning my integrity in the recent case of *Samuels v. Christian Ivanoff Pty. Ltd.* Which of these two views is correct I leave others to decide. But however that may be, I regard it as unthinkable that I should continue to perform judicial duties for the Government in the face of these slanders by its Attorney-General, and I have not in fact heard any cases under State law since they were uttered.

I draw the attention of the House to the following paragraph:

There are, of course, various remedies open to me, and the fact cannot be ignored that some if not all of these might be embarrassing to the Government. While I have not the slightest desire to embarrass the Government, or to make threats, I am not prepared nor indeed able, simply to forget the whole business. Moreover, if I were to put up with these slurs on my character, I should lose all my self-respect, as well as that of my colleagues.

I think that by far the most satisfactory solution, from everyone's point of view, would be for the Attorney-General: first, to make an unqualified retraction of his assent to the proposition that in my court there is one law for the rich and one for the poor; secondly, to withdraw any suggestion of a want of integrity on my part; and thirdly, to see to it that these retractions receive sufficient publicity to counter the very damaging effect of the radio broadcasts and news report to which I have referred.

The purpose for which I wished to see you was to discuss the matter generally. I am confident that you will see both the justice and the wisdom of the suggestion which I have made immediately above, and I venture to hope that you will be willing and able to make the Attorney-General do likewise. I look forward to an early reply from you. Meanwhile I shall continue my interim measure of not hearing any further cases under State law.

I have the honour to be Sir, Your obedient servant,  
D. Finlay Wilson.

I did not reply immediately to that letter for reasons that will appear in the letter which I shall now read. In the meantime (these events transpired during the election campaign, but I refer to that only on the question of time), the magistrate saw fit publicly to make a statement in the court as to his intentions as to the hearing of cases involving the State. I then wrote to him on September 20, as follows:

Dear Mr. Wilson,

I received your minute of August 17 and have seen your statements reported in the press since. I have not replied earlier as I wished to take time to consider the matter and to consult concerning it. I regret that you have been caused concern and distress. I must say that during my period as Attorney-General I had, I believe uniformly good relations with you, and have always had and still have a very high regard for your capacity, probity and devotion to duty.

You make two complaints in your minute. The first is that the Attorney-General should have seen fit publicly to find fault with penalties imposed by you on three prosecutions

under the Health Insurance Act. You say this is an unprecedented departure from the principle of complete independence of the courts. I am unable to see or to understand the basis for that assertion. A statement of public disagreement by the Attorney-General with penalties imposed in the court in no way interferes with the independence of the court in imposing penalties. There are very many cases in history of law officers of the Crown expressing public dissent from penalties imposed by courts, and I find that there is absolutely nothing improper or indeed unusual in that. Certainly the Government and the Attorney-General have endeavoured to maintain publicly the position that the courts are properly given a discretion as to penalty which must be exercised on the facts before them, and that uninformed public criticism (such as has been widely published in newspapers in sensationalist form recently) of penalties in the courts did not reflect an understanding of the matters with which the courts have to deal, and the way in which judicial discretion must be exercised. Indeed, so great has been the criticism that a Judge of the Supreme Court recently found it necessary to set forth in detail for publication the basis upon which courts have to act in considering penalties.

Unfortunately, much of the newspaper criticism and that of some members of Parliament of court penalties was politically motivated and directed against the Government which was being blamed for the fact that some penalties were more lenient than the critics believed proper, and that the Government was somehow responsible for that state of affairs. As you would be aware, there was no basis for that criticism of Government; nevertheless it was part of a current political campaign. The Attorney-General has consistently endeavoured to uphold publicly the right of the courts independently to decide upon appropriate penalties, but it was quite proper for him to say that in some particular cases he personally did not always necessarily agree with the view that the courts had taken.

Your second complaint is that in relation to the cases you mention the Attorney-General in the course of interrogation on this point agreed that there seemed to him to be an inconsistency in penalties applied to different classes of persons in the community. That of course is his personal view as to consistency and the application of penalties. I have no doubt that his view on consistency may well differ from yours. I do not believe, however, and I cannot agree with your proposition, that in stating his opinion he was stating that in the exercise of your judicial duties you had been guilty of partiality and a lack of integrity and had violated your judicial oath. I do not see anything more in this matter than a difference in social outlook. The Attorney-General has not made any allegation that you have failed to approach your duties in a way that shows a lack of integrity, a deliberate partiality or any violation of your judicial oath. I am sure that you have proceeded in this matter as you see right, and from my knowledge of you I would be quite certain that you would do so.

In all of those circumstances I did not feel called upon to ask the Attorney-General to apologise, as you have demanded. The Government will maintain the independence of the judiciary, but we will also maintain the right of the Executive independently to put its view publicly. Members of the magistracy on occasion have not been slow to criticise the Executive or the Legislature of the State in quite strong terms publicly and from the bench. At times I have considered some of those actions ill-advised or inappropriate, but I have not considered it an interference with the independence of the Executive.

There is a further matter. I refer to your second paragraph on page 2 of your minute.

That was the paragraph to which I drew the attention of

the House. My letter continues:

I am sorry to say that I find that paragraph a very serious lapse from propriety. In it you quite clearly make threats of political embarrassment, while saying that you have no wish to do so. I cannot, as Minister, accept any minute from any member of my department couched in those terms and I am sure you can see why. I can only conclude that your very evident sense of umbrage in this matter has caused you to write a paragraph which I am sure, on reflection, you would prefer not to have written.

I shall be away on doctor's orders until the end of next week, although having to return briefly for some very urgent matters. I will be happy to see you to discuss this matter, but I must ask you as Ministerial head of your department, to proceed with the work for which you have been appointed. I then received a letter dated September 21 from Mr. Wilson. As I intend to table the whole of this correspondence, I shall not read the whole of that letter to the House, but in it Mr. Wilson reiterated his position. He said he did not see anything wrong with the paragraph and the terms in which it was written to me, and finally he drew my attention to a further point.

At about the time of my letter to him, Mr. Wilson's situation had also been a matter of concern to the head of the Premier's Department who, quite independently of me, on September 19 directed a minute to the Acting Chief Stipendiary Magistrate. As this matter was mentioned by the member for Mitcham in the House last week, I propose to read that minute. It will explain some paragraphs in Mr. Wilson's reply to me.

**Mr. Millhouse:** We don't know the reply. Why can't we have that?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The honourable member will get it in a moment. If he does not get this minute first, he will not understand what is in the reply. I shall read it in a moment.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Are you going to read his reply?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Yes.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The minute of the head of the department to the Acting Chief Stipendiary Magistrate was as follows:

I have read the remarks of Mr. D. F. Wilson, S.M. (Supervising Stipendiary Magistrate, Adelaide Magistrates Court) made on September 19, 1977, on the resumption of a hearing in the matters of *Lawson v. M.R.C.S. Pty. Ltd.* The particular remarks that I refer to are "I do not think it proper to proceed any further with the hearing. I therefore think that at this stage I should simply further adjourn it for a few days to see if the situation changes."

These remarks arose out of a comment alleged to have been made by the Attorney-General on a radio programme last month and before proceeding with the hearing Mr. Wilson, S.M., has requested that the Minister either refute the comments he has allegedly made or retract them. I have ascertained from the Attorney-General that he proposes to do neither and furthermore does not intend to apply to the Supreme Court for an order in the nature of a prerogative writ to compel the magistrate to continue the hearings.

The resolution of this current impasse therefore appears to rest on my shoulders. I am of course unable to instruct Mr. Wilson, S.M., to proceed with the hearing above mentioned, because that would be a purported interference with his judicial discretion. The only recourse open to me in these circumstances is to request that you instruct Mr. Wilson, S.M., to make himself available to hear and to determine civil cases, not involving the Crown or an instrumentality of the Crown, in the limited jurisdiction of the Local Court of Adelaide after and including Tuesday, September 20, 1977.

If Mr. Wilson, S.M., continues to decline to continue with the hearing of the three cases before him it will be necessary for you to reallocate them to another stipendiary magistrate for hearing. In these circumstances, the Crown has indicated that it is prepared to make an *ex gratia* payment to the above-named defendant of an amount equivalent to the costs which might be ordered on a withdrawal of the complaints. The hearings are due to recommence before Mr. Wilson, S.M., on Tuesday, October 4, 1977.

Would you please arrange for Mr. Wilson, S.M. to be available to continue the hearings of other part heard cases. These part heard cases are to take priority over any of his listed duties in the Adelaide Local Court.

Mr. Wilson, S.M., in his reply to me referred to that situation, and said:

I refer next to your concluding request to me to proceed with the work for which I have been appointed. This seems to imply that I have not been performing it since August 11. That is quite untrue. All that has happened is that I have exercised my right as Supervising Stipendiary Magistrate in the Adelaide Magistrates Court to have the work allocated in such a way that I have heard only cases in which no department of the State Government has been involved—i.e. mainly, though not exclusively, Commonwealth prosecutions. The number and nature of such cases (about 4 000 in the past financial year) is more than one magistrate can cope with, and I have been quite as fully occupied as normally. The only sufferer has been myself in that I have had less variety in my work than formerly.

The "work for which I was appointed" was specifically to perform magisterial duties, and ultimately supervising duties, in the Adelaide Magistrates Court (called the Adelaide Police Court when I was first appointed).

I interpolate to say that in fact Mr. Wilson was originally appointed to both the Local Court and the Police Court. The letter continues:

By the time I received your letter however (at 1.05 p.m. on September 20) I had already received, on the previous afternoon, a verbal direction from Mr. I. E. Cameron, S.S.M., who I understand is performing the duties of the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate in his absence, that I henceforth perform duties quite other than those I was appointed to do, namely, in the Adelaide Local Court.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier must seek further leave if he wishes to continue.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I seek that leave, and I shall be as brief as I possibly can.  
Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The letter continues:

I have since read in a newspaper that this direction came from the permanent head of your department. I find myself considerably embarrassed by this conflict between the requirement of my Ministerial head and the direction by my permanent head above referred to: I cannot sit in either court without disobeying one or the other. I must respectfully request that this conflict be resolved as soon as possible.

I thank you for your concluding offer to discuss the matter further with you, and, if you summon me for this purpose, I shall of course come; but I see no point in my seeking you out at this stage unless Mr. Duncan is, even at this late hour, disposed to retract his remark. However since he has apparently made a statement to the press—which I am unable to do without your permission, and since I have been misrepresented in the respects set out above—I do seek your permission, pursuant to section 58 (j) of the Public Service Act, 1967, as amended, to forward a copy of this letter to the Adelaide press. If you do not see fit to grant such permission, then I ask permission to inform the press of such refusal.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,  
(signed) D. Finlay Wilson.

I then wrote to Mr. Wilson again as follows:

Dear Mr. Wilson,

I have and considered your letter of September 21. I note your remarks on the paragraph in your first letter to me to which I took exception. I do not agree with you as to your view on the propriety of that paragraph. I consider it gravely improper.

As to your seeing a conflict between my minute and the direction of the permanent head of the department, I am afraid I am at a loss to understand your sense of there being a conflict. The work for which you were appointed to which I was referring was to perform magisterial duties, i.e., to hear the cases properly coming before you as a magistrate. My request to you was to carry out that work. The particular work that would come before you as a magistrate of course depends upon where you are placed by the permanent head of the department. The permanent head has placed you in the limited jurisdiction of the Adelaide Local Court, and therefore the work which you are appointed to do is, by law, the work in that jurisdiction and part heard cases in the Adelaide Magistrates Court. I must again ask you to carry it out.

I note that you see no point in coming to see me. So be it.

You have asked for permission to forward a copy of your letter of September 21 to the press. I give you that permission, with the proviso that all the correspondence between us is published. In view of your request, I believe that the best course is that I should table the correspondence in Parliament.

I now table that correspondence. I also table the relevant minutes within the department, including those passing between Mr. Wilson and Mr. Cameron, S.S.M.

## QUESTIONS

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

## NATURAL RESOURCES

**Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. What opportunities exist in each of the Agriculture, Fisheries, and Lands Departments for graduates or diplomates with qualifications encompassing the control and management of natural resources?

2. How many appointments have been made and what is the anticipated growth of employment in this field in each of the next five years?

3. Where do students obtain training for a degree or diploma of natural resources which qualifies them for appointment in this field in either department and, if there is more than one course available, which particular course or courses best qualifies the graduate for appointment in the respective departments as technical, managerial, and field officers, respectively?

4. Is either department directly assisting or intending to assist any student to obtain the necessary qualifications and, if so, what are the details of the particular course or courses selected?

5. What are the current salary ranges offered for employment where such a qualification is a prerequisite of employment?

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

1. The Agriculture and Fisheries Department envisages opportunities in fisheries research and soil conservation for officers holding degrees or diplomas in natural resources management.

2. No appointments have been made in this field. The anticipated growth of employment in each of the next five years is currently under study by the Agriculture and Fisheries Department.

3. Within South Australia, two post-graduate courses are available. One, offered by the University of Adelaide, leads to the award of a master's degree in environmental studies. The second is a post-graduate diploma course in natural resources offered by the Roseworthy Agricultural College.

4. Two officers of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department are currently undertaking full-time study under the Public Service study assistance scheme in this area, one at the University of Adelaide, the other at Roseworthy Agricultural College.

5. None of the qualifications referred to are pre-requisites for employment in the Agriculture and Fisheries Department. However, the basic salary ranges for diplomates and graduates are as follows:

Diplomate—\$9 264 to \$12 583 per annum.

Graduate—\$9 854 to \$13 450 per annum.

Regarding the Lands Department:

1. Opportunities for graduates and diplomates in natural resource management in the Lands Department will depend critically on the future role and organisation of the proposed new Division of Land Resource Management. The existing Lands Department establishment includes approximately sixteen district and pastoral inspectors positions and eight administrative positions on statutory boards, the discharge of which would be enhanced by recently developed academic courses in natural resource management.

2. There have been no appointments of officers possessing the subject qualifications at this stage. Anticipated growth in the subject field over the next half decade are indeterminate and will depend critically upon retirements and future structure of the Land Resource Management Division of the department. It is estimated that a possible maximum of five positions may become available during this time interval as a result of retirements and reorganisation.

3. Courses relevant to natural resource management are known to exist, or be proposed, at the following educational institutions:—

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Subject of course and remarks</i>
Melbourne University	Resource use and conservation.
University of New England	Agro-ecology and natural resource management; 4 yr. graduate course.
Queensland University	Pastoral Science and land resources.
Griffith University	Ecosystem management and land use.
Canberra C.A.E.	Resource planning and management.
University of Adelaide	Master of environmental studies (post-graduate).
Roseworthy Agricultural C.A.E.	(1) Diploma in natural resource management. (2) Post-graduate diploma in natural resource management.

(N.B. A significant proportion of the above information extracted from the paper "The Need for Education in Rangeland Science in Australia" presented by Dr. B. R. Roberts, (Darling Downs Inst. of Adv. Education) to the second conference Aust. Rangeland Society, Broken Hill, July 8, 1977.) The Lands Department is unable to

comment on the suitability of the various course curricula, as at this stage their content has not been examined. The department does, however, strongly support the proposed course at diploma (UG2) level at Roseworthy, as this institution is seen as having an unexcelled capacity to provide significant input to such a course, relating to rural land use cultures and the interface with conservation issues. Diploma (UG2) level courses are seen by the department to provide an essential practical input that must enhance the credibility of technicians and their ability to communicate and extend their role to the land user. The Roseworthy courses are also seen by the department to have the potential for balanced, unbiased, unemotional training.

4. The Lands Department is not currently assisting or sponsoring students in the subject field. However, this possibility together with that of in-service post-graduate training for existing personnel will doubtless be considered by the departmental Staff Development Committee as a facet of Land Resource Management Divisional organisation.

5. Salary and career structures for officers qualified in the subject field are currently non-existent in this department. It would however seem reasonable to assume that existing Public Service salary structures for approved graduate and diploma qualifications would apply at sub-administrative levels. It should be noted that the salaries specified in the Agriculture and Fisheries Department reply are payable to holders of recognised diplomas and degrees in agriculture: for example, Roseworthy diploma of agriculture or equivalent (salary \$9 264-\$12 583) and bachelor of agricultural science or equivalent (\$9 854-\$13 410).

**Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. What opportunities exist in the Environment Department for graduates or diplomates with qualifications encompassing the control and management of natural resources?

2. How many appointments have been made and what is the anticipated growth of employment in the field in each of the next five years?

3. Where do students obtain training for a degree or diploma of natural resources and what, if there is more than one course, are the basic comparisons of the training available in each of the training establishments having regard to technological, managerial, and field survey aspects of employment?

4. Is the department directly assisting or intending to assist any student to obtain necessary qualifications and, if so, what are the details and the particular course or courses selected?

5. What are the current salary ranges offered for employment where such a qualification is a prerequisite of the employment?

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

1. The question refers specifically to graduates or diplomates in natural resources. This term is used by some universities and colleges in Australia but the limits of the discipline are not yet clearly established. Many comparable courses are available under other titles, such as environmental planning and environmental management, while some offered by Departments of Agriculture and of Forestry produce graduates whose qualifications encompass control and management of natural resources.

Within the environment department, staff are recruited for their personal and intellectual qualities as much as on their academic qualifications. Thus, applicants for Environmental Officer positions with natural resource qualifications, in the widest sense, could be considered for a range of positions. The number of such vacancies in the

foreseeable future is likely to be limited. There are likely to be opportunities, again of a limited nature within the National Parks and Wildlife Division and, possibly, within the Coast Protection Division of the department. In summary, opportunities will exist within the Environment Department for graduates of the nature covered by the question but they will be competing with persons with degrees or diplomas in forestry, parks and wildlife management, agriculture, environment and other related disciplines.

2. Three officers are Bachelors of Applied Science from the Canberra College of Advanced Education, a generalist qualification in the relatively specific area of control and management of natural resources. In addition, however, the department has graduates in forestry, agriculture, botany and zoology, all of whose qualifications to some extent come under the same heading. At this time it is not possible to anticipate the growth of employment for persons with qualifications in the control and management of natural resources in each of the next five years because the department does not know what number of staff will be needed or available, nor does it know the quality of the applicants it is likely to get.

3. At present degrees or diplomas, both under-graduate and post-graduate, are on offer from many universities and colleges within Australia. The number overseas will, of course, be greatly in excess of that number. The following Australian institutions are among those which offer such courses:

Australian National University, Macquarie University, Mitchell College of Advanced Education, University of New England, Griffith University, Queensland Institute of Technology, the University of Queensland, the University of Adelaide, the South Australian Institute of Technology, the Roseworthy Agricultural College, Salisbury College of Advanced Education, Tasmanian College of Advanced Education, University of Tasmania, Footscray Institute of Technology, Gordon Institute, State College of Victoria at Melbourne, and Rusden, Monash University, University of Melbourne, the Canberra College of Advanced Education.

It is not practicable in a reply to a Parliamentary question to give a comparison of the training available in each of the training establishments, but some indication of this can be obtained from a report "Environmental Studies in Australian Universities" published in *Search*, volume 8, No. 4, of April, 1977, and in "Environmental Education at the Tertiary Level in New Zealand and Australia", *Clean Air*, Volume 10, Part 3, August, 1976.

4. No. This is unnecessary because of the large number of graduates and diplomates with qualifications in this general area available for appointment.

5. Appointment of graduates would generally be in the Scientific Officer range which, depending on experience and responsibility, would be:

Scientific Officer Grade I . . . . .	\$ 9 854 - \$13 450
Scientific Officer Grade II . . . . .	\$14 038 - \$15 482
Scientific Officer Grade III . . . . .	\$16 068 - \$16 830

A degree or equivalent diploma is a prerequisite for appointment to these ranges, and persons with degrees and little experience are usually appointed to the grade I level.

#### BIRTH LINE

**Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. Has the organisation Birth Line ever been considered for a financial grant towards its voluntary 24

hour a day service to the community and, if so, what are the amounts and/or circumstances which have prevented assistance?

2. Will the organisation be assisted this year?

3. If not a recipient of assistance, what detail is required and to whom should it be submitted so that consideration may be given in the future?

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

1. Yes.

30/10/72—An application for a grant of \$20 000 to purchase an 8-room house at Everard Park was submitted. Unsuccessful.

17/7/74—Applications were received for:  
a salary grant of \$8 000 towards salaries, and  
an equipment grant of \$1 000.

These applications were unsuccessful because of a low priority due to the restricted clientele, and support already received from the Right to Life Association, churches and individuals.

11/12/75—An application for a salary grant of \$8 400 towards the salary of a social worker. Unsuccessful.

25/6/76—A grant of \$1 500 was approved to assist in resolving existing financial difficulties as a "once only" grant.

21/4/77—A request for \$4 000 as bridging finance to overcome financial difficulties was unsuccessful.

2. No.

3. Major grant applications closed on 1/8/77. Minor grants, limited to \$300, are still available, and the official forms and information sheets are available through the Community Welfare Department offices.

#### REVENUE ACCOUNT

**Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. What were the reasons for the delays in issuing Revenue Accounts statements for the past four months?

2. Will further statements be issued within 14 days from the preceding month and, if not, why not?

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

1. Issuing of the Revenue Accounts statements for the past four months has varied because of workloads both in my office and in the Treasury Department. Exact details are:

*May, 1977:* Difficulties were experienced getting clearance of material due to the Treasurer's absence.

*June, 1977:* It is normal for the June statement to be rather later than statements for other months. This is because it is a functional statement and it is necessary for it to tie up fully with the Treasurer's Financial Statements for the year as presented with the Auditor-General's Report. (This applied particularly to Statement D.) The other 11 months are not held up for this reason because the functional dissections necessary are acceptable approximations. The approximate results for the year 1976-77 were released within a couple of days of the end of the year.

*July, 1977:* There was no particular lateness as far as I am aware. There is always a difficulty in getting the July statement out early because of the sheer volume of work in early July in completing end of the year material and in

preparing for estimates for the forthcoming year.

*August, 1977:* This statement was deliberately held up in Treasury until the Under Treasurer was able to report to me on the reason for the larger deficit. Treasury has been concerned for some time about making monthly reports which compare the situation with that of the previous year. It is more meaningful to make a comparison of the actual end of month situation with what one would expect the end of month situation to be, based on expected cash flows of departments for the year in question. There are, of course, differences between years. During 1976-77 and in 1977-78, Treasury has initiated and tried to refine a procedure for getting from departments a projected monthly cash flow. This information cannot be given by departments, of course, until they know their allocations for the year in question. Accordingly, it was not until the end of September that Treasury was able to collate these estimated cash flows and to make a worthwhile comparison of the actual end of August position with the estimate collated from that cash flow information.

2. From now on the timing of the printing of monthly statements should be back towards normal.

3. What were the details of vandalism reported in the area covered by the Darlington police station region and how do these figures compare to each of the previous five years?

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

1. During the year ended June 30, 1977, there were 7 634 cases of wilful damage reported to police. It should be noted that the term "wilful damage" includes property damage caused in the course of disputes between parties.

2. The figures for the previous five years are as follows:

1976.....	7 111
1975.....	6 863
1974.....	6 050
1973.....	5 080
1972.....	4 127

3. The incidence of wilful damage reported to police in respect of the western suburbs extending from Henley Beach Road south to Marino during the last 5 years were as follows:

1977.....	910
1976.....	689
1975.....	699
1974.....	622
1973.....	486
1972.....	Not available

**"TWO UP"**

**Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. How many cases of playing "two up" were reported in the financial year ended June 30, 1977?
2. How do these figures compare to each year for the past five financial years?
3. What is the reason for any variation in these figures?

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** Statistics kept by the Police Department do not specifically identify "two up" offences. Therefore, the figures supplied relate to the broad category of unlawful gaming.

1. Final figures for the year ended June 30, 1977, are not yet available, but the number of cases so far tabulated are as follows:

Present at unlawful gaming .....	257
Play at unlawful game.....	81

2. Present at unlawful game:

1975-76 .....	333
1974-75 .....	468
1973-74 .....	434
1972-73 .....	343
1971-72 .....	357

Play at unlawful game:

1975-76 .....	322
1974-75 .....	309
1973-74 .....	299
1972-73 .....	211
1971-72 .....	208

3. The Police Department has not undertaken studies to identify reasons for variations in the figures.

**VANDALISM**

**Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. How many cases of vandalism have been reported to the police during the year ended June 30, 1977?
2. How do these figures compare to each of the previous five years?

**NATIONAL PARK**

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Will the Minister for the Environment say whether the Government intends to take any action to implement the recommendations of the report of the Nature Conservation Society, reported in the press this morning, which advocates a 225 square kilometre national park in the northern Mount Lofty Ranges? An outline of the report which was published today would cause great concern and bewilderment to landholders in the area involved (the Williamstown, Mount Crawford, Kersbrook and Barossa District Council areas). The report states that forestry, vineyard and pastoral activity should not be allowed to increase and that land use within the zone should be strictly controlled by zoning regulations.

The Minister, I trust, already knows something of the difficulties being experienced by landholders in the vicinity of national parks in the Mount Lofty Ranges, where parks, due to inadequate weed, vermin and fire control, are causing major problems. Now that Dr. Inglis has been sacked, as well as the former Minister, will there be any change of policy in these matters and in particular what action will the Government take in relation to the report I have cited?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I read the report to which the honourable member referred and which appeared in the *Advertiser* this morning. I have not had time to study the matter. As soon as I possibly can, because of the fears the honourable member has expressed on behalf of landholders in that area, I will do so, but, looking at the magnitude and cost of it, I very much doubt that the Government would be able to be involved in that sort of venture, anyway, to that extent. I say that without any real knowledge of the proposition. It would appear to me to be a very costly exercise, anyway.

On Dr. Inglis's behalf, I resent the statement made by the Deputy Leader in relation to Dr. Inglis. What he has said is not the case, and the honourable member knows that.

### MORPHETT VALE PRIMARY SCHOOL

**Mr. DRURY:** Can the Minister of Education give the House any information on the future of the Morphett Vale Primary School? I understand that the Education Department intends to close the school at the beginning of 1979 because, by then, the new Hackham West Primary School will have been built. As this will leave a valuable piece of community property unused, I wonder whether the Minister has formulated any plans for its continuing use as a community resource.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** As the honourable member has said, this school site will be surplus to the department's requirements at the beginning of 1979, when the Hackham West Primary School has been constructed. The school is on a very restricted site, and that is the main reason for the shift of site about 800 metres to the west. There is little playing space for the children, and, with the exception of the one stone and brick building, the rest of the buildings are transportable, some of which will doubtless be required for departmental purposes elsewhere. The stone building will remain, and it will be possible to leave some of the transportable buildings there. Some time ago, through the local newspaper, the *Southern Times*, I mentioned that this property would be surplus to departmental requirements and could be available for some kind of community use, and I solicited suggestions from the local community as to possible future uses. There was an encouraging response to my invitation, and I now intend to turn my attention to the information I have received from the honourable member's constituents and from my own to see what appropriate use it should be. Most of the suggestions have been along the lines of arts and crafts, adult classes, and the like.

### UNIONISM

**Mr. RODDA:** Can the Premier tell me how many people employed by the Government or by Government instrumentalities do not belong to trade unions? On the Australian Broadcasting Commission's current affairs programme *This Day Tonight*, on September 14 the Premier claimed that the Government's policy of preference to unionists did not mean that everyone employed directly or indirectly by the Government had to be a member of a trade union. The Premier went on to say that many people employed by the Government or by Government instrumentalities were not members of trade unions and said, "There is a very considerable number." Can the Premier now substantiate his claim by informing the House of the number involved?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I am unable to give the honourable member a figure, but I will try to get that for him. From memory, the last count revealed, for instance, that about 20 per cent of the officers of the Housing Trust were not members of a trade union, but that is just one instrumentality. It is probable that about the same proportion of public servants are not members of a union, but I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

### REPOSSESSION OF GOODS

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Will the Minister of Public and Consumer Affairs investigate the possibility of amending the existing legislation to protect the citizens of South Australia from the dubious methods of repossession being used by some finance companies? On May 6, a constituent of mine purchased a motor vehicle privately from a Mr. Roger Dalitz. He made out two cheques for the vehicle,

one for \$1 900 and the other for \$100. On July 12, he was visited at home by an employee of General Motors Acceptance Corporation who informed the constituent that money was owed by Mr. Dalitz to G.M.A.C. on the motor vehicle in question. The constituent offered every assistance to the finance company by supplying G.M.A.C. with the address where Mr. Dalitz was living when he purchased the car and other confidential information about his dealings with Mr. Dalitz.

Subsequent to the visit from G.M.A.C., he was informed by his bank that the cheque for \$100 had not been cashed. As Mr. Dalitz's whereabouts were unknown at that time, the constituent issued a "stop payment" notice, as any responsible citizen would have done in these circumstances. The constituent's intention to pay the full purchase price cannot be denied. After the "stop payment" notice was issued, he attempted to obtain an address to which to send the money.

On October 4, without informing my constituent, G.M.A.C. seized the vehicle, using the small technical point of the uncollected \$100 to show that my constituent had not met the terms of the contract, and that therefore justified the repossession of the vehicle. My constituent insists that he had met with the terms of the contract at all times. The \$100 had just not been collected. Because of the underhanded manner of G.M.A.C. to my constituent, he has incurred heavy expenses in procuring other means of transport and is receiving medical attention as a result of the worry he has had thrust upon him.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** If the facts in this matter are as they have been reported by the constituent to the honourable member it would seem that the finance company has found a loophole in the legislation. In the circumstances, I will certainly investigate the matter to ascertain whether or not consumer protection legislation needs to be amended to ensure that this sort of loophole is not exploited in future. Further, I will investigate this matter to ensure that everything possible has been done to provide protection for the honourable member's constituent. If anything can be done legally to assist the constituent in this matter I will ensure that it is done.

### RURAL UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr. BLACKER:** Can the Premier say whether the Government, as the agent for the Federal Government, has determined the criteria that will be used to enable primary producers to qualify for unemployment benefits and, if it has, what are those criteria? Members would be aware that many areas of South Australia are in the grip of the worst drought ever experienced, and many farmers and employees are concerned about their future ability to earn enough for sustenance, let alone finding the resources to restock and plant crops when the drought breaks. We have been told that farmers will be eligible for unemployment benefits. However, at this stage the criteria for eligibility seem to be unknown.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I am not aware of the stage of negotiations in detail, but I will get that information for the honourable member.

### CHILD-PARENT CENTRE

**Mr. KLUNDER:** Can the Minister of Education indicate the stage that has been reached in planning for the construction of the Fairview Park child-parent centre?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The Fairview Park child-parent centre is one of the propositions that the Education

Department has before the Childhood Services Council. It is the responsibility of that council to rationalise as between the Kindergarten Union on the one hand and the Education Department on the other hand. As I understand the situation, there are transportable classrooms at that school that are required by the Education Department for another purpose.

The people at that school are concerned about the removal of some, if not all, of the transportables if there were no longer the capacity available for a class to be undertaken. Therefore, what remains to be seen is whether it is possible for the building programme upon which Fairview Park has been placed to get underway in time for a replacement building to be available, or alternatively, whether the Education Department could find a replacement building from elsewhere within its resources. My officers have been made aware of the potential problem at this school, and it is pursuing actively a solution to it. I will get further information on the matter and report back to the honourable member and the House.

### CURB REPORT

**Dr. EASTICK:** Can the Premier say to what degree the recommendations of the CURB report have been implemented and whether the practical implementation of the recommendations has caused difficulties? If so, what steps, if any, have been taken to overcome the difficulties? The CURB report has now been circulated, albeit to a limited extent, and some action has been taken departmentally to involve various departments in the new scheme. The question has been raised, however, whether or not the decisions taken on the final format of the boundaries will be the most satisfactory for the departments which will be encompassed by the recommendations.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The Government has adopted the CURB report with two basic exceptions. One is in relation to the transfer of the Highways and Engineering and Water Supply Departments from Crystal Brook to Port Augusta and the other is in relation to the movement of any Government department from Whyalla to Port Augusta. We do not believe that in the present circumstances at Whyalla a move of that kind is justified, nor are we satisfied that a move from Crystal Brook as recommended in the CURB report is justified. Otherwise, the CURB report is, generally speaking, in the process of implementation. Undoubtedly, some difficulty occurs in some departments.

In order to get an arrangement which is overall the most advantageous, we have to weigh the advantages to some departments against disadvantages to others. I am aware, for instance, of some disquiet in the Mid North about moving from Clare to Port Augusta the regional education centre for some of those Mid North towns, and I know that some objection has been taken to that process by some schools within the area. All of those things are being looked at, but overall the report received a considerable investigation over a long period and, as far as the Government is able to judge, the arrangements are proceeding reasonably well.

### BEER GLASSES

**Mr. SLATER:** Can the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, say whether consideration is likely to be given to altering the Food and

Drugs Act regulations to provide for supplying a clean glass with each drink provided where liquor is dispensed in hotels and at sporting events? In the Eastern States, for some years the law has provided for the consumer to be given a clean glass with each drink. No doubt this is considered to be in the interests of public health. Because the law provides in those States for a clean glass to be given it is also interesting to note that adequate washing and sterilisation facilities are available to ensure that the glasses are meticulously cleaned before the consumer receives a glass.

The regulations in South Australia, however, do not make it mandatory for a fresh glass to be supplied with each drink, although I understand that a fresh glass may be given to the consumer on request. It is particularly noticeable that, at sporting events, facilities for glass washing are grossly inadequate and glasses, in my view, are not sufficiently cleansed or sterilised. Will the Minister ascertain whether action is likely to be taken, in the interests of public health, to ensure that adequate washing and sterilisation facilities are provided to enable a clean sterilised glass to be dispensed with each drink to the consumer?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** When I have been in other States, I have noticed, too, that different provisions appear to apply regarding the supply of clean drinking glasses. I shall be delighted to get a report for the honourable member from my colleague.

### CITRUS INDUSTRY

**Mr. ARNOLD:** Will the Deputy Premier say whether the Government supports a policy of grower-initiated orderly marketing within the citrus industry? Before the recent election, the Minister of Agriculture instructed the Citrus Organisation Committee to cease policing the regulations because of animosity created in the industry following the conviction of many growers and packers. A petition for a poll of growers to determine the future of C.O.C. has been presented to the Minister, and he has said that an inquiry into citrus marketing will follow the poll. Many people believe that, in the interests of the citrus industry, it is essential for the inquiry to be held immediately and for an interim report to be presented to the industry prior to the poll so that the various options can be taken into account when growers and packers cast their votes.

On a radio programme in which the Minister of Agriculture was taking part, I suggested that he had a moral obligation to refund the fines imposed under the regulations prior to his instruction no longer to police the legislation. The Minister agreed that he did have a moral obligation, because of the action the Government had taken, to refund the fines imposed for breaches under the C.O.C. legislation prior to the instruction no longer to police the Act. This same concern is felt throughout the industry. I have received a letter from the Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association (Australia) Limited, dated October 3, as follows:

The members of this association are deeply concerned at the action of the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, Mr. B. Chatterton, in directing that the Citrus Organisation Committee of South Australia cease policing the regulations of the Act under which they are constituted. Being a statutory body, it is felt that any interference is neither proper nor advisable. Further, it is questioned under what advice he took such action.

It is quite clear that the industry is concerned about where the Government stands, and I ask whether the



Government supports grower-initiated orderly marketing within the citrus industry.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** As I was involved in negotiations with the Citrus Organisation Committee and was present in some discussions between the Minister and the organisation, I think I should answer this question. The Government is proceeding with the citrus industry inquiry. The difficulty is, of course, that the inquiry must inevitably take a little time, because some of the submissions which will be made to it will be quite lengthy and complex. There will have to be time for public hearings in the Riverland. It will be, I should think, a week to 10 days before the inquiry is completely set up, or perhaps it will be a little longer. Cabinet dealt this morning with the terms of reference of the inquiry. Whether, therefore, it could be dealt with before the poll of growers I am not sure; I will have that matter examined and discuss it with the Minister.

As to the position about the prosecutions under the C.O.C. legislation, the request in relation to prosecutions was quite limited. It arose from internal minutes, including one from the magistrate in the area about the advisability of proceeding in the climate of opinion that occurred in the Riverland at the time. As a result, the suggestion made to the committee was that it should endeavour to cool the situation as much as possible so that the matters of the future of the orderly marketing of citrus could be dealt with more dispassionately than would otherwise be the case with the kind of feeling that was running high (as the honourable member would know) in the Riverland about some aspects of prosecutions. However, it is not the case that there will be no prosecutions by the C.O.C., because it still has the duty, amongst other things, of dealing with numbers of areas of agricultural regulations that require safety provisions to be taken in relation to supplying fruit to the market. I believe that the C.O.C. has an inspector in the field regarding that matter.

### QUESTION PROCEDURE

**The SPEAKER:** I have noticed that some members are finishing their explanation of a question by asking the question a second time before resuming their seats. This practice wastes time, and I ask honourable members to desist from it in future.

### MOBILE LIBRARY

**Mr. OLSON:** Has the Minister of Education any details concerning the mobile library in the Port Adelaide and Semaphore areas? Reports received from constituents since the introduction of this service indicate that the demand for literature has been outstanding and far exceeding supply. Has any consideration been given to having additional assistance provided to handle this public facility?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The response to the demonstration mobile library has been very encouraging. As the member for Price discussed this matter with me recently, I have had figures in my bag for some time, and I am pleased to be able to give them to the House. As the honourable member would know, the mobile library shuttles between Henley and Grange at one end and Port Adelaide at the other end. For the first 12 weeks from July 4 to September 23, there were 8 676 loans from the Port Adelaide end and 6 325 from the Henley and Grange end. Port Adelaide borrowers comprised 293 children and 582

adults, and Henley and Grange borrowers comprised 205 children and 471 adults. It is obvious that the facility is working extremely well and that local people have taken it very much to their hearts. I have in front of me an excerpt from the staff bulletin published by the State Library that indicates that people are using it extremely well. These details show that a Japanese exchange student, with the help of books, is learning a good old bit of Australian culture, oragami. Also, an 84-year-old lady is making a tape for the library to play on its sound equipment: she is playing, on an organ, music which she borrowed from the mobile library. The library has regular visits from a Polish lady who cannot speak English or read in Polish, and she is delighted to find that the driver of the mobile unit can speak Polish. It also reports that the most romantic segments of the population seems to be senior citizens, because that is the sort of book they ask for. The unit is working well, but it is too early to report exactly what will be done to extend the service. The honourable member would be aware of the plans which the Government has in hand for the western suburbs and which were announced by the Premier a short time ago, but generally we can say that the library services in the western and north-western suburbs are very much on the improve.

### WELFARE ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Will the Minister of Community Welfare release the report of the Welfare Advisory Committee into Youth Assessment and Training Centres? The Minister is aware that in September, 1976, he set up that committee to look into these matters. The following advertisement appeared in the *Advertiser*:

Public submissions are invited by the Community Welfare Advisory Committee for Youth Assessment and Training Centres in South Australia.

The Minister will also be aware that not long ago a meeting of residential care workers demanded the release of this report because of the assistance it would give them. It was so important to them that they threatened industrial action that time.

In the *Advertiser* of September, 1977, under the heading, "100 ban some duties" the following report appeared:

South Australian residential care workers yesterday banned certain clerical duties in protest at the Government's refusal to release a report. A stopwork meeting of about 100 workers took this action.

The Minister will know that they then approached the Premier by way of a deputation. Apparently the workers believed that this report would be released soon. Will the Minister now release that report?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I think that the honourable member more or less answered his own question. The honourable member pointed out that the matter had been taken to the Premier, and that Cabinet is involved.

**Mr. Mathwin:** That was long ago.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Well, the Cabinet position is quite clear—that the report needs to be considered in conjunction with the Royal Commissioner's report, and that is exactly what is being done. A working party has been set up, as the honourable member ought to know.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Don't give us the working party—Professor Sarri!

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I am not sure what the honourable member means by his reference to Professor Rosemary Sarri, who is a distinguished lady with a great

record in the United States in juvenile correction methods. This State ought to be honoured that it has her here. She is here, specifically, at Flinders University, but her services have been made available to the working party and some consultation has occurred. As a result of that, I would think that the juvenile population of South Australia will benefit for some years to come, which is more than I can say will be the result of the interventions by the honourable member in the juvenile field since I have known him. I noticed that there would be a change in the climate opposite because the honourable member has shifted his seat, or it has been shifted for him, to a new location. I can only say to him that the residential care workers concerned, the Public Service Association and the Public Service Board are all involved in this matter.

The honourable member said that industrial action had taken place, but he failed to mention that the bans had been removed. Most people would have observed that from the press.

**Mr. Mathwin:** They'll be on again within three weeks of the—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Glenelg has asked his question. I want to hear the answer from the honourable Minister.

**Mr. Mathwin:** He's shadow boxing.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** There is no shadow boxing going on. The matter is quite clear. It is well known to the residential care workers concerned, and the Public Service Association, that the time table involved was made available to those people. That time table, as far as Cabinet is concerned, will be adhered to.

#### HOUSE LOANS

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Can the Minister of Mines and Energy, as Minister in charge of housing, say whether he could have examined the possibility of the State Government Insurance Commission's announced finance scheme for home ownership being expanded to include country areas so that those areas may participate in the benefits that obviously exist in the scheme for future home owners? I understand that the Land Commission operates this scheme, which does not operate in the country as far as I know. Perhaps the Minister could arrange for the commission's activities to be expanded in the country soon or, alternatively, for the activities of a semi-government department, such as the Housing Trust, to be brought under the Land Commission. I understand that housing development areas in the country have a real need for the announced scheme, and I am sure that young newly married couples living in the country would welcome the possible benefits to be gained.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The Land Commission normally confines its operations to the metropolitan area, with the single exception of Mount Gambier, where it has subdivided and sold off land. The arrangement whereby the State Government Insurance Commission was making funds available to purchasers of Land Commission land would apply to people in Mount Gambier, as well as to those in the metropolitan area. Regarding purchases of land incurred by private individuals in the country where those purchases are from the Housing Trust or the Lands Department, I think it would be a relatively simple matter to get S.G.I.C. to extend its scheme to such purchasers. I will take up that matter with the Premier, who is responsible for S.G.I.C., and see whether this extension can take place.

#### CAN REGULATIONS

**Mr. WOTTON:** When will the Minister for the Environment withdraw the present regulations pertaining to the new can legislation, which has caused widespread dissatisfaction within the community, and introduce a new set of regulations giving exemptions to certain organisations and certain areas when the application of the present regulations serve little purpose in regard to litter control in this State? Many statements have been made condemning this legislation, which has been referred to as a disaster. The Packaging Environment Council Director (Mr. J. D. Honeysett) is quoted as saying:

The South Australian Government has gone ahead with its 5c can deposit legislation because of political obligations and despite contrary advice. I am quite sure the Government would withdraw the legislation if it could do so without losing face. Advice from experts in the fields of environment and economics has proved that the objectives of such legislation have not been achieved overseas, that the cost to the public and industry is high, and the problems immense.

Under the system for setting up refund depots, many areas do not have depots, and this incompetent administration withdraws the rights of some shopkeepers to sell cans, and it restricts their use. The fact that this legislation is a disaster is reflected by the number of deposit cans lying around, thus proving that the legislation does little to control litter in this State.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I was not certain to whom the honourable member was referring in the learned dissertation he has given to the House; I do not know by whom the person is employed. Mr. Honeysett?

**Mr. Wotton:** Yes, he's employed by the packaging—

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** By the packaging industry.

**Mr. Wotton:** He's the Packaging Environment Council Director.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I was anxious to know on whose behalf the honourable member was making response: whether on behalf of people involved in the legislation or people employed by the packaging industry, to destroy it. Now that I know who it is, I may be in a position to make some observations.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** That is nice, coming from the source whence it came. In the light of assuming the responsibilities of the Minister for the Environment, I am prepared to re-examine the situation, and that is as far as I will go at this time.

#### RECREATION PARK

**Mrs. BYRNE:** Will the Minister for Planning obtain for me an up-to-date report on the stage reached in the project to transform a quarry site adjacent to the North-East and Perseverance Roads, Tea Tree Gully, into a sports and recreation park on land acquired by the State Planning Authority as part of the planned 345-hectare Anstey Hill regional park?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** This is a State Planning Authority quarry that has been managed by Quarry Industries under an arrangement reached under an indenture negotiated with the State Planning Authority. I believe the quarry still has a few years to go before it is worked out and before substantial funding from the Quarry Rehabilitation Fund can be used for the purposes that have already been announced. However, I will get a detailed report on the future prospects for the quarry, including some form of time table, and bring it down as soon as possible.

### TRANSPORT REVIEW

**Mr. WILSON:** Can the Minister of Transport say what is the total cost of the North-East Area Public Transport Review to the end of the September quarter, what are the estimated completion dates of stages 3 and 4 of the review, and when Cabinet will make a decision in relation to the recommendations of that report? Today the Minister released the second stage report of this important study, and I take this opportunity to compliment the study team on the thorough job they have done and for the recommendations they have brought forward. Nevertheless, up to June this year the study has cost the taxpayer \$497 000. It is therefore essential that Cabinet makes a decision on the report as soon as possible.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** I presume that what the honourable member is looking for is the cost since the end of the financial year to the end of September, and I would not have that sort of figure available now, but I will get it for him. As far as decisions are concerned, if the honourable member glanced through this morning's newspaper supplement he would have seen that I said that Cabinet hoped to make a decision by December. However, many associated factors must be taken into account, not the least of which is that this is the first public involvement study that has been undertaken. I do not know how much further time will be needed for public involvement, but certainly I do not intend to cut out that involvement. Regarding the cost to date of \$479 000, I remember vividly the MATS report which a former Liberal Government ordered, which a Labor Government paid for, and which another Liberal Government said it would implement. Then the present Labor Government said it would not proceed with the freeway plans—

**Mr. Becker:** You are buying property.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Hanson is out of order.

**Mr. Gunn:** But—

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Eyre is right out of order.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** —where the substantial demolition of private property was involved. We have stuck to that decision since it was made in 1970. Many millions of dollars was thus wasted by the Liberals on that study.

### CONTAINER BERTH

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Can the Minister of Marine provide information about the use and efficiency of the new container ship berth at Port Adelaide? Last week I had discussions with the Secretary of the Waterside Workers Federation who told me that the container berth was being used much more now and that that use could be somewhat related to the dispute occurring in Victoria. We are lucky for the foresight that brought about the container berth, otherwise many people in other States would not be able to get goods.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The honourable member has asked me to comment on two aspects of the container berth. One of those aspects related to efficiency. I am pleased to be able to say that, in the short time the facility has been operating, the people responsible for operating the crane (which is the most important part of the facility) have improved considerably and are now at a stage where I consider them to be if not quite the equal of anything in

Australia very close to it. I am delighted to think (although in one sense I am disappointed) that because of certain conditions existing in other States we were able over the weekend to handle two container ships at the berth where these operators were able to demonstrate their efficiency.

The second point raised by the honourable member related to the use of the facility. It is being used as we expected when the study to build it was undertaken. I am alarmed and dismayed at times at the shortcomings and short-sightedness of certain members opposite when they criticise this facility. If we followed their advice we would not have the container berth and, indeed, the port of Adelaide would gradually die. There is no question about that. In fact, the port of Adelaide is being relocated slowly at the mouth of the river, which is the obvious place for it to be relocated. In addition, it is being equipped with some of the most modern facilities existing anywhere in the world. Instead of the Government's gaining proper credit for providing this facility it is condemned and criticised. In other words, the Opposition wants the best of both worlds: it wants its cake and wants to be able to eat it, too. The Opposition will not have its way, because, despite what it says, the facility will be a success. I am pleased with the progress that has been made and the pride that those involved with the facility have taken in it.

### SMALL LOTTERIES

**Mr. EVANS:** Will the Chief Secretary ask the Minister of Tourism, Recreation, and Sport to consider changing the regulations or the legislation in relation to small lotteries to improve their effectiveness and benefit to the community? When people set out to raise money for charitable purposes such as the Crippled Children's Association, the Adelaide Children's Hospital, the Phoenix Society, and so on, they are obliged, once more than \$2 000 worth of tickets is to be sold, to pay to the department before any tickets are sold 4 per cent of the expected sales. In the case of the Phoenix Society, which had 5 000 tickets to sell at \$10 each (a sum of \$50 000), it would be obliged to pay to the Government \$2 000 before it started to sell tickets. Another organisation, to which the Minister of Works gave \$1 000 of Government money to get it off the ground, would have to pay about \$6 000 to the Government before it started to sell tickets. The maximum amount of a small lottery that one can run has not been increased in line with inflation for many years. The maximum small lottery that can be conducted is \$50 000. The Premier would be wise to consider increasing that amount so that organisations could run lotteries for higher prize money.

People who raise money for voluntary and charitable organisations are really, in a sense, being ripped off in a form of Government tax that must be paid to the Government before money is raised. The fact is that, when ticket sales of \$100 000 are expected, \$4 000 must be paid to the Government whether or not the tickets are sold. That is a lot of money. I therefore believe that that anomaly should be rectified. I ask the Minister to consider it and to bring down a report whether the Government is willing to amend that provision of the legislation relating to small lotteries.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I will refer the comments of the honourable member to my colleague in another place. I know that the regulations under this Act covering small lotteries were brought in in 1970 because I had something to do with the drafting of them. It may well be that we could look at some of the limits which were imposed and also some of the limits which were imposed

by the Upper House which at that stage was much more recalcitrant than it is likely to be at the present time. I will refer the remarks of the honourable member to my colleague and get a report.

and take the care and precautions that I consider necessary to preserve what is a valuable asset to them.

### ROCKY RIVER SCHOOLS

**Mr. VENNING:** Can the Premier say when a decision on the regionalisation of schools in the Rocky River District will be made? Whilst the Premier was in my area on March 1 and 2 this year, representation was made to him about this problem. That was some time ago and I would think a decision would have been made by now regarding the schools. I refer to the schools in the northern part of the State which, under the CURB report, would be required to be handled by the regional office in Port Augusta rather than the present regional office in Clare. Has the Premier a reply for these people who at that time comprised a deputation to him?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I referred those matters raised with me by the schools in the district to the Minister of Education. The view of the Education Department was that many of the objections raised by the schools could effectively be overcome within the terms of the CURB report. However, I will see whether I can get a further answer from the Minister upon those specifics.

### BUSH FIRES

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL:** Can the Minister for the Environment state whether any problems arose over the long weekend holiday relating to bush fires in national or conservation parks? In view of the dry season we have had, the warm weather and the fact that we have enjoyed a long weekend with much use of the parks by visitors, I would be interested to know whether any problems occurred in our parks.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** First, I am concerned, as I think all members would be concerned, about the dry season. It has been dry and I hope it will not continue to be so, but I think it will continue to be a dry season. Every possible precaution must be taken by people using our national parks to see to it that a careless action does not lead to a bush fire or a fire starting in the parks.

Only this morning personnel of the National Parks Commission were in the Port Gawler Conservation Park fighting a fire which they believe began over the weekend. I am informed by the Director of National Parks (Mr. Lyons) that the fire is established in seaweed at the northern edge of this 433-hectare park. Unless an unexpected northerly wind picks it up and spreads it to scrub before it is dealt with, no great problems are expected. In addition, Mr. Lyons reports that a fire believed to have been deliberately lit was put out over the weekend near the railway line in the Belair Recreation Park. A controlled burn outside Flinders Chase National Park on Kangaroo Island got away and burnt a long, thin path into the park.

**Mr. Chapman:** They did a good job.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Yes, first class. I agree with the honourable member that the efficient, prompt action in this case stopped the fire from becoming troublesome.

**Mr. Chapman:** We all recognise the benefits of strip burning, anyway.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Yes. I would ask the people of South Australia to heed the warning I have given

### SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

### JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council intimated that it had appointed the President, and the Hons. J. A. Carnie, C. W. Creedon, and N. K. Foster to the committee.

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

That, in accordance with section 4 of the Joint House Committee Act, the House of Assembly members on the committee be the Speaker, the Hon. G. R. Broomhill, and Messrs. Nankivell and Slater.

Motion carried.

### JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

The Legislative Council intimated that it had appointed the Hons. N. K. Foster, C. J. Sumner, and A. M. Whyte to the committee.

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

That the House of Assembly members on the committee be Messrs. Harrison, Mathwin, and McRae.

Motion carried.

*At 3.17 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.
2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.
3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.
4. We associate ourselves wholeheartedly with Your Excellency's acknowledgment of the signal service rendered to the State by Walter Russell Crocker, Esq., the Lieutenant-Governor.

### LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from October 6. Page 46.)

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** This Bill has as its primary object the reduction of land tax by applying a new scale from July 1, 1977. The scale is not changed at the lowest end, but results in a reduction of 3c at the upper end, and for that reason I support the Bill. The reduction of land tax is something which at any time is desirable, and

indeed I believe it would have been far more appropriate if in this Chamber we had been considering the total abolition of residential land tax; that is, the abolition of land tax payable on properties of half a hectare or less in area used as the principal place of residence by the owner.

The second reading explanation comments on the need having arisen as a result of uneven increases in equalisation factors, ranging from 5 per cent to 30 per cent, and sharp increases in taxable values resulting from new valuations. It indicates a new sensitivity in the Premier, possibly related to the recent situation in Norwood of which we are all aware.

The major area of concern to the Opposition in reading this Bill relates to aggregation, and in particular to the matters of clause 6. As well as reducing land tax, the Bill replaces the present provision dealing with conveyances designed to avoid the aggregation principle with one which gives the Commissioner the power to disregard any transaction which he believes has been designed for that purpose. The Commissioner's decision is to be subject to a right of appeal, but that right of appeal is to be to the Treasurer. There are other aspects of the Bill, such as the exemption from land tax of prescribed organisations which provide benefits for the Aboriginal people (for instance, Aboriginal Hostels Limited); and, as I understand it, through an abundance of caution (although why that should be necessary I am not sure) to ensure that, although land may have become exempt from tax from the beginning of the last financial year as declared rural land, differential tax in respect of previous years will be payable until the expiry of the prescribed five-year period. The effect of this aggregation clause, a clause which will prevent anyone getting over the aggregation provisions, will be rather difficult indeed for some developers.

I note in the second reading explanation that it has been directed at individuals and developers who have been avoiding the aggregation provisions. The reduction in revenue expected is \$2 600 000, but we will still be collecting \$1 800 000, in all probability, more than in the past financial year. Companies and individuals who deal and speculate in land have adopted the practice of transferring small fractional interests in land for the purpose of avoiding the aggregation provisions. This, as in the case of the pay-roll tax amendments, is to close a loophole of a serious nature. I agree that, if this is a practice that is being undertaken specifically to avoid taxation, that loophole should be closed, but I think it is important that we must now ask: why are some individuals and companies doing this? Is it simply to minimise the amount of tax or because the present situation is unfair?

**Mr. Becker:** It is the only way they can survive.

**Mr. TONKIN:** Who, the Government?

**Mr. Becker:** No, the companies.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I think the member for Hanson has hit the nail on the head to some extent. He has made a very shrewd point. It is the only way in fact that some companies can survive. The unfortunate thing is that private subdividers and developers are lumbered with having to meet these aggregated costs, whereas the Land Commission, which is in direct competition with them, is not. That is the injustice of the present situation.

Obviously, something is lacking in the legislation. The private developer pays on aggregated land. He can recover on a pro rata basis when he sells an allotment, but the recovered amount is calculated only on a single allotment basis. Once again, the Land Commission has a decided advantage over and above the private developer. It is an anomaly directed against the private developer, and, what is more to the point, it will increase the cost of allotments coming from private subdividers. There can be no two

ways about that.

The question is whether the Commissioner can take this into account. Under the provisions of clause 6 of the Bill, the Commissioner is given the power in new section 42 to treat that contract, agreement or arrangement as void for the purposes of the Act if he is convinced that it has been entered into for the express purpose of avoiding, altering, or relieving any person of a liability to pay land tax. Obviously, the Commissioner is not in a position to take into account the heavy burden falling on private developers in this way. He has no option. The appeal to the Treasurer, although it makes good reading, in my opinion is nothing more than a farce.

It has been suggested by the people whom we have consulted on this subject that perhaps there should be a right of appeal to the Supreme Court. The position is most difficult. Many people over the weekend have expressed concern to me. Let me make one point quite clear: no-one in the community to whom I have spoken condones tax evasion. That has been made clear to me. The anti-evasion provision which replaces the existing evasion provision is probably justified in terms of the current second reading explanation.

Many elaborate schemes are operating at present. They defraud the revenue and they should be stopped. The Bill does not alter the aggregation provisions, but simply provides a more watertight evasion provision. The agreement or arrangement must have or purport to have the purpose of altering the incidence of tax. The word is not "effect" but "purpose". As it is, the new section provides that the Commissioner must establish that the contract has the purpose of altering the incidence of tax.

I find myself in a difficult position, because it is not necessarily wrong as it stands. From the point of view of blatant tax evasion, we support the Bill, but I believe there is a need for a special provision to look after those developers who are caught under the aggregation system, who cannot recoup their outlay and who, therefore, are operating at a disadvantage in comparison with the Land Commission. It is the consumer who will pay. As usual, we have a sugar-coated pill with a rather bitter centre: land tax reductions with a perpetuation of what amounts to discrimination against private enterprise. That is what this Bill amounts to.

It is difficult indeed to find any sort of way, in this short time, in which the private developer can be helped in this regard. I believe it is a subject to which the Government must give close attention. I sincerely trust that, when we have a little more time to consider it, something can be done. Members in another place may be able to examine the Bill in more detail to see whether some consideration can be given to those private developers. With those quite severe reservations, I support the Bill.

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I wish to comment briefly on the aggregation clause. Even under the reduced scale as the Government now has it, from \$170 000 upwards the total property holdings of a person will be taxed for land tax at the rate of 24c in every \$10. The State Land Commission thus has a distinct advantage over private operators in the matter of developing properties. I draw that comparison particularly in relation to properties in Taylors Road, Happy Valley, where the Land Commission could have bought developed property from private operators (or the Housing Trust could have bought the properties if it had chosen) at a lower rate or as low as the rate which the Land Commission charged the Housing Trust, even though the Land Commission had this massive cost advantage regarding land tax.

If the Land Commission had to pay land tax on the

\$40 000 000 worth of investment, which is the capital cost of initial purchase without development because it would have increased the value of the broad acres as individual allotments, the tax it is saving compared to the private developer would be many hundreds of thousands of dollars, and this gives it a distinct advantage. We are saying to those who operate privately, "Move out of this State." That may be the intention of the Government: if it is (and I know that some Government members believe that and say it openly and it is Government policy), the Premier has the chance to say to private operators that he does not want them here, they will be taxed out of the field by the Land Tax Act and its aggregation clauses, and that the Government will make sure that they cannot benefit by operating here and would prefer them to take their capital to another State and operate there, if they are allowed. If this is the intention, why not say it, and make sure that those people understand where they are situated in relation to this State.

The benefit of land tax to State revenue is great but although the Government is making a slight reduction now, it has not kept up with the inflationary trend. The amount of tax a person pays on the same five, 10, or 100 acres of non-primary productive land will be higher under these amendments than it would have been in 1970. That is a fact the Premier cannot deny. Some people who have primary productive land in the metropolitan area, or open-space land if not defined under section 62 of the Planning and Development Act and who keep it as open-space or scrub land, are being fleeced because they cannot claim that the principal part of their income comes from rural pursuits. Again, that is a fact the Government cannot deny.

Many people situated in the near fringe areas of Adelaide have received some acclaim from environmentalists and the Government because of the benefit they give to the aesthetic value of our community for the breathing space they make available to the metropolitan area, but at the same time we tax them by land tax. In one case a man with 100 acres of hills face zone has had a high valuation placed on it by the Valuation Branch. I am not blaming that branch for the valuation, but the person may get no income from the property, and it may have no income value, as it may be scrub land, but he cannot avoid paying the tax because he cannot prove that he gets a substantial part of his income from rural endeavour. That is a disgrace on us as a Parliament or on the Government, as we claim that we want the land protected and preserved in order to give breathing space to the community.

As much as I do not oppose the intention of the Government to close loopholes for people who have set up special schemes to avoid land tax, I oppose other aspects, especially in relation to benefits received by the Land Commission compared to those given to private operators. The commission is receiving many thousands of dollars of Government subsidy every week of the year as a result of land tax provisions.

**Dr. EASTICK (Light):** I refer briefly to the provisions of the Bill that introduce a right of appeal. More particularly, I go back to the circumstances that require a person to have a difference of opinion with the Commissioner. Since the previous series of amendments were created, many people have found themselves in an invidious position because of the death of another person. They may become the recipients of land that has been used for rural purposes but is not being used for rural purposes by the new owner, who has the land as the result of the death of another person.

There are circumstances in which three sisters received a

parcel of property as the result of the death of their father. They were three married women living in three areas of the State divorced from where the parcel of land was held. The land continued to be used for agricultural purposes in their names rather than in the name of their late father, but they were refused the opportunity to receive the benefits of any rural land tax rebate, which has resulted in quite a hassle. The cost of production on this parcel of land was more than the cost of the charges levied against it in land tax, and council and water rates.

We have the situation in which a person who retains the property but puts in a share-farmer, or enters into a leasing arrangement because of the age of the person leaving the property, has had difficulty in obtaining for the leaseholder the concessions that should apply. More recently, they have been charged a land tax when to all intents and purposes land tax on land used for rural purposes has been completely eliminated. These are two examples of what has become a difficult situation. I appreciate that there has been a transitory period between the earlier arrangements and those now existing as a result of the 1976 amendments, but I should like the Premier to say how much attention he has been called on to give, or the Government has given, to discrepancies that have shown up. I am sure that the two cases to which I have referred are not the only instances.

I would be interested to know, because it is pertinent to this matter, why many people on rural properties received accounts for land tax as long as nine or ten months after rural land tax was eliminated from our Statutes; that is, for people who were still in possession of land and pursuing the same activities as they had pursued previously. I believe these difficulties have led to much hardship. Many of them paid the accounts that they were not legally required to pay rather than argue with a Government department, as that seems to upset some people. As a result, they have become poorer. As we are considering further alterations and the right of appeal, I should like to believe that the Government has done this as a result of recent experiences, and I hope the Premier will indicate what those experiences have been.

**Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** I wish to speak briefly on this Bill. In relation to the clause dealing with the aggregation of properties for the purposes of land taxing, I will draw an example to the attention of the House. Generally, I support the Bill, which, as our Leader said earlier, suggests that at least in one area there is some relief for some people in relation to land tax accounts.

However, on principle I am opposed to capital taxation, particularly when the taxation applies to properties whether they are unencumbered or under extensive mortgage. I cite for example a property which is held in the name of a person or family but where the indebtedness is, in some cases, an amount equal to the current value of the property yet that property still attracts land tax payable on an annual basis. Whether or not the site is revenue-earning for the occupier is quite irrelevant in the application of land tax. An industrial site may be failing to recover an income but still attracts land tax; it is quite cruel in those circumstances.

I draw to the attention of the House an example of where the aggregation of properties has caused hardship and is contrary to the implied message that the Premier has given us in his second reading explanation. The case is of a property in my electorate at Deep Creek, a large rural holding which, at the time of its acquisition, was subject to rural land tax. The property was held by Stuart Florence at that time. Mr. Florence, over a period of five or six years, either offered for sale or agreed to sell a considerable area of land to the Environment and Conservation Depart-

ment. The property to which I draw attention involves a number of sections, including section 60 of the hundred of Waitpinga. That property was finally purchased by the Government on October 30, 1975.

During the year, 1975-76, rural lands were subject to land tax. Accordingly, Mr. Florence has been charged tax for the period from June 30, 1975, to October 30, 1975. As a result of the aggregation system, his tax was calculated on the basis of his ownership of several properties. Accordingly, the tax applicable to those sections to which I have referred amounted to \$414. But, as the Government had purchased the land during the period in question, it was, accordingly, subject to the taxes payable on that land for the balance of 1975-76 (some eight months of the period).

This is where the anomaly appears, because Mr. Florence had to pay his portion of the land tax on the aggregated figure and not on the single property figure for which the calculation was made with respect to the Government's commitment. We find in this instance that, although the Government has owned the property for some eight months of the 12-month period, it has to pay only \$132.19. Mr. Florence, under the aggregation system, has to pay for the four-month period \$281.81 on the same land. That is a simple example of where the land occupier is subjected to quite unfair charges as a result of the aggregation system applying.

That was a case of the Government setting out to acquire the land, doing so, and taking advantage of a land occupier to the degree that I have outlined. I believe that that is an example that could be reflected in a number of cases throughout South Australia, in particular in relation to properties that have been purchased by the Government, whether they be rural holdings (which are now admittedly not subject to rural land tax) or industrial or residential sites, which are subject to land tax.

I conclude by saying that any relief from land tax in South Australia is most welcome, but the matter of land taxation, or capital taxation generally, ought to be seriously looked at, particularly in relation to those properties from which no income may be obtained by the occupier. Indeed, there may be a drought, whether it be a rural or industrial drought, prevailing, and there may be circumstances where there is absolutely no return and no capacity to pay, yet the occupier of land is subjected to this form of taxation.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer):** I propose only to reply briefly to honourable members. The member for Light has suggested that we have seen a grave series of anomalies. I must say, as Treasurer, that that has not been my experience. Certainly there are those people who object in principle to the aggregation system. However, I believe the aggregation system is necessary. This is graduated taxation, and we will not have effective graduated taxation without the aggregation system. It is now long standing in this legislation, and I think it is right and proper that it remain. I will have a look at the matters the honourable member has raised, but I must say that in the matters that have been brought to me by the Under Treasurer and the Commissioner for Taxes I have not had a large number of anomalous situations reported to me.

I have dealt with the question of the aggregation principle briefly. I do not believe it is wrong, and I believe it is vital for the revenue of the State that it be maintained. Without the aggregation principle, people could so divide their properties that the people who have the greatest capacity to pay would in fact pay less than the average householder is paying. The aggregation principle is vital, therefore, to maintain the graduated nature of this taxation.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Contracts, etc., to evade land tax."

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** I would like some clarification by the Premier on this subject, because this clause has given the Opposition some concern. I am particularly interested to know what sort of arrangement the Premier believes will be caught by this new provision that was not caught by the old provision and, that being so, why the old provisions were not adequate as they stood.

Is it intended that family companies and properties belonging to family companies will be aggregated? Will joint ownership of a house apply for the purposes of aggregating the property owned by one individual? Would a holiday home owned by one spouse be caught under the provisions of this clause for the purposes of aggregation? What about family trusts? Exactly what is it that the Premier thinks is not being caught under the existing provisions, and how will the proposed provisions close those loopholes?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer):** I do not expect that we will have the operation from the kind of holiday home proprietorship, as between different spouses, about which the Leader speaks. I am looking back in the docket to see the basis on which the Commissioner originally made this recommendation. I remember that there were some specific multiple company set-ups that were specifically designed to evade the land tax provisions. Because of those, the opportunity was taken on this amendment to the Act to bring the provision into line with other taxation measures already on the Statute Book, and these provisions are directly in line with those, allowing the discretion of the Commissioner in investigating tax evasion measures. The specific cases are cited in my second reading explanation. The aim specifically was in relation to transfers by companies of a small interest in land to related companies to prevent the aggregation of assessments. The following is the Crown Solicitor's opinion on this matter:

The Commissioner of Land Tax has suggested that transfers of interest in land which, although being genuine and not "sham" transactions and being for valuable consideration are carried out solely or principally to avoid land tax, may be rendered void for the purposes of assessments of land tax if section 42 of the Land Tax Act is amended so that its provisions are similar to those of section 65 of the Land Tax Management Act of New South Wales. The nature of the transactions which are sought to be rendered ineffective for the purposes of assessments of land tax are exemplified by those entered into between various companies—

a particular group I will not name—

which were the subject of my opinion of May 5, 1976. By transferring small undivided shares in allotments of land held by one of those companies to various other companies in the group, the total amount of land tax payable by the groups of companies on a multiple holdings basis is reduced to a significant extent.

The essential difference between the effect of section 42, as it now stands, and the New South Wales provision is that the latter renders transactions entered into with an intent to avoid ineffective against the Commissioner, whereas section 42 is directed at dispositions which take place "not *bona fide* for valuable consideration, but with intent to evade the payment or to lessen the amount of the land tax payable" by the taxpayer. As I pointed out in my opinion, an intention "to evade" has consistently been held to connote an intention by a person to escape the incidence of a tax by appearing to have placed himself in a position in which he is exigible with

no tax or a lesser amount of tax without in substance having done so.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I thank the Premier for that explanation, which clarifies the matter to some extent, but which raises other questions inevitably. Obviously, it seems that the provisions of new section 42 have been brought about because of the activities of specific companies, and I totally agree that the Premier should not name those companies publicly. It brings forward the question of what are the terms of reference under which the Commissioner will be working. Does he have access to a list of those companies? Is it a question simply of those companies? What specifically are the terms of reference, and why will this legislation not apply to the situations I have outlined, namely, the family company, the holiday houses, etc? All we have is a piece of legislation with a new section 42 that gives the Commissioner the discretion and a heavy responsibility to decide whether or not he believes that a transaction has been entered into with the direct intent to avoid land tax. What will he take as his term of reference, and how will he distinguish between those cases?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** As the Crown Solicitor says, he will be looking to see whether there has been a real change of substance or whether it is simply an arrangement that does not alter the previous substance at all but simply arranges property in such a way as to lower the amount of land tax. That is what he is looking at in these circumstances. In most cases with family companies, it is simply not an economic proposition to go in for this kind of dividing up of properties.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I thank the Premier for his explanation. Will he agree to examine the circumstance I have in mind, namely, the case of a private developer who is being severely hampered in his operations by having to pay aggregated land tax? Will the Premier see whether some specific exemption can be devised to relieve the burden of aggregated land tax on those people who inevitably must pass the land tax on to the consumer?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Yes.

Clause passed.

Clause 7 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 6. Page 45.)

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** According to tradition, I support the Bill. I have already expressed my appreciation of the work done by the Under-Treasurer and his officers in preparing the Budget, especially under the circumstances of the very heavy politicking that is currently being indulged in by the Treasurer and his political financial advisers.

The Treasurer's Financial Statement is in two, perhaps even three, major sections, and the contrast between that part which has been prepared by the Treasury and that prepared by the ever-growing political branch of the Premier's Department is most marked, and quite disturbing. "Political diatribe" was the expression I used to describe the first section of the statement when I saw it last week, and nothing I have found since then has caused me to change that description. I have never before heard such a farrago of nonsense, distortion, and plain untruth in what should be, hopefully, a responsible Treasurer's document. Distasteful though it may be, it is necessary to deal with the heavy-handed politicking and the blatant attempts to rewrite Australian history that are contained in the first section and to very briefly cover a general

analysis of the Federal Government's overall economic strategy during the past five years.

I will then analyse South Australia's performance compared with other States, with particular regard to the major economic indicators, inflation and employment. Unemployment is now rising in South Australia more rapidly than in any other State, and cost of living increases are also more marked.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. TONKIN:** We do know whose fault it is. If honourable members continue to interject, they will get what they deserve. It is the fault of the South Australian Government, no-one else. Because of the recent election, and the delayed introduction of the South Australian Budget, it is possible to make certain comparisons with other State Budgets.

It is quite obvious that the Treasurer's political economist is trying to cover up the inadequacies of the South Australian Government's performance compared with that of other States, even allowing for the Railways money. Then certain comments must be made on specific items of income and expenditure in the Budget, in particular on the high levels of State taxation, and the grossly misleading and deceitful propaganda used by the Labor Party during the recent election campaign.

Let us turn to the first section of the Treasurer's Statement. I emphasise again that I do not believe officers of the Treasury were in any way responsible for that section. The general tone is one of sustained, almost fanatical bitterness, which has twisted the thinking and reasoning of the person who wrote it, and the person who delivered it, and which has led both of them to distort the present situation. Economists are well aware of the dangers of regarding value judgments, or stated opinions, as established facts, or laws of economics. Once an economist, or a Treasurer, loses his objectivity, and begins to regard his own opinions, however they were established, as fact, he immediately loses his own credibility and his ability to manage an economy effectively.

This is what shows through in this part of the Treasurer's statement: it is a most revealing part. The Treasurer could well regret allowing it to be written by one of his political staff, rather than run his eye over it first. I am sure that even he could not agree with some of the claptrap contained therein. There is a complete loss of economic objectivity, not only by assertions of opinions as facts, but by blatant distortion of facts. The Treasurer, by implication, because he stated that he was the author of the speech, has lost his objectivity, which is something of most serious concern to all South Australians who are aware of what is happening. If he has lost his objectivity, and that is the stage that we have now reached, he will soon lose his credibility.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** He's lost that.

**Mr. TONKIN:** Unfortunately, he has not yet lost his credibility to a large enough extent. The reason for his loss of objectivity is not hard to establish. Page 6 of his statement states:

The Budget which I present to you today is based upon an economic philosophy quite opposite to that followed presently by the Federal Government.

The Treasurer has made very clear by now that whatever economic policy is followed by a Federal Liberal Government he will adopt the opposite course, with as much dedication as he totally supported the economic policies of the Whitlam-Hayden Government previously. He is still smarting from the humiliating experience of having to dissociate himself from the Whitlam-Hayden Government when, in fact, he totally supported it. He,



like many of his Federal colleagues, still harbours a deep and burning hatred and bitterness because of the event which led to the Labor Party's being decisively defeated at the polls in 1975.

The fundamental fact that it was the people who finally passed judgment on the Labor Government at that time is one which he, and his colleagues, choose to ignore. It is a measure of his bitter obsession that he cannot resist a reference to "those people who justified breaking almost every constitutional rule in the book two years ago", even in this document. He is still living in the past. It is in the light of this political obsession and bitterness that we must now examine the first section of the Treasurer's Financial Statement, recalling constantly his fanatical vendetta against the present Federal Government and his total support for the previous Whitlam-Hayden regime.

In actual fact, this section is virtually identical with a speech given by Dr. Barry Hughes, the Treasurer's economic adviser, at a seminar for Labor economists held in August, and logically it is directed towards future Labor Party campaigning. The statement is predicated on the view that the problems of unemployment and inflation are perpetuated and worsened as a result of what the Treasurer chooses to call "the most antiquated economic thinking applied in Australia since the grim days of the depression". He continues:

All of this has been done in the name of controlling inflation, but inflation in fact has not come down.

**Mr. Mathwin:** He wants to print more money, I suppose.

**Mr. TONKIN:** That is one way to deal with the situation. I suppose that if the Mint was under the control of this State Government, all I could say would be, "God help us!"

The statement that inflation has not come down could fit in well with the line of the Treasurer's obsessional argument, but it is in direct conflict with the comments of his Premier and Treasurer colleagues in the other States.

Mr. Neilson, the Premier of Tasmania, authorised the following statement in relation to the Tasmanian economy for the past financial year:

It is apparent that the rate of inflation fell significantly during 1976-77 from the high level of the previous two years. With this fall have come tentative but fairly definite signs of some economic recovery in Australia. . . New investment in manufacturing industry, although still below the level of investment a few years ago, increased considerably in 1976-77 over the level in the previous year.

In other words the Tasmanian Premier takes a realistic view of problems facing the Federal Government and his Government now. He continues:

The dilemma facing all Governments at present is that on present trends, no significant improvement in the unemployment position can be expected for some time, because such a reduction would lag behind economic recovery and the signs are that this will be slow. A return to reasonable levels of economic prosperity with a satisfactory level of job opportunities can only be achieved by a co-operative effort by the public and private sectors.

This is the responsible view, the view of a Premier, who, although a member of the Labor Party, has the general welfare of the people in mind. He has chosen, very properly, in my view not to distort the facts for political gain. He acknowledges that the rate of inflation has fallen and that unemployment is a long-term problem, statements with which I would totally agree. The Western Australian Premier, Sir Charles Court, in his Budget speech, took the following view of the national economic situation and the Federal Government's role within it, when he stated:

As I have consistently maintained, the essential first task of all Governments must be the control of inflation. The task is not easy and the medicine is unpalatable but we cannot afford to waver from this aim.

To the credit of the Federal Government it has not wavered despite criticism and its own concern at the slowness of economic recovery. That Government can rightly point to the slowing down of the inflation rate in the past year to a current annual rate of less than 10 per cent as vindication of its policies.

Sir Charles is served by most competent Treasury officials and has no reason to distort the facts or the situation facing him and the Federal Government. He has not done that. Premier Hamer in his Budget speech has stated:

The Government has consistently stood firm on the need to bring down the rate of inflation as the basis for renewed economic activity and for a return to greater confidence in the business and farming communities.

The rate of inflation in Australia has fallen in the last year and now stands at an annual rate of below 10 per cent, a result which reflects great credit on the Federal Government.

However, the problem has not been solved by any means. These are comments from people, one of whom is a member of the same Party and persuasion as the Treasurer of this State, and the other two are Premiers to whom our Treasurer frequently refers as allies in his dealings with the Federal Government, yet they seem to be in total opposition to the point of view that he has expressed as fact in his Budget speech.

I repeat that it is not a fact; he is expressing an opinion. It seems he depends on advisers, and on this occasion they have let him down seriously. The Treasurers of Victoria, Western Australia, and Tasmania, all the States in which Budgets have so far been handed down in 1977, have expressed satisfaction at the downward movement in the underlying inflationary trend. Apparently South Australia's Treasurer is the only one out of step. The following statement by his pessimistic economic adviser is so much arrant nonsense:

These tragic results have been the consequences of the most antiquated economic thinking applied in Australia since the grim days of the depression.

As his pessimistic economic adviser knows, but apparently the Treasurer does not (we will give him that small benefit of the doubt), even Keynes argued that unemployment was associated with an excessively high real wage rate. Real labour costs in Australia are still too high, although a great deal of progress has been made over the past few years in reducing the level of real wage costs in the economy. Professional economic advisers both here and in other States, from the public and the private sector, have advised me that by the middle of next year a base will have been formed from which a non-inflationary return to full employment can proceed. I refer honourable members to a publication that I recommend they read, *Inflation, a Guide to the Crisis in Economics* by J. A. Trevithick. He writes from Cambridge and deals with the Cambridge economic policy group. He is a Fellow of Fitzwilliam College.

**Mr. Mathwin:** That is where the Minister of Mines and Energy came from, Cambridge.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I do not think we can blame the university for that. It is an excellent book on a guide to the crisis in economics. On the matter of a full employment policy, the author had this to say:

Of pivotal importance is the proposition that a decline in the real wage rate is a *sine qua non* for the attainment of full employment. Unless some means can be found for depressing the real wage rate to its marked clearing level, all attempts at stimulating employment will prove to be sterile.

The appropriate policy is one of restrictive-demand management, combined with an incomes policy such as indexation (which we are happy to see the State Labor Government has supported, up to a point) operated by the Arbitration Commission. This will reduce the period of under-utilisation of capacity and high unemployment, which is an essential prerequisite to the success of any anti-inflation policy. On this matter Trevithick states:

Thus incomes policies which are not accompanied by a policy of demand restriction will not work. Similarly, restrictive demand policies which are not backed up by incomes policies will, even on the most optimistic assumptions only achieve a relatively slow reduction in the pace of inflation and will entail periods of appreciable under-utilisation of capacity and high unemployment.

Obviously and clearly incomes policies will not be a credible weapon in the absence of demand restraint policies. On the matter of the cause of our current economic difficulties, many theories have been put forward, but the prime cause in Australia (and this is a factor which the members of the Labor Party will not keep in mind and do not wish to remember) was the wage explosion in 1974 when wages rose dramatically faster than prices and output. The Whitlam-Hayden axis was in operation during that period. Acknowledgment of this fact is still reflected throughout our community and was registered clearly at the time of the 1975 Federal election. As I have said, the Treasurer has stated:

The Prime Minister has attempted to move Australia in a direction quite opposite to that of any other country.

That is another total and complete lie. The lie to that assertion is given by the policies carried out by the Labour Party in Great Britain and the Social Democrats in Germany, both of which Governments have cut Government expenditure in the last year. *The Times* economic monthly for October, 1977, has reported Germany's recent economic history as follows:

The Federal Government [of West Germany] decided in 1975 to introduce draconian economics in 1976 with the result that the Federal Budget deficit was reduced from 35 000 000 000 marks in 1975 to 28 500 000 000 marks in 1976.

*The Times* refers to the decline in the overall public sector deficit from 65 800 000 000 marks in 1975 to 47 700 000 000 marks in 1976, and an estimated 37 000 000 000 marks this year. In other words, the measures which are being taken in West Germany by the Social Democrats to control Government expenditure have resulted in a lowering of the deficit in that country, and it is exactly the same policy that is being undertaken by the Federal Government of Australia.

In the United Kingdom, only last week the Labour Party conference in Britain held in Brighton endorsed British Chancellor Healey's policies of cuts in the real level of public spending last year and his call to hold down incomes to an acceptable level. That was a Labour Socialist Government in the United Kingdom, and that is precisely what responsible economists in this country have been saying over the past few years. The only people who seem to be totally and completely out of step appear to be the Premier's pessimist, and he is a professional pessimist, and the Premier himself. At the beginning of his remarks the Treasurer states:

In order to get unemployment down appreciably, we need to be looking at growth rates of 7 to 8 per cent.

As he himself admits, this target is well within our grasp at the moment, and there is no reason why we should not expect such growth rates to get under way around the middle of next year. This is a scenario which the Labor Party in South Australia fears; it does not want it to come

about, because of the consequences to its Federal colleagues. In addition, it will make it look stupid because it will totally undermine all the statements and the arguments put forward by the Labor Government in this State over the past two years.

The Treasurer's assertion that no improvement at all in the inflation rate has been achieved since September, 1975, is effectively refuted by referring to the views of the three other State Treasurers. I have already covered that. However, I would like to add that analysis of broadly based price indexes, such as the gross domestic product deflator, the gross national expenditure deflator, the deflator for consumption expenditure, and so on, all indicate a consistent trend downwards.

I would now refer members to statement No. 2 of the Commonwealth Budget speech delivered on August 16. The Commonwealth Treasurer argued that, while they expected growth in the volume of money broadly defined (M3) over the course of 1977-78 to range from somewhere between 8 per cent and 10 per cent, they also expected some increase in the velocity of circulation. On this basis an increase in M3 of 10 per cent could well be consistent with a growth in money gross domestic product of 12 per cent or more. This refutes the statement by the State Treasurer, as follows:

The projected M3 target of 8 per cent to 10 per cent is simply inadequate to finance the sort of recovery that the Australian economy and Australians generally need.

Obviously, the Treasurer's pessimist (or his economic adviser) has seized on his argument to prescribe the type of doom and gloom which the Labor Party so earnestly wants for its own short-term political ends to help it to win the next Federal election, whenever that may be. Labor Party members do not care what happens to confidence and to the Australian economy while they busily go around undermining it. Such a tactic does them no credit at all, and it is effectively destroying any chance that they might have had of winning more seats and perhaps Government at the next election. It was a long shot, anyway, but they have blown it completely now. One thing that an Australian will not stand is people running down his own economic situation. Where is the "strenuous objection of every Premier, Labor, Liberal and National Country Party alike" to which the Treasurer referred in his statement? What the Treasurer has said is really a manifestation of his obsessional hatred of the Federal Government, and nothing else. Obviously, he is prepared to distort the truth without hesitation. Equally, he seems to believe in the principle that the more blatant the distortion, the more blatant the misrepresentation and the lie, the more likely it is to be accepted without question. Can anyone really take seriously the statement, "The Fraser Government inherited a strongly growing economy"? Perhaps that statement referred to the astronomical growth of the Federal deficit, which was well on the way to \$4 000 000 000, but the facts simply do not support the proposition otherwise. Unemployment was 136 000 when the Labor Party was elected to office in Canberra in 1972, and unemployment was 328 000 when the Labor Party left office.

**Mr. Whitten:** What is it now?

**Mr. TONKIN:** I will answer the honourable member in a moment. Inflation increased from a 10-year average of 3.4 per cent up to 1972 (much less than the average of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) to a peak of 17.6 per cent in the March quarter of 1975. Average award rates (this was the wages explosion which has been pinned as the basic cause of our present financial difficulties) rose by about 56 per cent in the three years from 1973, while the gross domestic product rose by

only 6 per cent. No country can stand that sort of pressure. This was the mess that the Fraser Government inherited, and by no stretch of the imagination could it be called a "strongly growing economy", as the Treasurer described it, except by someone bent on twisting the facts and rewriting the history of the economy for political advantage.

Consistency and responsibility are two attributes totally lacking in the first part of the document. The Federal Government is blamed by the Treasurer for failing to contain prices, and he describes the attitude of the trade union movement to wage increases as exceptionally compliant. Has he forgotten his own sorry part in the destruction of the wage-price freeze proposed by Premier Hamer earlier this year and at first enthusiastically supported by him? I am not surprised that the member for Henley Beach is leaving the Chamber in shame and disgust. The Treasurer said that he had no doubt that he would convince the Trades and Labor Council that it should go along with a wage-price freeze, and he talked of enforcing the freeze on retailers and manufacturers through the Prices Commissioner. At the same time, the South Australian Government was intending to support before the Industrial Commission a full flow-on of the increase in the consumer price index.

In fact, the Treasurer was unable to get any co-operation from the trade union movement, and it was he who destroyed the wage-price freeze for all of Australia, something which had brought hope and, more important, a remarkable singleness of purpose to the Australian people as a whole, simply because it was having that effect. I have no doubt that, when the Treasurer first supported the scheme, he thought it had no chance of working, but it captured the imagination of the Australian people and it appealed to them, because it made sense to them that they should move together in a voluntary wage-price freeze to try to overcome the serious problem confronting them. The Treasurer of South Australia was not willing to see that happen; for political ends, he destroyed that spirit of co-operation. That is the Treasurer that we have leading this State today. I hope and trust that the people will recall everything he has done when it comes to the next election.

The Treasurer of South Australia acted against the express wish of most South Australians for political reasons only, in the same way that his colleague, Mr. Hayden, has done so much to destroy confidence in the economy generally by his repeated politicking. Mr. Hayden has consistently done everything he can to destroy confidence in the Australian economy and the dollar. Devaluation, when it came, was in no small measure due to his actions. Neither the Treasurer nor Mr. Hayden is in any position to criticise the Federal Government for lack of confidence in the Australian economy, because they themselves have done so much so effectively to destroy confidence in that economy. I will turn now to the Treasurer's criticism of the Federal Government for cutting back public sector spending. The Treasurer carefully omitted any reference to the enormous increase in public spending which occurred under the Whitlam Government and the same policies pursued in this last financial year by the British Labour Government and the West German Social Democratic Government. The following extract from the Western Australian Budget speech, given by Sir Charles Court, one of the Treasurer's allies (when he so chooses), sums up the situation well:

In particular we must accept and support the efforts of the Federal Government to get its own fiscal house in order and bring revenue and expenditure back into balance. This can only be done by imposing higher taxation, or by holding

down tightly on the growth of expenditure.

It goes on:

If the excessive expenditure levels generated in the period of the Whitlam Government are to be reduced it is inevitable that a number of recurrent expenditure programmes are reduced or held to more realistic growth rates.

It continues:

Members opposite have made great play with the Commonwealth Government's actions in slowing down the previously excessive rate of expenditure of taxpayers' funds. However, they are silent as to the alternative, even higher taxes, continued inflation and growing unemployment in the private sector.

That is no figment of the imagination. I wish to refer to a statement by Mr. Hurford at the Labor Party's Federal conference. I am not sure about the Federal Labor Party's portfolios, but I gather that Mr. Hurford has something to do with financial affairs. He made clear to delegates at that conference in Perth that they could expect higher taxation if they put into practice all of their ideological aims.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** Was he speaking as a future Treasurer?

**Mr. TONKIN:** Perhaps. Maybe there will be an outsider coming up. Sir Charles Court continued:

Have they learned nothing from the disastrous spendthrift policies of the Whitlam era? Do they really think the taxpayer has a bottomless purse or that money can be churned out of the printing press to pay for lavish welfare programmes regardless of the economic consequences?

At the Labor Party's Federal conference, even Gough Whitlam admitted that that sort of spending would have to be cut back when and if the Labor Party got back into office. Premier Hamer, who is also claimed as an ally by the Treasurer when it suits him, has also conveyed support for the Federal Government's policies in this regard. On page 4 of his Budget speech, he states:

Control of the growth of the money supply is accepted as a weapon in the fight against inflation.

Again, the statement by the Treasurer referring to "the strenuous objection of every Premier" is clearly a complete misrepresentation of the facts. Indeed, Premier Court's comments are in direct conflict with that statement. In his Financial Statement, written so well by his pessimistic economic adviser, the Treasurer goes on to big-note himself. It is hard not to believe that he is building up for a grand run into Federal politics. He claimed credit for a change in the Federal Government's attitude, following the State election.

His statement—that Mr. Fraser's acknowledgement of the damage that cuts in Government spending have inflicted on the Australian economy is welcome and represents the most constructive change in his attitude to date—is again a total misrepresentation of the facts. The statement referred to is Mr. Fraser's electorate talk of September 18, 1977, prepared before the State election, in which the Prime Minister says:

The Government is encouraged by figures which show a continuing and substantial progress in our fight against inflation. The rate of inflation—as measured by what is technically called the implicit price deflator—is now 9.2 per cent. This is 7 per cent less than the rate of the previous year. Our economic strategy has remained consistent. For the second time, we have produced a Budget that reduced the Government deficit by over half a billion dollars. For the second time, our Budget firmly controls the rate of Government spending.

The Prime Minister went on:

During our 21 months in office, the Government has demonstrably exercised the greatest possible restraint in its own spending. Because of this, I believe we have now

reached a responsible expenditure base. We could have made further cuts or put a further squeeze on Government spending. We did not, and do not, consider this necessary to achieve a return to full economic health.

The Prime Minister then reiterated his Government's attitude, with the following words:

We will never resort to Labor's big spending approach because we know Australia's resources are limited.

Regarding interest rates, there can be nothing but unanimity, although I suspect that, if the Federal Government moved to bring them down, the South Australian Government would be tempted, out of sheer perversity, to argue that they should go up.

The major problem has been the need to finance the Commonwealth deficit, of extraordinary proportions, built up by the Whitlam-Hayden Government. This is using up the funds from the private sector that would otherwise be used to support both private and public investment. Every Government is united in wishing to see interest rates reduced.

The subject of employment is one on which I spoke at some length during the debate that preceded the consideration of the last Supply Bill in Committee in the last Parliament. The Treasurer has, it appears, finally accepted that structural unemployment exists. He has not accepted that State Governments must take a share of the credit or blame for unemployment or employment in their own States. State Governments take the credit for industrial development and for the jobs that are created, and they must also take the blame when industry closes its doors because of State activities and State legislation and when jobs are lost. State Governments have an accepted role to play in the total economy, too, although the Treasurer seems unwilling to accept this, and the South Australian Government must take its share of what blame there is.

The long-term solutions to structural unemployment will not be found without a great deal of co-operation between all Governments and between the private and public sectors, and it will require much research and investigation. I am particularly pleased to learn that a joint Commonwealth-States study has now been set up. As I have said many times before, the nature of structural unemployment makes it inevitable that it will be several years before a workable solution is found, and I repeat that it is a subject into which consideration of political advantage should not enter. I would go further, and strongly advocate that representatives from the Opposition of each Parliament should be invited to participate in this most important Commonwealth-States study, too.

There are many people in our community, and particularly young people, on whom the burden of unemployment falls very heavily. We must do everything we can to ensure that, both through our education system and through Government and private agencies and industry as well, these people are trained to cope with a restructured form of industry, and are helped to fulfil their aims and ambitions.

For many of our problems we have no-one to blame but ourselves. Higher and higher wage demands, with lower and lower productivity, can end in disaster only, and we must now all take up the challenge to restore this country to a position where we can again compete with the rest of the world. We have immense resources, if we are prepared to develop them; we have a skilled work force and an ability to pitch in in times of trouble; and we are Australians, with all that that implies. We must have confidence in the future, and in our own destiny, and it is up to Governments, Parliaments, and leaders from all sections of industry to show the way. I intend to deal with

this matter further during the debate on the Loan Estimates, but it is becoming increasingly apparent that the present procedures for cost accountability in Government departments and instrumentalities are far from satisfactory.

Year after year the Auditor-General's Report contains comments and criticisms and, although action is taken in some instances, the position remains unchanged in many others. It is reassuring to find some evidence of concern in that portion of the Treasurer's statement prepared by Treasury officials, and to note that all departments have been asked to examine critically (I think it is) their existing activities and to identify those areas where economies might be achieved. Perhaps the Premier might start with the staffing of his own department, if he really means what he says. In general, the annual increase in South Australia's public sector employment has been 6.3 per cent, the fastest rate of increase of any State or Commonwealth public sector.

The Premier began the election campaign by saying that South Australia had been singled out by the Fraser Government for an especially tough financial deal. This ridiculous statement was not based on fact, and even the Premier did not press on with the claim when the actual figures became available. Per capita, South Australia will receive about \$830 compared with the six-State average of about \$720, and much more than New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland. Although the amounts made available in capital funds were not as high as any State would have wanted, South Australia was not singled out for any specific adverse treatment, and other State Premiers have indicated that they will accept the situation as being necessary, and are prepared to make the best of it. They will make a go of it, and do the best for their States. All we have heard from the Premier of this State is a complete succession of blame and excuses. He blames the Federal Government. He says, "Throw the blame on the Federal Government at all times, and do not say that we had anything to do with it." However, blaming someone else will never solve a problem, and it will not solve this one that faces us.

The performance of the South Australian Government compared with that of other State Governments is referred to again by the Premier, in relation to what he calls the insulating effect of the railways money. Once again, he places the blame on Canberra and, once again, he does not let accuracy stand in the way of a good build-up for his own Government's performance. I quote:

For the first time in post-war history in an economic downturn, South Australia has had much lower than average unemployment. We used to be the first and hardest hit of any State in the country.

The Premier is obviously aware of the speech made by the former head of his own department and a very highly respected and objective economic manager, Mr. R. D. Bakewell, who is now the Director of the Economic Affairs Department. I may cause the Premier continued embarrassment, but I think this needs to be said over and again. Mr. Bakewell said:

Since 1960, the Australian economy has experienced four clear down-turns in the level of economic activity. Of these, one was mild in most States (i.e. the 1966-68 period). Three were severe, those in 1961, 1971-72, and the current prolonged recession which began nearly three years ago and is still with us. The impact of the four recessions on this State were quite different. South Australia did not suffer as much as other States in the 1960-61 sudden down-turn, and it recovered faster.

Those were the words of Mr. Bakewell. The Treasurer's statement is thus presently inaccurate in several respects.

We were not always hit more or harder than were other States; the current recession started during the term of the Whitlam Government; and our level of unemployment is rapidly approaching the national average.

The period from September, 1976, to September, 1977, has seen unemployment in South Australia rise from 3.32 per cent to 5.21 per cent of the work force; that is a rise of 57 per cent, more than twice as fast as in any other State. We know that unemployment has gone up in South Australia during September, when it has gone down in every other State. The gap is rapidly closing between South Australia's unemployment rate of 5.21 per cent and the national average of 5.29 per cent.

Whatever has been the insulating effect of the railways money and the use of funds for unemployment relief schemes, it is apparent that it has had no permanent or lasting benefit in relation to employment. What would the result have been without the railways money? Those funds certainly have been used to insulate, but they have been used to insulate the people in South Australia, not from Canberra, but from the effects of the wasteful and inept administration of the South Australian Government.

This sorry section, this original first section of inaccuracies and calculated political rantings against the Federal Government, ends with one more blatant untruth. I certainly have not organised protest marches to give away money to anyone, and I do not know why the Treasurer should make such a stupid claim. Where on earth has he got it? Has he plucked it out of the air? It seems so patently absurd that a stupid claim of this nature should be made in a document which is supposedly the most important document that comes before this House. The situation is quite ridiculous. It is some measure of the value of the document as a whole. It is a ridiculous and typical end to a section of patent politicking where economic objectivity has given way to obsessional political hatred and where facts have been twisted and distorted in order to discredit and attack the Liberal Party, whether on a State or Federal basis, and to hide the Labor Party's mismanagement, also on a Federal basis in the past and on the State scene at present.

Turning to the remainder of the document—and my colleagues will be examining this in rather more detail—it is apparent that we must maintain a maximum level of works activity in the interests of employment and economic activity, and that we must exercise restraint in the running costs of essential Government services. Good housekeeping and strict economy are essential items. Obviously, this is an area in which the present Government of this State is falling down badly.

**Mr. Venning:** It knows nothing about it.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I suspect that the member for Rocky River is right on that score. I do not believe that the present Government in this State knows how to economise or what the meaning of the word is. The Auditor-General's Report makes dismal reading, and obviously a tremendous amount of cost cutting can be achieved by more efficient accounting and inventory procedures.

State taxation is another area which needs careful examination, and this will be followed up by my colleagues. The fact is—and this is a fundamental fact which honourable gentlemen sitting opposite seem to have lost sight of—that, by reducing the productivity of the State, this Government is thereby lowering the State's taxable basis which, in turn, will accelerate increases in State taxation on those people still left to pay tax. That is something this Government should consider deeply. Obviously, we will see increases in State taxation and State charges. Unfortunately, they will be paid by relatively fewer and fewer people.

Concessions in land tax still will not result in any reduction in the total of \$20 500 000 this year, as compared with last year, and the increase in the basic exemption level for pay-roll tax, a policy partially adopted from the Liberal Party, will not go anywhere near far enough in helping to stimulate the private sector. Whilst it is desirable, it will not help small businesses nearly as much as the Liberal Party would like. Receipts for this year will still be higher than those of last year by 11 per cent in spite of the change, and this applies also to land tax and succession duties, which will have higher receipts.

Mineral royalties are expected to increase this year from \$2 900 000 to \$3 500 000. During the election campaign, the Government published a set of comparable per capita tax figures for the States, which showed South Australia in a relatively favourable position. These figures, whilst technically accurate, included mining royalties as a per capita tax, and these were thus considerably lower than in those States receiving large and healthy mining royalties from extensive mining development. I refer particularly to Western Australia, Queensland, and Victoria.

These figures, which were published in table form by way of advertisement in the daily press, were deliberately misleading and deceitful. My inquiries reveal that mining royalties have not been included in per capita calculations in other States, because it is felt that to do so would be gravely misleading. There are standards of integrity in Government which are not adhered to by the present Government in South Australia.

The following figures indicate the estimated per capita taxation for the 1977-78 financial year, and they are according to the figures given by each responsible State Government. Queensland and New South Wales have yet to hand down their Budgets, but in Tasmania the per capita taxation is \$197.56, in Western Australia \$224.39, in Victoria \$297.47, and in South Australia \$241.67. Those are the latest available figures to March, 1977. It is quite clear that, according to the figures presented by the respective Treasurers, South Australians pay more tax per head than do Tasmanians and Western Australians. That totally refutes the lies perpetuated by the Labor Party during the recent election campaign that South Australians paid the lowest per capita taxation on the mainland. The Labor Party has deliberately misled the people of South Australia in this way, and one wonders in what other areas political expediency has resulted in deliberate deceit on the part of the Government. The lines will be examined in some detail as they come before the Committee. It is traditional that this Bill be supported, and I do that, but with distaste and reluctance, because I am fast losing what little respect I ever had for this Government's integrity.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** I, too, formally support the Budget, although with little enthusiasm; in fact, with no enthusiasm at all, because it is a most unusual document. We are becoming used to the Treasurer's outbursts made from time to time, but I think this latest statement accompanying the other Budget material would get first prize for its uncontrolled, immoderate and frenzied tone.

We are not accustomed to its being presented in mid-October, but the reason is obvious; in fact, the Treasurer made no secret of the fact that he was calling an early election to take advantage of a boundaries redistribution which was clearly favourable to his Party. So we take very little notice of the jibes from members opposite indicating that there are 20 members on this side of the House when we look at the gerrymander instituted in that redistribution, which will ensure that the Labor Party will remain in office with significantly less than majority support in South

Australia.

If one reads the first few pages of the document, one cannot escape the conclusion that the Treasurer is deliberately trying to sabotage economic recovery in this country. The point has been made several times by notable spokesmen throughout Australia that the thing largely lacking in the country is a spirit of confidence among the general public and investors. We have noticed the Treasurer's role as a saboteur when making the predictions of doom that pour forth from him. I recall his prediction that we would have 500 000 unemployed (and I believe that he has now increased that to 1 000 000) within a year. Now we have the Treasurer attacking in the most trenchant terms the economic policy of the Federal Government and trying to sap the confidence of people who would otherwise be spending or seeking to invest money. I quote from a statement by one of my recently-acquired constituents in the redistribution, Sir Thomas Playford. In a recent interview he said:

If people would stop talking about depression, and stop talking about the economy, and if we could give the economists a couple of years' holiday and, without any more trouble, I think we would be all right.

People don't have confidence today. They are putting their money in the savings banks. They are frightened of unemployment, and that fright is largely due to the excessive amount of emphasis placed on our economic problems.

The Labor Party is saying the economy is getting rotten and unemployment is worsening. The moment you emphasise those things you create in people's minds the very sort of thing that tempts them to put their money into savings banks, instead of going up the street and buying things.

He says a fair bit more than that, which is the common sense we would expect from a statesman of his calibre, but he emphasises that all the Treasurer is doing is acting out his role as a saboteur in seeking to destroy any confidence being built up in the Budget strategy of the Federal Government. As the Leader said, the Treasurer is a prophet of doom. We only have to compare the language of his Budget statement to the language of the Federal Budget introduced earlier this year. I quote the objectives of the Federal Government in relation to the Treasurer's comments in his statement: this is what the Federal Treasurer said in Canberra:

At the outset tonight I reaffirm the Government's basic objectives. Our first goal is to maintain the underlying trend to lower inflation.

Statements by the South Australian Treasurer in his Budget explanation are clearly false. He said there had been no decrease in the level of inflation, and that is patently false and an absurd statement. Inflation has dropped from about 17 per cent to about 10 per cent. If the Treasurer was more realistic in his predictions he could say that there was every chance that the level of inflation would reach single digit proportions in the next 12 months. When referring to the second goal of the Budget, the Federal Treasurer said:

Our second goal, which is dependent upon the achievement of the first, is to promote moderate and non-inflationary growth in order to create jobs and reduce unemployment. This Budget will move Australia further towards achieving those goals and, in so doing, it will build on the foundations laid by last year's Budget. Over the next 12 months the depths of Labor's recession, and all of the community hardship that went with it, will be put further behind us. This Budget is designed to give a lead to the community by addressing itself directly and realistically to our remaining problems. One way in which it does so, in a decisive and unprecedented manner, is by lifting the yoke of taxation that has sapped the spirit and initiative of the

community over recent years.

That statement contains none of the carping criticism, half-truths and even blatant untruths that appear in the document issued by the South Australian Treasurer, who does not even state that many Labor spokesmen have been clamouring for years for taxation relief: for instance, Dunstan, Whitlam, Hayden, Hurford, Cairns, and the fellow who went overseas but whose name I cannot remember. All of these pseudo-economists have been claiming that we must have tax cuts in order to stimulate spending and, at the same time, we must increase Government spending in the public sector. Obviously, these two conditions are not compatible unless one is willing to increase by many billions of dollars the Federal deficit. The scene in South Australia in relation to budgetary matters is vastly different from the scene as we see it in Canberra. In South Australia we are not battling with a record deficit, and we acknowledge that the money the State Government managed to acquire by selling our country railways has been the only thing that has saved this Government's bacon. Without it, this State would be in an appalling position in relation to the other States. For Government members, the Treasurer, and Hayden, Hurford, and other knockers of Federal Government strategy to claim that we must have tax cuts and at the same time markedly increase Government spending in order to increase unemployment, is completely ignoring basic economic facts. However, now that taxation has been cut in an unprecedented fashion, not a word about it appears in the Treasurer's Financial Statement.

**Mr. Max Brown:** We would be paying more direct tax now than ever.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** That interjection indicates that the honourable member has not come to terms in any way with income tax reforms that have been instituted, so I will explain them to him. The new taxation proposals ensure that there are tax reductions at all levels of taxable income, and the burden of taxation is reduced for everyone. Labor spokesmen sought to confuse the issue, and Mr. Hayden completely misunderstood what was being proposed in the Budget in relation to tax cuts. He deliberately sought to mislead the Australian public. The largest proportional tax gainers in these taxation cuts are the lower income earners. There is a new tax system, and the basic tax rate is established at 32 per cent for most taxpayers. This basic rate will cover about 90 per cent of all taxpayers; under the new system to apply from February 1 next year, persons earning less than \$3 750 will pay no tax. This will benefit an expected 225 000 taxpayers, particularly pensioners who had been badly affected by the Hayden Budget of 1975.

I could explain in more detail for the benefit of Government members what is envisaged in those taxation reforms. The confusion, generated deliberately, I suspect, by Labor spokesmen, does not deny the fact that everyone in Australia will be better off under these taxation reforms. An editorial in the *Australian* of August 22 points out that there was much confusion in Australia as a result of pronouncements by Hayden and other Labor spokesmen. After explaining the tax scales, the editorial states:

As a result we are in danger of losing sight, in the recriminations over the fine financial print, of the essential point that a major and quite courageous change is being made to our tax system. In opting for a three-tier system of tax scales which amounts to flat-rate tax for 90 per cent of Australian income earners, Mr. Lynch has become the first Treasurer in the Western World to take the essential step, which many have nervously considered, to give people back some control over their own marginal incomes...

Reforming the basic system, as Mr. Lynch has done, is something that they have proved historically much less willing to do—

that is a reference to the critics—

which is why we have suffered the ill-effects of the 1956 system of progressive tax scales, essentially unchanged ever since. Even at 32 cents in the dollar, the system benefits the great mass of wage and salary earners. The closest examination of the new scales today does not shake in the slightest Mr. Lynch's claim last Tuesday that the vast bulk of people will be significantly better off next year as a result. And the greatest percentage advantage is won, in fact, by people on the low taxable incomes of \$6 000 a year and under. All this is certainly no small achievement. It is certainly not a disguised tax gouge, as some critics have tried to suggest. The shortcoming of the Budget is not what Mr. Lynch has done—it is what he has not done in spelling out that achievement to the people.

I would be prepared to debate, other than in the time allowed for me to speak now, the details of the tremendous taxation reform which has been instituted in Australia and which the Treasurer so conveniently overlooks in his condemnation of the Federal Budget. I should also like to point out to the House just how South Australia has fared in the Budget allocations. If I do that, it will help to refute the criticisms by the Treasurer of South Australia in relation to the deal that we have got.

Regarding total grants to the States, South Australia recorded the third highest increase in payments, with 12.7 per cent, ahead of Victoria, Tasmania and Queensland. In total payments and Loan Council borrowings, South Australia recorded the third highest increase, with 11.8 per cent, ahead of Victoria, Tasmania and Queensland. For technical and further education, South Australia received a higher increase than any other State, at 23.1 per cent, way ahead of the other States average of 9.1 per cent. For senior citizens' centres, South Australia fared better than any other State, with a 44.4 per cent increase.

All this is in the Federal Budget that the Treasurer has gone to such great pains to denigrate in his explanation. For growth centres, we fared better than all other mainland States, with an increase of 10.7 per cent, well above the States average of 5.6 per cent decline. For leisure and cultural facilities, South Australia recorded an increase of 8.8 per cent, while all other States received a substantial decrease. In personal income tax-sharing entitlement, South Australia received a 17.2 per cent increase on 1976-77, equal to the States average.

For universities, South Australia received an increase of 4.5 per cent, ahead of New South Wales and Queensland. For colleges of advanced education, South Australia received the second highest increase, with 12.7 per cent, Tasmania received the highest increase (14.5 per cent), and the average States increase was 4.3 per cent. We did extremely well in that area. For schools, we got more than Victoria. In community health, South Australia received the second highest increase, with 14 per cent, well ahead of Western Australia, Tasmania, New South Wales and Queensland. For pre-schools and child care, South Australia received the second highest increase, at 8.2 per cent, compared to an average States increase of only 4.7 per cent. For housing, South Australia recorded a 3.7 per cent increase; this was the third highest. For home care services, South Australia received the second highest increase, with 39.9 per cent.

We in South Australia did extremely well from the Commonwealth Budget in the economic circumstances in which the Federal Government finds itself, and it ill behoves the Treasurer to spend so much time in his Budget explanation in denigrating the Federal Govern-

ment and putting a false aspect about many of the features of that Budget. I will give another example of his putting a completely false picture on what has transpired in negotiations with the Federal Government. The Treasurer decried the New Federalism policy and talked about the tax-sharing policy. In dealing with tax sharing in his explanation, the Treasurer states:

In order to try to overcome the scheme's deficiencies, the Prime Minister has now found it necessary to propose a change in its basis so that entitlements of the States to tax sharing would be based on the personal income tax collections of the previous financial year. Provided the Prime Minister honours the details of the offer which he made on July 1, this arrangement would be acceptable to South Australia. I have already indicated so. This proposal is associated with the offer of a firm amount in 1977-78.

What is the truth of the matter? I have a report of the proceedings at a Premiers' Conference, and I will quote from it in regard to whose bright idea it was to take the current year's income tax as the basis for tax sharing. The report states:

It has, of course, been emphasised that the personal income tax-sharing system to the extent it adopted current year tax collections as the "base" involved more uncertainty than the previous financial grants system. The States accepted this as part of the package, and in fact opted to have their tax-sharing entitlements calculated as a percentage of the current year's personal income tax collections against the advice of the Commonwealth. The Prime Minister suggested at the Premiers' Conference, however, that the States might reconsider the earlier Commonwealth proposal that the previous year's collections be used as the base.

It ill behoves the Treasurer to squawk about the fact that there was uncertainty about the current level of income tax and this having led to uncertainty about tax allocations in the way that he does in this document, when it was at the Treasurer's own behest that that arrangement was entered into. That again highlights the falsehood and misrepresentation so rampant in the political document that has been put before this House. It would be far more useful if the Treasurer had stuck to the truth when he was giving an explanation such as this to the House.

When I interjected during his reading of this diatribe (and there were Treasury officials in the House then) to find out who had written the mumbo-jumbo at the commencement of the explanation, the Treasurer said that it was his own work, and I do not find that hard to believe, because the document is full of misrepresentation and falsehood.

There are proposals about State charges. This has been said in this House many times. The Treasurer has devoted a long part of his explanation to what is proposed in relation to State taxes. I should certainly hope there would be no increase in State taxes and charges during the next Budget period, because it is a fact of life that South Australia is amongst the highest taxed States in the Commonwealth. We certainly are that in relation to household charges. I remember that the Treasurer went to great pains to point out that we did not get mining royalties that other States got and that, when one added mining royalties, our level of taxes was relatively lower than the tax in other States. Of course, that was mumbo-jumbo. In fact, he has got his facts wrong. Even if such royalties are included, we are amongst the highest taxed States.

If we consider the household charges that affect the average citizen, the one that the Treasurer proclaims loudly he protects, we find that we are the highest. We now have by far the most expensive water in Australia, at 19c a kilolitre. I checked the charges for water in Australia

as at July 1, and found that charges in South Australia were way ahead. The nearest to South Australia is Queensland, where they have not yet a metered system, so there is no basis for comparison there. However, at 19c a kilolitre, South Australia is certainly the pacesetter in that charge.

We have the highest charges in relation to putting an average motor car on the road. The cost in Adelaide is \$330 for stamp duty, registration and compulsory third party insurance to put a Holden Kingswood on the road. In Perth the cost is \$131, which is only about one third of the cost here. In Brisbane the cost is \$162, in Sydney \$280, and in Melbourne \$328, so we certainly are the pacesetters in this regard:

I remember the nonsense the Treasurer went on with in one of his Budget speeches when it was proposed in Canberra that there might be a marginal increase in sales tax on motor vehicles: he spoke about how this would sap the life blood of the motor vehicle industry in South Australia. Since the Labor Government came to office in this State in 1970 it has not hesitated to slug the motorist.

Look at the other areas of household tax. This Government introduced a new tax on electricity; that was a Labor Party proposal in the past five or six years. It introduced a new tax on gas. This State has by far the highest household charges, and despite what the Premier has said it costs more to build a house in South Australia than in other mainland States.

The mention made in the Budget speech of drought relief gives a completely misleading picture of what is happening. I think that the record of the Minister of Agriculture has been pathetic. The fact is that we did not attract money for drought relief in previous years in South Australia because the Government was too lousy to spend the \$1 250 000 to attract money from the Federal Government. This is what the Treasurer said in the Budget document:

Once again, unfortunately I must refer to the serious seasonal conditions.

There are a few crocodile tears, and then he goes on as follows:

The Government expresses its sincere sympathy to all the rural community—

that is all it has ever got—

affected and, as a practical token of our concern we have included in the Budget almost \$12 000 000 for a drought relief programme.

It transpires, of course, that over \$10 000 000 of that money will come from the Commonwealth Government. The State Government in the past has not been willing to put up the \$1 250 000 needed to attract \$10 000 000 from the Federal Government.

**Mr. Allison:** That was in the small print.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** It is not in the print at all. The Treasurer says in the Budget explanation that the Government proposes to spend \$12 000 000 on drought relief. What it means is that it proposes to spend \$11 000 000 of Commonwealth money to assist drought relief in South Australia. Again, that is the political part, which was written by the Premier, and one would not expect much better than that from him.

It is pleasing to notice that the Minister of Agriculture has bestirred himself enough at least to get Cabinet to agree to spend the \$1 250 000 in South Australia necessary to attract that massive support from the Federal Government. I do not have to recall the other activities of the Minister of Agriculture, such as that nonsense that he and his wife (I think she is now) wrote in an article on farming in South Australia, which was the biggest load of nonsense—

**Mr. Nankivell:** It was childish.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes, childish. It had no appeal whatever, because we were to hand over all agriculture in South Australia to hobby farmers, according to that article. We do not have to recall, either, the lack of action in relation to grasshoppers in South Australia. The only time the Government took any interest in controlling them was when they looked like getting into the gardens of metropolitan Adelaide. The Government could have done something about them when they were hatching in the northern areas, as previous Liberal Governments have done, but it did nothing, and now we are warned to look out in the Hills areas for likely hatchings of eggs left over from last year. The record of the Minister of Agriculture is pathetic. It is unfortunate that the Labor Party has nobody who knows anything about agriculture. I make a plea to the Treasurer that he at least should acknowledge the contribution made by the Federal Government to agriculture in South Australia.

I want to refer also to the statement about accountability and to say something about mining, but some of my comments will have to remain for a later speech. I want to mention accountability, because the Treasurer goes in for a bit of window dressing in this statement under the heading "Effective use of resources", where he states:

Before turning to the more detailed explanations of the Budget, I would like to comment briefly on the benefits to be obtained from the long-term planning of our financial resources, from improved financial management and from reviews of policies and operations.

This, of course, impinges on things that we have been saying here, and things that the Auditor-General has been saying, for the past seven years. It highlights the dilemma in which the Government finds itself in relation to what enterprises the Government will undertake and what it will leave to the private sector.

We know perfectly well that the answer of a socialist Government is to expand the Government sector and allow the private sector to waste away. I make no apology for saying that in my judgment, and the judgment of many people, the private sector is the most efficient in many areas of operation. This does not deny that certain things must be done by the Government. Many of the social areas obviously cannot be dealt with by private enterprise, but in the construction industry in particular in the major constructing areas, the private sector can do the job far more efficiently than can a Government department, or certainly more so than a Government department has done to date.

If members need any evidence of this I refer them to the Auditor-General's Report, which came out a day or two ago, from which one can find with ease various references to the fact that he is far from satisfied with financial management in many Government departments. He says in his opening remarks:

For several years I have expressed concern at the quality of financial management in many departments, without which one cannot be satisfied that the maximum value is being obtained for each dollar of public moneys spent. Steps are being taken in some departments and in the Treasury towards this end, but I would emphasise that there is a continuing and urgent need for improvement in this direction . . .

I refer members to page 87 of the report, which indicates a fairly chaotic situation in relation to the Education Department. I refer members to page 125, which relates to the Environment Department, where there are adverse references to the control of budgeting. Further, I refer to the Highways Department, a major constructing author-



ity, where he concludes his remarks by saying:

The setting back of the completion date, and, on the experience of the past year, the likelihood of further delay, is a matter of great concern.

There he is referring to satisfactory budgeting procedures. These things do not happen elsewhere to anywhere near the degree they do in major constructing departments.

I urge the Government to look at the costs in major constructing departments and to see that efficiencies are initiated, because their absence is one of the reasons why South Australia is amongst the highest taxed States in Australia. Unless the Government takes a realistic look at this matter there will be no improvement.

The other subject on which I wish to speak at some length is unemployment, which stems back to the Whitlam era.

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

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** There is no doubt that the Treasurer of this State and his Government have set out to attack the Fraser Government with one objective, an objective that is not to benefit Australia or South Australia but to benefit, if possible, their own political Party for an event that it thinks may take place some time between now and Christmas, and, if not then, some time later; that is, a Federal election.

The Treasurer, in 1975, attacked the Federal Labor Government for all its wrongdoings. He divorced himself from the Federal Whitlam Government in an attempt to save his own Government's skin. We must give him credit for that, because he scraped in by the skin of his teeth to hold Government in this State, by winning back a renegade who was kicked out of the Party and who has now been kicked out of Parliament by some very good scheming. However they will give him a job later on; there is no doubt about that. The Government had the numbers after that time. The Treasurer attacked the Whitlam Government (his own socialist friends) then because he wanted to retain Government.

That was the only reason why he did it, and not one of his colleagues would deny it. Now he has a bigger goal for the socialist philosophy: he wants to win back the Treasury benches in Canberra, regardless of whether Hayden or Whitlam leads the team at the time. So, he has set out with a deliberate and blatant attack on the Fraser Government, in many cases with untruths, because he believes (and his colleagues support him) that will be one way of achieving that goal. I have no doubt that, if there were a Federal Labor Government at present, and if the Treasurer was facing an election and it was to his benefit to attack a Federal Labor Government, he would do so, because he is a political opportunist, and I give him credit for that.

I submit that, since about 1970, we in Australia have lived in a period that will go down in history as being a period of greed. We are a greedy society, and, no matter whether we are politicians, industrialists, average wage-earners, or trade unionists, if we look back on that period through which we have gone, we will see that perhaps the whole of this time will go down in Australia's history as being a decade of greed. Because of that greed, we have priced ourselves out of world markets, and South Australia in many cases has priced itself out of Australian markets. Geographically, we in this State are in some difficulty in maintaining markets, because we are but one-tenth of the Australian population and are divorced from the major part of Australia, on the eastern seaboard, by about 800 or 1 600 km. Immediately we increase our cost base above that of the Eastern States, we are in difficulty, and we are in difficulty now.

Hitherto, the Treasurer and his colleagues have been able to say that we have struggled through and maintained a reasonable amount of expenditure in the public sector, but that is mainly because we are a high-cost State and because we have had the benefit of the sale of one of our assets, namely, the railways. Although we will still have a benefit from that sale for a few years to come, the burden we will not be able to carry in industry and in the private sector will be State taxation. Mr. Speaker, you live in an area in which many electors will feel the burden in the coming two or three years of meeting State taxes. Regarding unemployment, we would find that there are no more people percentage-wise unemployed today between the ages of 18 years and 60 years than there were in the 1960's. If we look at the percentage of people working between the ages of 18 years and 60 years, we would see that it would be about the same today as it was during the 1960's. The member for Stuart looks at me in amazement.

**Mr. Chapman:** The difference is that those who were unemployed wanted to work back then.

**Mr. EVANS:** The difference is that nowadays we have a much larger percentage of housewives participating in the work force, and they have a right to be there if they so wish. However, as many more wives are in the work force, we have reduced some of the opportunities for those coming out of schools, universities, and institutes of technology; there is no denying that. We, as a society, have a problem that will be difficult to solve. In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer said:

We need an output growth of around 4 per cent a year merely to hold the unemployment total steady.

What output growth is he talking about? Productivity, or spending money? I believe that he is talking about spending money, but if he is talking about productivity, which is the real benefit and asset to the community, he should start talking about getting back to the work ethic and encouraging people to work, whether they be in the public or private sector, and whether they be employers or employees. We need a greater work effort and level of productivity in our society at present to maintain our employment level. The Treasurer also said:

Thus, in order to get unemployment down appreciably, we need to be looking for growth rates of around 7 per cent to 8 per cent.

As far as the country overall is concerned, Australia's gross national product has seldom ever reached a growth rate of 7 per cent or 8 per cent a year, but that is the kind of growth rate the Treasurer suggests that we need, at least if we want to start reducing the number of unemployed. Is he again saying that we should be starting to spend 7 per cent or 8 per cent more a year, without producing more?

**The Hon. D. W. Simmons:** Why shouldn't he?

**Mr. EVANS:** I know that the ex-Minister for the Environment believes in that philosophy, and that is what happened when the Whitlam Government was in power. It spent money, without creating productivity in real terms in Australia, and it got us into a serious situation. The Treasurer attacks the Fraser Federal Government for that situation.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. EVANS:** The Treasurer and the member for Henley Beach know that the Treasurer is wrong, and that is the reason we are in the situation we are in now, namely, because of the Whitlam-Hayden coalition. The only reason for the Treasurer's attack on the Federal Government is that he wants to try to destroy the credibility of the Fraser Government. One thing he has not tried to do is build up the credibility of the Whitlam field, which has no credibility, and he knows that it is an impossible task to build up any credibility for it. He has

kept away from that field, hoping that he can denigrate the Federal Government instead. However, if anyone sets out on that field, he will fail.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. EVANS:** I am pleased that the ex-Minister for the Environment has referred to the unemployed. I should imagine that his can legislation, which he had the glory and honour of introducing in South Australia, helped to bring about his change in portfolio. The legislation will certainly put a few more people out of work in the State before it is fully implemented. The Minister smiles and is happy about it, but I hope that those people who will be put out of work will remember him for the action he took, for being so pig-headed, stubborn and determined in his approach to destroying that industry, when he had other ways of tackling the problem if he so wished.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** Why did they sack Inglis?

**Mr. EVANS:** I do not want to talk about him, because I am half Scot myself and I do not want to say anything about a Scottish gentleman.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. EVANS:** I offered to take either the member for Henley Beach or the member for Stuart with me. The latter wanted to come, but he did not have the courage to go. His Party said that it would be angry if he went. The member for Stuart is now Chairman of Committees for not going, so I suppose that he has been well paid for toeing the Party line. The Treasurer also said:

As I have already indicated, inflation had been wound down in 1975 from an annual rate of over 17 per cent to 12.1 per cent by September, 1975.

He implied that it was to the credit of the Whitlam Government that inflation had been reduced from over 17 per cent to 12.1 per cent in one quarter.

That is what the Treasurer said in this policy document. Who took inflation up to 17 per cent immediately prior to the 1975 September quarter? Was it Mr. Fraser? Was it Mr. Tonkin? Was it Sir Charles Court? Who took inflation from about 5 per cent or 6 per cent in 1972 to 17 per cent in 1975? Who was the great white god who did that for the benefit of Australians?

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** Who took unemployment to 320 000?

**Mr. EVANS:** Yes, who did that? It was the Whitlam-Hayden coalition. Now the Treasurer has said that, because during a period of three months the Federal A.L.P. was able to cut inflation by 5 per cent in one quarter, we should give it some credibility. Who is the Treasurer kidding? He claims to be a man of integrity, but I do not believe that, because he is not willing to state in this House that the Fraser Government has brought down inflation over a 12-month period to 10 per cent, and there is every indication that it will bring it down to a single figure rate within the next 12 months. This is the sort of thing we have coming from the other side.

I now refer to why we had such a massive cost increase in our State and in Australia, apart from the position in South Australia where high taxes have been imposed by the present Government as well as the result of its attitude to money: that money does not really count, that it will keep coming in provided we keep spending it. One major cause was our move as a nation to accept the age of 18 as the age of majority. Another major cause was the move for equal pay for equal work for women in the work force and, finally, the massive wage spiral overall, especially in the years 1973-76, which saw a 55 or 56 per cent increase in that time.

Those three factors have affected this country's economy substantially and have helped to create much of the unemployment problem facing younger people within

our community. I refer to young adults and people facing adulthood in the immediate future, that is, young people aged 16½ or 17 years of age. True, I did not oppose the introduction of 18 years as the age of majority, although I did oppose in 1969 reducing the minimum age for drinking to 18 years. With the help of certain A.L.P. members, whom I respect, because they were people believing in something and working for it at that time, I fought to keep the minimum drinking age at 20 years. That was achieved in 1969, and that age was maintained in the law in this State for nine months. I am not sure that Australia, as a country competing with Japan and other countries with an age of majority of 20 years, would not have been better off if we had the courage to say that 20 years was the best age as the age of majority.

As I did not oppose the introduction of an age of majority at 18, I am not criticising anyone for that; I am merely saying that it is a factor which has had a serious effect upon our economy and upon job opportunities for young people in this age group. I should now like to give an example in general terms to indicate the position.

If one was an employer and a young person aged 18 applied for a job, he might tell the employer after being asked whether he had previously had work experience, "No, I am straight from school, or straight from the Institute of Technology." Another person might apply for the job who was aged 28 years, with a few years experience in the work force. Who will get that job when the amount of pay is likely to be equal? Logically, the employer will say that he will take the person aged 28, because he has had some experience. However, if we had a period during which people even over the age of 18 could be paid first a substantial, but not a full, part of the adult rate while getting work experience, we would not now be facing to the same degree the unemployment problems that presently obtain.

It would not make a major difference but it would make a significant difference to the number of people in the unemployed sector. For the satisfaction of the member for Stuart, I do not oppose equal pay for women: it was a proper move. Women are entitled to equal pay if they are doing equal work, but that move encouraged more wives to move back into the work force. Women who had some training were able to come back into the work force and in some instances obtain higher salaries or salaries equal to their husband's. These women saw this dual income as an opportunity to achieve some of the things they never thought they would be able to achieve, things such as holiday shacks, speed boats, caravans, or trips around the world.

This started the era of greed. And, with it, we pushed other opportunities out of the window for those young people who may have wished to get into the work force. I do not deny people the right to have those things, but that is the sort of situation that we created.

The wage spiral was brought about by union officials convincing their members, in some cases, that they were entitled to much higher benefits from the community, so they set out on this massive increase in wages of 56 per cent in three years. No economy anywhere in the world can stand that without serious repercussions. Those repercussions have been drastic and we are reaping the harvest of our indiscretion now. Maybe we as Parliamentarians are not exceptions to the rule when one considers the salary and benefit increases we have had since 1968 when I came into this place. If we had a conscience we would consider that for a moment.

Even Government departments are not divorced from slugging wherever they get the opportunity. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has a

monopoly over its service. If one lives within the metropolitan area or in a township where a sewerage facility passes one's property and the local health inspector says, "You must be connected to a sewerage service", there is only the one service available—the Government instrumentality. One is compelled by law to connect to that service and to pay the fee set by the Government at that time. One is compelled because of health reasons to connect to the service.

**Mr. Slater:** What do you want?

**Mr. EVANS:** I should like to see us receiving a reasonable service (which we are) for a reasonable fee. If the member for Gilles wants an example, I will give him one. On page 7 of the Estimates of Revenue one will see that the Engineering and Water Supply Department received \$69 997 149 in actual receipts for water and sewerage rates and other earnings and that this year the estimated receipts will be \$80 700 000. That is an increase of nearly 15 per cent for one Government department when the inflation rate for the year is not 15 per cent. If that is not a slug, what is? That is one example of this Government's action contained in the Treasurer's documents.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. EVANS:** Land tax was the subject of debate earlier today. I emphasise that the South Australian Land Commission has been given a decided advantage over the private sector because the minimum benefit it receives each year is \$960 000 by not having to pay land tax. That could possibly exceed \$1 000 000. That is the sort of slug we are putting on the private sector that we are not putting on the public sector.

Today I asked a question about a matter that I should like to expand. It is referred to in the Estimates of Revenue under the heading "Small lottery, dog-racing control and totalisator licences" under the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department. Estimated receipts this year are expected to amount to \$700 000. In 1975-76, actual receipts amounted to \$449 000, and in 1976-77, small lotteries contributed to State revenue the sum of about \$650 000, which is an increase of 50 per cent. The Government will receive revenue from small football clubs, the Red Cross, the Children's Hospital, the Crippled Children's Association, the Phoenix Society, and the leukemia group, which is now running a large raffle, totalling nearly \$750 000. It is ironic that before that leukemia group ran its lottery it had to pay to the State Government (where receipts are over \$2 000) 4 per cent of its expected takings.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Which one is that?

**Mr. EVANS:** It applies to any lottery where the total expected receipts exceed \$2 000. In that case the organisation must pay 4 per cent of its expected takings. Many organisations have ticket sales of \$100 000. When one gets into that sort of figure one must pay to the State Government \$4 000 in cold cash before selling any tickets. One must walk into the department and say, "Here is \$4 000 for the right to go out and hope to sell \$100 000 worth of tickets to help a charity or a sporting club."

Is that obtaining money under false pretences? I believe it is. Any Government, whether Liberal or Labor, that operates under that system is acting improperly. We should have a set licence fee for any sort of lottery, as long as the organisation concerned submits a return of the tickets sold and, before selling any tickets, it gives some idea of the maximum expected number of tickets to be sold. Why should we tax voluntary help when it is for the benefit of the community? These organisations are exempt

from income tax in the Federal field. Why can we not do the same in the State field?

The maximum for a small lottery, as I said earlier today, has been \$50 000. That was back in 1970, and I believe the Minister referred to that period, but the inflationary trend has been high since then. Prize money should now be up to \$100 000. If anyone wishes to run a lottery for \$100 000 or for a holiday shack, one should be allowed to do it. Having to pay a fee to run a lottery on a percentage basis is wrong. I hope this matter will be given the consideration it deserves. I am not attacking the Minister concerned, because the fee has existed for a long time; however, the situation should be remedied.

The Treasurer set out to attack the Federal Liberal Government. I believe that that Government has been successful. The economy of the world has not been easily managed, but the Commonwealth Government has brought back a sense of balance to our country. If the Treasurer would go out into the community and promote goodwill our society would become more confident. Instead of people sitting on their money and waiting to see what will happen in the community, they would start to spend in areas where their money would be used sensibly to create employment. No-one with money to invest in business or a new enterprise would do so today when the Treasurer of this State is indulging in back-biting. He has achieved his goal of winning an election. I hope that he will now set out to bring the South Australian and the Australian economy back into a sense of balance by promoting goodwill and confidence in the community. Because it is customary to do so, I support the Bill.

**Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** I support this measure for the purpose of debating the issues raised. It seems that the Treasurer places far more importance on politics in this document than he does on people. The document is blatantly anti-Federal Government: it is an anti-Fraser document and it seems to be quite single-minded towards the potentially forthcoming Federal election. In that respect, it sacrifices far too many things and makes no attempt to resolve the real problems that South Australia faces.

The statement spends considerable time trying to place the blame for our ills, but nowhere does it really come up with a suggestion of how to cure them. Nowhere in the document does one even see that the Treasurer has recognised the different problems, other than probably to recommend a continuation of the unemployment relief scheme, to which I will refer more specifically later. The Treasurer in this document states:

Over the past two years unemployment is up by 85 000. This in itself would be quite a humorous statement from the Treasurer when one bears in mind that, in December, 1975, just before the last Federal election, the Treasurer forecast that, by the end of 1976, the unemployment rate in Australia would have reached 1 000 000. Therefore, the figure of 85 000 unemployed, by comparison, is far more acceptable. The Treasurer stated that there was a solid economic recovery in progress when the Whitlam Labor Government lost power. I do not believe that anyone in Australia would do anything but laugh at a comment such as that. The "promising" recovery in 1976 was hard to detect.

In fact, one previous Minister for Labor and Immigration in the Whitlam Government predicted that he would be ready to retire when unemployment in this country reached 200 000. He reneged when it reached 300 000 unemployed. If that is any indication of a strong recovery, one has yet to see one.

By way of interjection, something one should not do, I referred to the rate of growth in output. The Treasurer

said that an output growth of about 4 per cent was essential to maintain satisfactory economic standards in Australia. I interjected that, during the time of the Whitlam Government, there had been an increase in wages of about 43 per cent, and although the Treasurer said he would refer to that a little later, he did not.

One peg upon which one could hang the entire economic disaster during the Whitlam Government's regime was the rise of 12 per cent at one go in 1974 to the Federal Public Service, at a time when increases generally were about 1 per cent or 1.5 per cent. It was a disastrous move, which was not only not opposed by the Federal Whitlam Government but was actually encouraged. That single move in 1974 set the pattern for the Federal Government services and for State Government services, which had no alternative but to comply and to follow, and of course the private enterprise system right throughout Australia was faced with the problem of losing key staff to Government or competing with similar salary increases and all the additional perks which went with Government services and still do, although the differences are less marked now than they were between Government service and private service.

The whole point was that the Federal Government service was the pacesetter for Australia, and from that time the spiral in prices and wages increased so rapidly that, instead of being well behind the United States of America on the wage structure (and this was something on which we had prided ourselves for many years), we were well ahead of it even on the basic wage rate. If we have to look for blame, let us pin it fairly and squarely on that one single factor. In case there is any doubt in the minds of members opposite, let us not forget that Whitlam himself recently acknowledged that, had he his time over again, he was quite ready to admit that he tried to do far too much far too quickly and made a mess of things. We need not argue that point it is an admission and one has to admire the man for going so far.

We need an output growth of 4 per cent a year merely to hold the unemployment total steady. The Treasurer completely ignored another salient point. It does not matter how much productivity rises, productivity and wages have to rise commensurately. We have lost the race for stability in wages; wages are far ahead of productivity. The 6 per cent growth in productivity was countered by the 56 per cent growth in wages, making our products almost impossible to sell at home as well as on the export market. During the Whitlam regime, productivity did not increase, but it declined at the same time as wages were rocketing in that disastrous 56 per cent increase.

The Treasurer says that the Liberal Party condones unemployment. I think everyone in Australia accepts that it is an Australian and a world-wide tragedy. The Western civilised world is faced with this problem, but the real tragedy is that we need never have got on to that rat race. Australia was one of the world's most affluent countries with a stable economy, and it was pursuing too many things too soon in the field of social welfare that Whitlam has admitted was his mistake. Had he gone more slowly, we would not have been in anything like the present situation. That brings me to the State scene.

The Treasurer rightly has claimed that the sale of the railway system has benefited South Australia considerably. Quite wrongly, he brings to everyone's attention repeatedly that the Liberal Party was absolutely opposed to the concept of selling the State's country rail system to the Federal Government. That was not so. When I came into Parliament two and half years ago, four clauses were at issue which we felt at that stage would be detrimental, if they went through, to the wellbeing of South Australia.

The concept of having an Australia-wide rail system was acceptable and had been since Federation, because the Federal Constitution made provision for it, put there by the States themselves.

The clauses which members on this side opposed were not put into the legislation when it went through after it was brought forward to the House a second time. I felt that they affected the rights of country users of rail systems, and I do not think I was wrong when one considers that the South-East railcar, which should have been provided for by depreciation money being set aside and which should have been covered by a State insurance system of some kind, burnt out a year ago and neither the State Government nor the Federal Government is ready or has the cash to replace it.

Country people who have been sold out, their country railway system having gone to the benefit of the State, are not being attended to quite as well as we would have hoped if the railcar had been still the possession of the State Government. That was one issue I raised. We felt we might be neglected if the railway system was no longer in the hands of the State Government, which is generally more sympathetic than are Federal Governments, irrespective of which Party is in power. The other clause in the rail legislation concerned the possibility of the road transport system in the country areas deteriorating. I do not think there is any question that that situation has arisen.

Another fact which seems to be increasingly the way with the Government is that taxation increases are never necessary when a Budget comes along! Let me go through this, the third I have seen. In each case we find that there is little increase in taxation, but what has happened?

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** You nearly didn't see this Budget!

**Mr. ALLISON:** The honourable member's prediction was out. He said there would be 31 seats for the A.L.P. in South Australia, and he was four out. I know which one hurt him most! The taxation increases which are generally found to be necessary have been covered by regulation rather than by legislation. Most of the charges have been put up in the preceding months. This year is no exception. All sorts of sundry increases were made before the Budget was brought in.

**Mr. Max Brown:** He has—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Whyalla is out of order.

**Mr. ALLISON:** Whilst the Treasurer is constantly proclaiming his success in bringing forward balanced Budgets, this time we managed to balance the Budget, he says, only by making use of the money we got from the sale of the State railways. This is interesting, because every other State in South Australia has managed to balance its Budget.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. ALLISON:** I keep thinking of the state South Australia is in! Every other State in Australia has managed to balance its Budget without having recourse to the sale of a railway system. How well is the State being managed in 1976, 1977, and 1978? Another statement by the Treasurer was that the Federal Government had not played its part in assisting in wage indexation's contribution to lower the rate of price increases. That is a strange statement to make. If the Federal Government agrees to wage indexation without making any protest, it automatically accepts the rate of increase which wage indexation brings. By opposing wage indexation and making it part indexation, one is attempting to bring down at least one of the ingredients in this inflationary spiral.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** You're missing the point.

**Mr. ALLISON:** I am not missing the point. I am missing the Treasurer's point.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** You are saying the Federal Government has not done anything.

**Mr. ALLISON:** The Minister will get his turn.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister is out of order. The honourable member for Mount Gambier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. ALLISON:** As long as wages continue to spiral, however slowly, and productivity continues at a low level, no-one is going to resolve the problems, and single bland statements like this are not finding a solution, a cure, but are simply trying to apportion blame, and anyone can do that. I shall get around later to a few suggestions as to how we might cure the situation, but I shall continue for the moment with a detailed analysis of what the Treasurer said. I think that the South Australian people might have benefited a little had they returned a Liberal Party Government this time, if only from the incentives the Liberal Party was offering in its decentralisation policy and its freezing of pay-roll tax.

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

**Mr. ALLISON:** The plain facts are that in South Australia we seem to be thanking the Lord for some sort of cloud cuckoo land. The Treasurer must have been rather cynical when he devised that bit of campaigning. South Australia has a declining employment situation, and that is indisputable, when the rest of Australia is apparently picking up. We are on a descending scale, and it was apparent that September, 1977, was an important time for several reasons for calling an election in this State, and the Treasurer knew it. Whom in the Federal sphere would the Treasurer nominate to prescribe the remedy for ours and Australia's current ills? Surely not that reluctant heir-apparent, Hayden, who was the last of a long line of 1973-75 inflators.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** That's rubbish!

**Mr. ALLISON:** Of course he was. Look at Hayden's mathematics: when he first invented Medibank he said it would cost \$50 000 000. When they appointed him Treasurer, the third of a quick trilogy, he said it would cost \$500 000 000. We know that the actual cost is about \$1 100 000 000. His first calculation was fairly erroneous, a small margin of error, nothing significant! That was from the potential Prime Minister or at least the potential Treasurer. It is significant that the Labour Party in the United Kingdom has for the past three years, in fact whilst I was there in 1975 on a study tour, brought in measures that the Treasurer was criticising the Federal Government for introducing: namely, control of inflation and reduction of public spending, with union co-operation (these are the measures the Labour Party in Britain has been striving to introduce for three years).

Prime Minister Callaghan of the United Kingdom stressed that it was essential that union co-operation be sustained for yet another period in order to get them out of the mire. You cannot have one group acclaiming a policy in one country and another group of the same political affiliation saying that it is entirely wrong. Someone has picked the wrong horse. It is significant that the United Kingdom has one ingredient that we do not have, and that is strong staunch union co-operation, even to the extent of my old—I was going to say "townie", but he is from Nottingham—acquaintance Joe Gormley saying, "We have to get out of the idea, lads, that we are here for political reasons and get down to reality and put the country back on the right road, by co-operation and common sense." That is what I like to hear. A bit of that

here would not go amiss, even if the British disease has been imported.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** You didn't take Sinclair's remarks personally? You didn't think he was referring to you?

**Mr. ALLISON:** No, I came here to get away from it. Indexation obviously is preferable to galloping inflation, and the British Labour Government froze wages two years ago with union agreement.

**Mr. Harrison:** They are getting back to what they did many years ago, quarterly adjustments.

**Mr. ALLISON:** They were reasonably acceptable, but who threw them out?

**Mr. Whitten:** Menzies!

**Mr. ALLISON:** Not in Britain. The obvious thing is that if you accept quarterly adjustments and wage indexation, admirable though they are for a temporary solution, it still carries the implication that you are prepared to accept a certain level of inflation. None of us should be willing to do that: we should be getting back to the 3 per cent to 6 per cent we had about six or seven years ago. Unless we have ideals to aim at, we will never achieve them, and it is no good saying that it cannot be done. Unless we reach an acceptable balance between productivity and wages, make no mistake, machines will continue to be more acceptable than are people. That is one of the saddest factors I have noticed emerging in my district in South Australia, and generally in Australia in the past few months.

The State Government's partial contribution has been to increase workmen's compensation benefits, leave loadings, paternity leave, and to initiate legislation that makes salary overheads too excessive. It costs a firm in the South-East paying a man \$10 000 about another \$5 000 in overheads for the whole range of additional things that an industrialist has to provide. Employers were warned a couple of years ago that the Treasurer was willing then to provide retrenchment pay. The principle is good, but at that stage he said he would pay one month's retrenchment pay for each year of service. That threat was reintroduced in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech a few weeks ago at the previous session of Parliament. Many industrialists are wondering how far the Government is willing to go with this retrenchment pay.

What happens? Someone in business would look around to see whom he could stand off, in the knowledge that it is easier to take people on than it is to stand them off. Industrialists would go broke if they kept people on because they could not afford to retrench them, and if they keep them on because they cannot afford to retrench them they still lose out. The Treasurer said that many South Australian industrialists were approaching bankruptcy and that his Industrial Assistance Corporation had been helping reputable firms. If legislation is introduced that may further embarrass industrialists, the Treasurer and the Government should say that this is one thing they will forget, and should try to encourage people to take on employees rather than have this hidden threat.

I am sure that many people when looking around and deciding what to do in the next few months before that legislation is introduced will have it in mind. It would be realistic to assume that the threat is there. That means that people with long service will stand to lose most, and that is a sad thing. I would like to see the Government change its mind and encourage employers to keep people on, instead of retrenching them. Companies on marginal returns can be bankrupted whichever way they move, and that is not the answer to the present problem.

The \$35 000 000 that was put into unemployment relief schemes was an admirable effort to try to remove a great fault, but there are alternatives.

On page X of his statement, the Treasurer said that the \$35 000 000 had employed about 8 000 people for a period of 21 weeks each on average. If that \$35 000 000 had been used to subsidise industries that needed it to keep staff on, and \$50 a week had been given to keep people employed, 13 461 people could have been employed for a whole year. That is nearly double the number of people employed not for 21 weeks, but for a year. If we had provided only half of that sum for industry and the rest for unemployment relief schemes, we could have given 13 461 people employment with a \$25 a week subsidy.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Why don't you tell Fraser that?

**Mr. ALLISON:** I have been telling this to the Treasurer and Fraser, but no-one seems to be taking any notice.

**Mr. Whitten:** But why didn't you—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Price is out of order.

**Mr. Gunn:** Throw him out

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Eyre is out of order also, and he is not the Speaker at present. I wish he would abide by the decisions.

**Mr. ALLISON:** The Federal Government, of course, is providing apprenticeship incentives, plus accommodation and travel, and so far about 20 000 people throughout Australia have availed themselves of this in the first three months of the scheme.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. ALLISON:** Members are throwing interjections in without having done their homework, which is customary. We have had the Treasurer's statement, with no acknowledgment that he even recognises a few of the problems that we have not only in South Australia but Australia-wide. Regarding population growth, the Borrie report was quite factual and true, despite the fact that the Treasurer pooh-poohed it two and a half years ago. We have a birth rate that has been slowed down. The medical practitioners tell us that the fertility rate is actually down. We know that South Australia has a high abortion rate: that is indisputable. We know that the immigration rate is less than half what it was about four or five years ago.

Everyone knows that industry and commerce need people, if they are to sell or expand, or they need export markets. Everyone also knows that, with our salaries, wages, and port and freight charges, there is no way in which we can compete with oversea industry. According to a statement by Mr. Bob Bakewell a few weeks ago, 34.6 per cent of the people were employed in manufacturing industry in 1964 and the percentage was down to 24.5 per cent as at June, 1977, a substantial drop.

Productivity is increasing only where there are machines and skilled labour, and that is another sad fact, because machines are making retrenchments an increasing fact of life. People generally seem to be demanding quality. They expect items to last longer, and that means less demand in the long run. By consumer legislation and consumer protection, people are encouraged to look for quality, which again is admirable provided it is within reason and moderation. The Government obviously is encouraging this point of view, so we are looking towards a decline in productivity.

Unemployment is most critical amongst the young people, those from 15 years to 20 years of age. People are too old at 20, because they have stayed at school to get that mythical thing, the Matriculation certificate, only to be told that they are still not trained for a job, that they are too old and have to be paid the adult salary. These people are told, "We will get someone who has the skills and who is grown up." That is bad for the young people.

A person is unemployed if he is handicapped. He is

unemployed if he is amongst the older migrant groups who have had to be phased out of an unskilled job that is no longer there. He is unemployed if he is not adaptable enough, because of some educational deficiency, to do a skilled job. Further, persons are unemployable if they are more than 45 years of age. If we look at the advertisements for positions around Australia, we see that there is little on offer. Persons are unemployable if they are amongst the Aboriginal community.

Generally, I do not see many remedies pointed out in this rather critical document that blames the Federal Government but does not say what it is blaming it for. I think there is a need for increased availability of part-time work (and here the Education Department is moving towards that) with job-sharing or part-time work, and I think preferably people should be attracted to that work with some kind of pro rata benefits like leave and sickness pay. Then, perhaps, people will be encouraged to share, whereas at present, if they have left a job, they know that they lost everything and they resent being told they have to go into part-time work. At present, there seems to be a move in some departments to get rid of part-time workers in favour of full-time workers, and I think that that is a retrograde step.

I am a little concerned about environmental legislation because, admirable though such legislation may be, we have recently read that the Deputy Premier has taken over this portfolio, and my immediate question was does this appointment mean increased severity? I hope not and I hope that the possible change of heart on the can legislation is some indication that we will not be so severe. However, if we in South Australia blaze the trail and other States do not follow, here again we can say goodbye to South Australian industry. Industry will go where it has fewer restrictions, and that again is an indisputable fact of life. In South Australia compromise is essential if we are to protect industry as well as the environment.

An interesting thing is that we are legislating for hearing loss, yet people who have been testing youngsters under 25 years have found that a vast proportion of those people already have considerable hearing loss, not from industry but merely from listening to pop records played at too many decibels, and that again is not disputable. However, these young people will come into industry ultimately and, unless industry protects itself by having pre-employment hearing tests, we will have further compensation claims, the cost of which will be debited against the community at large and put on to the cost of goods.

Members may be laughing at what I am saying, but it is true to say that our youth is going deaf before reaching 25 years of age. Members do not have to look to me for the proof of that. They have to look only at this Government's Public Health Department statistical records. An interesting fact is that recently Mr. Bob Bakewell, Director-General of the Economic Development Department, stated that during the Playford era several practicable and good changes had been made by Playford through personal approaches and through enacting a broad Government policy. He said that Labor tended to be in a hurry to make changes, sometimes in a heavy-handed way social legislation was not always well thought through and in some cases was lacking in research. He stated that Labor often lacked background and the training required to assess the long-term or short-term effects of legislation on the business community, so I ask the Government to examine that matter and make sure that, when environmental legislation is brought in, it is reasonable, policed and protects our industry rather than defeating its purpose, because moderation obviously is the thing.

In conclusion, I say that, if a radical South Australian

Government does enact legislation first to cure the potential ills in our society, we can say goodbye to employment here if it does it unilaterally without the co-operation of other States and the Federal Government. It is no good being sarcastic, cynical or blaming only one section of society for our ills. Co-operation by all States and the Federal Government is essential if we are to get anywhere towards solving the problems at present ailing Australia.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport):** During this debate, I wish to deal with two matters. The first is the credibility of the Budget speech as presented to the House by the Treasurer, and the second is a brief examination of the employment situation in South Australia in regard to what the Government appears to be doing about it, or what it does not appear to be doing about it, and what should be done to remedy the situation as soon as possible.

I come back to the matter of the credibility of this Budget speech. I consider that that matter is important, because we should judge the Budget on its accuracy and on the accuracy of previous predictions from the man who presented it. I take from the Budget speech four examples that I think show the House and the public that the document comes from a man who cannot be relied on as far as his economic predictions are concerned, a man who frankly is devoid of economic ideas on how to handle the employment difficulties of this State, and a man who unfortunately is prepared to make cheap political gain from the situation that currently exists.

I will deal first with the issue of unemployment, because the Treasurer dealt with this matter at great length in his speech and made certain predictions. On page four, he predicted that, as at January next, more than 400 000 would be unemployed throughout Australia, and then he implied that the figure would eventually reach 500 000, the magical half a million.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** You are disputing that, are you?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Henley Beach is out of order.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** On not too many occasions has the Treasurer made predictions, but in a report in the *News* of December 9, 1975, he predicted that unemployment would reach 1 000 000 under a Liberal-National Country Party Government. The last time the Treasurer made such a prediction he was found to be inaccurate by 150 per cent. I cannot accept predictions from a man whose track record already shows he is totally unreliable. If I were the Treasurer of this State, having made such a wide, inaccurate prediction previously, I would have shut up and buried my head on such an issue.

The second issue, the second most important one mentioned in the speech, is inflation. The Treasurer predicted an inflation rate of 12 per cent for the current financial year. What he did not mention was that the Whitlam Government, supported and applauded by the Treasurer, had an inflation rate over 50 per cent higher than the present inflation rate. He criticised the Fraser Government for producing or maintaining an inflation rate of about 12 per cent for the current year, but he completely ignored the fact that his own national Leader, whom he supported and praised once he had achieved Government, produced an inflation rate nearly 50 per cent higher than that level, 17 per cent in the year 1974-75.

It is interesting to look at the facts behind the figures that have been served up. The 13.4 per cent for the last financial year includes the figure relating to hospital charges being brought into the so-called economic basket, which is used to assess the consumer price index. The Treasurer refers to the inflation rate under the previous

Government and mentions September, 1975, not December when that Government lost power. There was a good reason for that. That was the last 12 months that he could take in which Medibank had been taken out of the economic basket, not put back to the extent of 13.4 per cent. The 12 per cent quoted by the Treasurer was a figure arrived at after hospital charges had been removed from the consideration. It was well known and accepted by both politicians and economists that that had an impact of reducing inflation by about 3.5 per cent, so the last figure under the Whitlam Government that we could accurately assess on a comparative basis would indicate an inflation rate of about 15.5 per cent.

On December 9, 1975, the Treasurer said that under a Liberal-National Country Party Government there would be an annual inflation rate of 30 per cent. What have the facts shown? That inflation rate has dropped from the peak of 17 per cent under a Labor Government to about 13 per cent a year, not the 30 per cent that the Treasurer predicted. So we see that he is over 100 per cent out in his prediction. How can a man like that, who has proved to be so inaccurate in the past, make similar claims again in his Budget speech?

The third point relates to the effect of unemployment on the State of South Australia. The Treasurer said:

For the first time in post-war history, in an economic down-turn South Australia has had much lower-than-average unemployment. We used to be the first and the hardest hit of any State in the country. No longer is this so and, with the aid of the railway's money, we will be able to alleviate Canberra's policy for at least another year . . .

Let us refer to what the Director-General of the Economic Development Department (the Treasurer's own public servant, the man who headed the Premier's Department for so many years) said.

**Mr. Becker:** Did he say this before he got moved out of the administration block?

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** No, after. This is why I interjected last Thursday afternoon while the Treasurer was reading the Budget speech, because it was interesting that his own public servant expert disagreed with the facts he served up in such a cheap political manner last Thursday. The Director-General said:

Since 1960 the Australian economy has experienced four clear down-turns in the level of economic activity. Of these, one was mild in most States (i.e. the 1966-68 period). Three were severe, those in 1961, 1971-72, and the current prolonged recession which began nearly three years ago and which is still with us. The impact of the four recessions on the State were quite different.

"Quite different", Mr. Bakewell says, totally in disagreement with his own Treasurer. Mr. Bakewell continued:

The impact of the four recessions on this State were quite different. South Australia did not suffer as much as other States in the 1961 sudden down-turn, and it recovered faster. This was a period when immigration into South Australia, particularly from Britain, was extremely strong, and stimulated a large housing programme.

He goes on to talk about the effect in 1965, which was different again. The other serious recession referred to was in 1971-72. Mr. Bakewell states

In the 1971-72 recession, employment in the building and motor vehicle production industries was reasonably well maintained, and it was the turn of other industries, especially electrical appliances, to cause South Australia's unemployment rate to stay higher than the Australian average.

He goes on to talk about the other effects. I quote that simply to prove that, again, in the third most important part of the Treasurer's Budget speech, he has been found

to be quite inaccurate (found to be so not by a politician but by the former Director of his own department).

The fourth issue I take up in the speech was the tone of the entire speech where the Treasurer argued that the present Australian Government is responsible for the current plight of industry and for unemployment. He completely ignored the fact that it was a Labor Government that produced the initial inflation rate of 17 per cent, having come into office when it was below 5 per cent. He ignored the fact that it was a national Labor Government that increased unemployment when it came to office from only 1.94 per cent up to 5.4 per cent. He ignored the evidence presented by his own Director-General, and again I quote from what Mr. Bakewell had to say:

The real output of the Australian manufacturing sector declined by 7.5 per cent during the two years, 1973-74 to 1975-76.

It was Mr. Bakewell who made that claim, no-one else it was the Public Service head of the Economic Development Department. That shows the extent to which the Treasurer's speech can be totally discredited frankly, it does him no credit.

I come now to the other important issue that South Australia should now be considering, namely, unemployment. I am disturbed, because the State Government is unwilling to admit how desperate the unemployment situation is. Only last Thursday in the House, the Treasurer made some outrageous statement about how South Australia had the lowest unemployment. I called him a liar, was asked to withdraw, and I withdrew, but the fact stands that South Australia does not have the lowest unemployment in Australia.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** The Treasurer said that South Australia had lower than the average.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** The figures released only last Friday afternoon clearly indicate that South Australia is the only State currently facing increased unemployment, against the national trend and against the trend in every other State. Yet, our Treasurer has the hide to claim that we have the best economic record of unemployment in Australia. However, the facts prove just the opposite.

**Mr. Keneally:** What is our percentage of unemployed compared to other States?

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** The honourable member has asked me to come out with the facts on our record compared to the other States. In the past 12 months, from September last year to September this year, our unemployment increased by 57 per cent, or more than double the increase of the next highest State, which was Western Australia, which had an increase of only 26 per cent. I present to the Government the facts as presented by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and the Government cannot accept them. Like the Treasurer, the Government just cannot accept any fact that shows that it is incompetent. It is not only throughout all industry but in our most vital sector, the manufacturing sector, for which the Treasurer boasts that he has done so much that South Australia is doing poorly. In an election advertisement, the Treasurer claimed that 98 new manufacturing establishments had been created in South Australia in the past two years, but what he did not say, no doubt deliberately, was that 142 companies in South Australia had gone either into forced liquidation or into receivership. His figure of 98 over a two-year period pales into insignificance against the 142, and again the Government cannot accept it.

I put up yet a third batch of statistics to the Government, if it wants any others, and that is to look at employment in the manufacturing sector, which in South

Australia has an employment record that is the second to worst of any Australian State. Based on the latest annual figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, South Australia has suffered a 5 per cent decline in employment in manufacturing industries. Only one other State has a higher decline, namely, New South Wales, which also has a Labor Government. The sharp rise in South Australia's unemployment is devastating and unfortunate. Equally unfortunate is the fact that Mr. Dunstan, as State Treasurer, is devoid of ideas about how to reverse the trend. He presented no new ideas in the Budget. When I look at the submission that this Government presented in Canberra to the Industries Assistance Commission on the motor vehicle industry, it becomes apparent that the Government is prepared, secretly at least, to accept that South Australia's unemployment is about to rise rapidly, particularly in the motor vehicle industry. Mr. Barry Orr, Assistant Director of the Economic Development Department (the No. 2 behind Mr. Bakewell), on behalf of the South Australian Government only two months ago presented a case on behalf of the Government. The submission states

The short-term prospects for employment in Australia, and especially South Australia, seem to be deteriorating.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** It's just—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister is out of order in talking while the honourable member is making his speech.

**Mr. Becker:** Name him!

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I will name the honourable member for Hanson.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I realise that the Minister of Mines and Energy is embarrassed by the case Mr. Orr presented and that the Government was so embarrassed that, when a political newspaper reporter went to the Treasurer and asked whether this was the case presented by the South Australian Government, the Treasurer disowned the very case his Government had presented. I again throw that up to the Treasurer because, he having brushed this reporter aside, I obtained an exact transcript of the case.

**Mr. Slater:** How?

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** By simply writing to the Industries Assistance Commission in Canberra, and obtaining a copy. The honourable member should not show his ignorance on these matters. The submission also revealed that employment in the motor vehicle industry in South Australia had declined by 4 780 from September, 1974, to July, 1977. This figure was based on a telephone survey by the Economic Development Department of the two major motor vehicle manufacturers and 104 component manufacturers in South Australia. This decline in employment shows the serious employment situation South Australia now faces, especially as manufacturing industry accounts for 25 per cent of our civilian work force. The most astounding aspect of the submission is that the South Australian Government is prepared to allow a rundown in employment in the motor vehicle industry, provided that structural adjustment assistance is provided from Canberra. The commission cross-examined Mr. Orr and asked:

Does that imply that if there were to be a programme of structural adjustment assistance the South Australian Government would be prepared to contemplate a run-down in employment in the motor industry in its State?

In answer, Mr. Orr said:

I think I would have to say "Yes". I can't commit the South Australian Government, but that is the implication.

It was clearly the implication that came through in the original submission, picked up not only by the Commissioner but also by various newspaper com-



mentators in other States who expressed grave concern and surprise at the submission put forward by the Government. It is outrageous that the Treasurer should assure us that all is well in South Australian industry, but conceal the apparent inevitable decline in our major industry. Why has the Treasurer not previously revealed the seriousness of our unemployment situation?

I now turn to what should be done to help the situation. First, it is being done at a Federal level. The Commonwealth Government has already proposed several schemes, and I remind the House of some of them, such as the Commonwealth rebate on apprenticeship full-time training, called the CRAFT scheme, under which there are assistance rates for the employer rebate for release of the apprentice to basic trade courses, the employer rebate for approved off-the-job training, and an apprenticeship allowance for living-away-from-home expenses.

There are also the Special Youth Employment Training Scheme and the Community Youth Support Scheme, and various other schemes have been so ably put forward and initiated by the Commonwealth Government. Through such schemes it has been possible to increase substantially the number of apprentices throughout Australia. I understand the number of apprentices has increased in this State just as the number has increased in other States.

Indeed, Victoria has just recently boasted that there has been an increase of 18 per cent in the number of apprentices. It was with some concern that I looked at the Budget speech brought down by the Treasurer to see how he proposed to help the unemployment situation in South Australia. Frankly, there was nothing there at all. Indeed, when one analyses what he said during the election speech, equally one sees that there are no ideas at all to help improve the unemployment situation. I refer to the SURS scheme briefly, because history has shown already that SURS as a long-term policy to increase employment in South Australia has failed miserably.

From the Treasurer's own figures, the Government has sunk over \$22 000 000 into this scheme since it first started, but what do we have to show for it? We have the State with the highest increase in unemployment in Australia. What greater proof of failure could any State have? SURS has been condemned as a scheme. In the Treasurer's own words, it has produced short-term employment for periods up to 21 weeks only—it has failed to stimulate industrial employment in this State and, after all, that is the most important sector to stimulate.

Instead, what did the Treasurer promise in his election speech? He promised a series of legislative changes, which were simply going to worsen the situation in South Australia rather than improve it. We had the continuing issue of compulsory unionism to line the pockets of the trade unions and the Australian Labor Party. We had the policy announced by both the Treasurer and the Minister of Labour and Industry promising to legislate for more comprehensive rights with regard to job security and retrenchment, irrespective of the reasons for dismissal.

I refer to the 1975 A.L.P. policy statement on the working environment which we can take as being the only substantial guideline for such a policy. Applying that policy to economic conditions, one can accurately judge that at least in the present economic down-turn that scheme alone would cost South Australian industry at least \$30 000 000, and more likely \$100 000 000, in any one year. In other words, it would be as expensive as workmen's compensation premiums and, perhaps, twice as expensive. I was interested to have those costs backed up by someone in industry who took out independent figures.

The Treasurer talked of his usual promise to remove tort action; he promised to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, not to remove the anomalies about which he talked in various election campaigns but to broaden further its scope so that it applies for 24 hours a day. That would further increase costs to industry in this State. What the Treasurer fails to acknowledge is that, every time he imposes a further restriction on industry in this State, he is simply exporting jobs out of this State, either to other States which do not have such restrictions or to oversea countries, and that is why manufacturing employment in South Australia has already declined by five per cent, in the last 12 months for which figures have been available.

We need a Government willing to take the bold steps to ensure that employment within private industry is stimulated. Over 70 per cent of people are employed in private industry, and there is no way one can give long-term job security and increased employment in South Australia until the Government is willing to tackle the problem on that basis. We need meaningful pay-roll tax rebates and the removal of some of the anomalies in our legislation, especially in respect of workmen's compensation.

**Mr. Keneally:** We tried to do it.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** All the Government tried to do was fiddle with some of the minor details of that Act and, when the Opposition advanced appropriate amendments, the Government could not accept them; its masters were dictating to it. This State needs urgent responsible Government: it does not need the sort of political pander that came out in the Treasurer's Budget speech. South Australia needs a Government which understands the economy and which is willing, despite its political philosophy, to take appropriate action to ensure that the number of jobs in this State is increased and that we have greater job security.

**Mr. GUNN (Eyre):** I state at the outset that I endorse entirely the remarks of my Leader and the member for Davenport.

**Mr. Slater:** Which one?

**Mr. GUNN:** Unlike the Australian Labor Party, members on this side have only one Leader. We are well aware that the Government's Federal colleagues have two Leaders—indeed, we are not sure whether they have two or three shadow Treasurers. As the weeks go by they might have even three or four. In Government, it had three or four Treasurers: one was hardly sworn in before he was replaced by another.

This Budget is a document that needs some analysis, not for what is in it but for what is not in it. The Treasurer's speech can be described only as a diatribe of garbage prepared by the Treasurer's political staff. Indeed, it would be an insult to link this document in any way with the responsible officers of the State Treasury, because I am sure that they would be embarrassed to be in any way associated with a document which contains so much nonsense, half-truths and deliberate untruths and which does nothing for the welfare of the people of this State. In particular, it does nothing for development.

I was expecting to see, when I examined the Treasurer's speech and the supplement, some reference to development of the mining venture at Roxby Downs. However, it seems that the Government does not want to be associated with any project that will create jobs and earn income for the people of this State. As the member representing the largest district in South Australia, an area which has the opportunity of tremendous development, it is disappointing for me to point out to the people of this State that we have a Government which is unwilling to face up to its

responsibility and give the go-ahead to a large company, which has the responsibility, the resources, the know-how and technology to develop this project.

All the Government has done so far is to pour cold water on the project and upset the opal miners at Andamooka. The Minister of Mines and Energy should be ashamed of himself. He introduced legislation into this House which we all thought was the first step towards getting this project off the ground. However, that legislation was dealt with in haste, although the Minister gave assurances which were completely untrue.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** That's rubbish. You're not telling the truth.

**Mr. GUNN:** I am telling the truth.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** You're dishonest.

**Mr. GUNN:** I am not dishonest.

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

**Mr. GUNN:** As the member for Davenport has pointed out to me, the sort of advice the Minister gave to the House is similar to the advice he gave to Burnside pensioners: he told them to move out of the area. That is about what he said to the opal miners at Andamooka when he took away from them areas which they had previously had the right to mine, the precious stones prospecting area.

I hope that when the Minister is investigating projects that will help the people of this State, he will not make deliberately untrue statements and that he will not interfere with existing mining operations, which are important to the welfare of this State. To this stage, the Minister has a tarnished record.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** You're making this up.

**Mr. GUNN:** I am not. The Minister is on record as saying that the matter had been discussed with the responsible organisation at Andamooka.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** Which was the only responsible organisation—the Andamooka Progress Association—and that is the truth. If you say differently, all I can say is that you don't know the facts.

**Mr. GUNN:** We will talk about that in the Address in Reply debate. I want to make one or two comments in relation to the track record of the previous Federal Labor Government and the track record of this Government. **The Treasurer, in his diatribe, states:**

In 1975 inflation had been steadily wound down with the prospect of single-figure inflation ahead.

Let us now consider the record and the economic policies of the Federal Labor Party. The Treasurer has gone to great lengths to criticise the present Commonwealth Government, yet in this document no initiative to industry and no initiative to encourage people to invest or to come to South Australia has been given. One would have expected a Government that claims to be concerned about unemployment to have something constructive to put before Parliament that would encourage people to invest and to come to South Australia and to encourage existing industry to produce. What have we seen—the complete opposite! They are some of the facts that the Government likes to forget. Regarding unemployment, the following statement should be taken into account:

The Labor Government—  
the Whitlam Government—

not the present Government, stands indicted for the destruction of full employment in Australia. The average rate of unemployment in Australia between 1963 and 1972 was 1.3 per cent of the work force. In December, 1972, when the Whitlam Government came to office, the level of unemployment was 1.8 per cent.

In January, 1976, reflecting three years of the Whitlam policies, the level of unemployment had reached 5.6 per cent—it is now 5.8 per cent. In other words, the Labor Party, which pushed unemployment from 1.8 per cent to 5.6 per cent over a period of three years, is now condemning the present Government because the level has moved upward by one fraction of one per cent over the past 12 months.

This year's Budget papers made it clear that a decline in the level of unemployment could only be expected towards the end of the financial year, with further improvement in labour market conditions later in 1977 in response to strengthening economic activity. This trend should be further aided by the positive effects of devaluation.

Unemployment in January this year was in no way inconsistent with what was said in last year's Budget speech. Let us consider one or two other matters.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** You—

**Mr. GUNN:** The honourable member does not like what I have to say. Clyde Cameron said that if unemployment reached 300 000 he would resign. He did not resign; he was sacked. It is no good the Treasurer and other members condemning the Fraser Government when, by their own actions, they set out to destroy the economic base of this country. If anyone was to read what Dr. Coombes had to say in his report he would be aware what the policies of the Australian Labor Party did to Australia and what that Party intended to do had it been allowed to continue in Government.

In a district such as that which I represent in Parliament, the effects of the Labor Party were a disgrace to any Government. The Treasurer has the audacity to criticise the present Federal Government because of its fuel policy yet, with a stroke of the pen, the South Australian Government increased the cost of fuel by 12c. This Government talks about unemployment, but it drove people out of country areas where there was a likelihood of employment.

**Mr. Whitten:** Do you think the present Minister will resign when it gets to 400 000?

**Mr. GUNN:** You should resign. That would be the most constructive thing you could do.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! It is not "you"; it is "honourable member".

**Mr. GUNN:** I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. One could describe the member for Price in other terms, but I believe that that would be unparliamentary. I know that the Labor Party does not like what I am saying.

**Mr. McRae:** When will you reach the controversial material?

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** What about all the papers you have there?

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** What document is that?

**Mr. GUNN:** I have several other documents that I wish to quote from for the Minister's benefit, but this is a document that I would recommend to the Minister, although I know that he would not understand it, so that is why I am quoting it.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** What is it?

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** Who wrote it for you?

**Mr. GUNN:** It is a document which I have had the pleasure to receive and which was prepared by the Federal Treasury. It is a document that is far more accurate than the Treasurer's document. It was prepared by people who are not dishonest but have the interest of the people of Australia at heart.

The Labor Party has indicated that it would abolish the 40 per cent investment allowance. It has made it clear that it does not regard that allowance as a proper incentive to industry and agriculture. The Labor Party believes that industry should not receive that benefit.

I wonder what farm machinery manufacturers in this State think of that policy statement. What would happen to John Shearer, Horwood Bagshaw and other manufacturers who are large employers of labour in this State and depend on the rural industry and, to a minor degree, exports to sell their products so as to employ people? The 40 per cent investment allowance is a great incentive for people to purchase equipment, and this in turn creates employment.

The Treasurer's document indicates that revenue will be increased in various areas. I note that succession duties will rise by more than \$1 000 000. In itself, succession duties constitute another form of taxation that acts in a direction that is completely opposite to that relating to other areas of State Government involvement.

We have a rural adjustment scheme that is designed to improve farm viability, but we have a Succession Duties Act in this State that is deliberately splitting up properties and destroying agriculture. It is high time that this Government followed the enlightened course that has already been taken by the Queensland and the Western Australian Governments. Its is all very well for the member for Price to clap his hands and hold his head, but the people of Queensland, when they go to the polls in a few weeks, will vote in a way that will cause the honourable member to bury his head in the sand, because the Queensland Government will be returned with an overwhelming majority.

If the people of this State were as well governed as are the people in Queensland, South Australia would have nothing to complain about. I understand that millions of dollars is flowing out of New South Wales into Queensland every month purely because of initiatives taken by the Queensland Government. Those initiatives are of tremendous benefit to the people of Queensland, and the funds are obviously being used to create employment and facilities there. It is unlikely that money will be invested in this State while we have a Government that has economic policies that are designed to thwart investment and not reward people with initiative or enterprise.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Why won't they have the Prime Minister up there?

**Mr. Venning:** Do you think Don will go?

**Mr. GUNN:** I hope he does, because it will guarantee that the Labor Party will have its numbers reduced even further. The few seats it has it will lose. I turn now to one or two minor matters. During the recent election campaign, the Labor Party took out full-page advertisements in many newspapers circulating throughout South Australia indicating that South Australia was the lowest taxed State per head of population anywhere in Australia.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** On the Australian mainland.

**Mr. GUNN:** Obviously, the Minister was the architect of that advertisement, because that is about what I would expect. If one analyses those figures, it is obvious that it was a deliberate confidence trick.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** Nothing of the sort.

**Mr. GUNN:** It was completely dishonest, because the Premier and the Government failed to tell the people that those figures included mineral royalties.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** You ask the mining companies if it is a tax.

**Mr. GUNN:** It is not a tax per head of population, and the Minister knows that. In South Australia we receive \$2 000 000 while Queensland receives about \$50 000 000, Western Australia about \$50 000 000, and New South Wales about \$39 000 000. The figures were completely dishonest and were designed to mislead the public. It is a thoroughly disreputable Government that would carry on in such a fashion.

**Mr. Whitten:** Did you see what was said in the *Herald*?

**Mr. GUNN:** I have been shown the *Herald*, but I have not had an opportunity to go into it this evening. I shall do so on another occasion. I understand a journalist known as the Shrike was saying something about the member for Rocky River and me. We are aware of the reputation of that journalist, but I shall deal with him on some other occasion.

The reason why the South Australian Government wanted to include mineral royalties in the figures is obvious: it gave a misleading picture of the taxation figure per head of population. I was not aware that I would be speaking tonight. I had prepared the true picture, but I have not got it with me. At some other time I shall have it inserted in *Hansard* and it would correct the misleading situation which the Government used quite effectively, unfortunately, during the election campaign.

**Mr. McRae:** When are you going to introduce something controversial?

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** You've only got 13 minutes left.

**Mr. GUNN:** I do not need the assistance of the member for Henley Beach. I want to comment on a document circulated in most country districts, I understand, in the recent election campaign, telling the people what a great job the Government had done for South Australia. It explained that the Government had abolished rural land tax. That policy, of course, had been advocated by the Liberal Party since 1970, so it took the Government seven years to put it into effect. It should have been done years ago.

The document mentioned what the Government had done regarding succession duties but, on examining the Act, it is obvious that the Government has not gone nearly far enough. It should follow the enlightened action taken in Queensland and Western Australia, which would certainly assist people in South Australia. The Government claimed to have reorganised the administration of drought relief, ensuring that farmers were quickly assisted and providing carry-on finance for low interest rates for seven years with repayment holiday periods. This has happened throughout Australia, so I do not think the Labor Party can take credit for that initiative.

The South Australian Government has recognised that people in isolated areas face special difficulties, but it has done nothing about them. The Minister of Transport would not give permission for the people of Leigh Creek to have a bus service. He was waiting until the railways transfer agreement had been completed, and those people were penalised for months. The document stated that the Government would provide an outback areas development trust to provide funds in the Far North, but we have heard nothing more about that. Is it going to be a form of local government? Will it be foisted on the people whether they want it or not? The people in outback areas have made it clear that they do not want local government.

The Premier used this material during the election campaign, but since then we have heard no more from him. We are waiting to see when he will come forward with the \$1 000 000. The people of Coober Pedy want to know whether any of the money will be available to upgrade the streets there, and they want to know what is to be done about the airstrip. The Premier was critical of the Leader of the Opposition and me when we announced on behalf of the Liberal Party that we would do something about the airstrip. I would say that the promises in this widely circulated document will be typical of the other 200 broken promises of the Labor Party.

The Treasurer said that the Federal Budget introduced by the Federal Liberal Treasurer, Mr. Lynch, would add

11c a gallon to the price of petrol and diesel fuel. I have already answered that. The Whitlam Government, with one stroke of the pen, increased the cost of fuel in some areas by 12c a gallon and in other areas by up to 18c. The Labor Party was most critical of the scheme, and yet it is prepared to subsidise metropolitan transport but not upgrade the facilities in outback areas.

The South Australian Minister of Transport, Mr. Virgo, thinks so highly of providing services for people of the outback areas that he would not allocate any of the money received from the Commonwealth for the Stuart Highway. We received \$18 000 000, and it was up to the South Australian Minister to allocate those funds. He ignored the North of South Australia, where we have one of the worst roads in the world. South Australia is losing about \$75 000 000 a year to Queensland. The Queensland Government has built bitumen roads to the border of the Northern Territory and is getting most of the trade that formerly came to South Australia. By his failure to recognise his responsibility, the Minister has denied South Australia an economic advantage. If some of the money being spent on unemployment had been put towards the Stuart Highway, employment opportunities would have been available for the people of South Australia, and a project would have been set in motion which would be in the long-term interests of South Australia and Australia. It would have allowed firms in South Australia to have exported products again to the Northern Territory on a competitive basis, and the goods would have arrived in a saleable condition. But the Minister has done nothing. Not only am I disappointed, but I believe that he has completely abrogated his responsibilities. As long as we have this Premier and this Government, the people in outlying areas will not have their problems rectified in any measure.

Having received \$18 000 000, the Minister decided that other roads were far more important than was the Stuart Highway. He has failed properly to inform the people in the northern areas just what that route of the road will be. A number of plans have been put forward, but the exact route has not been finalised. The people in my electoral district are concerned about the siting of the new road. At least \$500 000 of that money should have been provided to finalise the route of the road so that preliminary investigation and planning could have been undertaken and a start made on the section between Woomera and Port Augusta, which is not sealed.

My district is basically a rural district, although in the Far North it contains important gas reserves vital to the future development of South Australia. It also has other mining areas at Coober Pedy and Andamooka, and contains the important railway town of Peterborough, which has an unemployment problem. Peterborough is unique in that it is the only town in Australia, and possibly one of the few in the world, into which three different railway gauges enter. The people responsible for that must carry a heavy burden.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you and I first entered this Chamber as members, the first legislation passed was the ratification of an agreement between the Commonwealth and South Australian Governments to standardise the railway gauge between Crystal Brook and Adelaide. We have waited 7½ years and nothing has happened, another example of the inactivity of the Minister of Transport. Now, he talks about building tram lines or transport corridors to north-eastern suburbs, but I suggest to people living in those areas that they should not get too excited. If the present Minister remains in that portfolio, nothing will be done for them. As I said, nothing has yet been done about standardising the railway gauge, and whilst we have

the present Minister nothing will be done. There will be plenty of abuse and plenty of press statements, but no action.

**Mr. McRae:** I will be pleased to see the Volvo buses out there.

**Mr. GUNN:** Do you mean dial-a-bus they were to operate in South Australia, too! I am disappointed at the Treasurer resorting to the tactics he has in his explanation of the Budget. It is a dishonest document, which does not clearly set out the true economic position of this State. It is a political document aimed at discrediting the present Federal Government, which has made decisions that may not be popular but which are in the best interests of the nation and of the people of this country. Anyone can mouth popular noises, but it takes a Government which has the people at heart to make unpopular decisions, which will in the long term be in the best interests of the people of Australia. The policies of the Whitlam Government were aimed at the complete destruction of economic development and of society. The honourable member should read about the policies put forward by Callaghan in the United Kingdom and by the present West German Government and compare them to the policies of the Whitlam Government.

Compared to other leading industrial countries overseas, Australia's rate of inflation has consistently exceeded the rate in many of its trading partners, and Australia's rate of inflation must be reduced before our competitive position can be restored. I have a chart that was produced by the Australian Woolgrowers and Graziers Council, and ask leave to have it inserted in *Hazard* without my reading it.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is it a diagram, a chart, or figures?

**Mr. GUNN:** It is a diagram giving the positions in relation to comparative inflation rates since 1971 for the United Kingdom, Japan, United States, and West Germany.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It cannot be inserted.

**Mr. GUNN:** I have done it before, but it is obvious that the Government does not want this chart inserted because it may be embarrassing. I had two or three of these charts that I wished to insert but, if I cannot do so, I will resume my seat.

**Mr. VENNING (Rocky River):** I support the Bill as a matter of formality. I congratulate you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on your appointment to that position and I hope that, at the appropriate time, you will express your appreciation to the person responsible for your taking that position. It would be appropriate if I gave an outline of the situation in the Rocky River District during the recent election, regarding the campaign conducted and the result. I introduce these remarks in this debate, because I believe that the State was involved in a large expenditure for this campaign.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I know that in the Budget debate members can range far and wide. However, the honourable member must tie his remarks to the Budget somehow, and I will listen closely to the honourable member to ensure that he does that. At present it would seem that he will not be able to do it and, if he cannot tie his remarks in with the Budget, I will have to rule him out of order.

**Mr. VENNING:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It seems that I will not be able to run through this exercise because I believe that much money was involved and that must have affected the revenue of this State. The previous Speaker's car was driven to Wandearah, some miles from Port Pirie, three times when taking people there to hand out cards. I have no doubt that, judging from this sort of

activity, Government members will stop at nothing. Perhaps later I shall refer to the campaign, because I cannot say now what I would like to say and link my remarks to the Budget.

I was amazed when the Treasurer, with his intelligence, education, and ability got up here and put before the people the rubbish that he did when introducing the Budget. We know he is an excellent performer, and he performs often. This time he performed well from the point of view of the Government, especially leading up to the aspect of the Federal election that we believe could be held some time this year, but he swept many things aside in order to deal with this one aspect.

One matter that I should like to speak about is electricity in this State. In the past, we have prided ourselves on being a low-cost State. Coal from Leigh Creek is brought to Port Augusta. Back in 1971 the Treasurer introduced a Bill in this House that made it necessary for the Electricity Trust to pay into the Treasury a percentage of the gross sales of electricity. At that time, he stated:

The concept of a contribution to Consolidated Revenue by those public authorities which are not called upon to pay income tax and some other costs and taxes which impinge on comparable private undertakings is common to all States and the Commonwealth.

I was interested to hear my colleague the member for Fisher this afternoon speaking about the Land Commission. The commission had acquired about \$40 000 000 worth of land, and the land tax on that amount of land would be about \$1 000 000. However, the Land Commission is not required to pay any dues whatsoever. Reverting to the Electricity Trust, in 1971 the Treasurer introduced a Bill to make it necessary for the trust to pay to the Treasury 3 per cent of receipts from gross sales of electricity. With increasing costs, it was necessary for the trust to increase charges for electricity, and, in 1971, 3 per cent of the gross sales of electricity amounted to \$468 007. With the increased cost and sales of electricity, in 1972, the 3 per cent amounted to payment by the trust of more than \$2 000 000.

Then the Treasurer introduced an amending Bill in 1973 to increase the 3 per cent of gross sales to 5 per cent. In that year, the payment by the trust to the revenue of the State was \$2 241 906. In 1974, the amount paid was \$3 755 007. It was interesting to note that in 1973 the Treasurer increased the rate from 3 per cent to 5 per cent. As recently as the other day, an announcement was made that, on meter readings from September 1, there would be an increase of 10 per cent in electricity charges in this State, which brought the contribution by the trust from \$4 800 000 in 1975 to \$5 800 000 in 1976 and, as we see from the Auditor-General's Report, to \$6 956 000 at June 30, 1977.

I point these figures out because, when I door-knocked the area, particularly the Port Pirie area, the pensioners there in particular complained bitterly about the cost of electricity. The trust must increase its charges to cover this amount, which is continually increasing.

The more electricity that is used by South Australia, the bigger will be the contribution to the Treasury, and it is something that the trust will never be able to keep up with. The people will be paying the iniquitous charge just to meet the amount that the trust is required, by Statute, to pay to the Treasury.

Before the recent State election, we were concerned that the election was being brought on at a time when we did not have the Auditor-General's Report. If we had had the report, we would have been able to expose many of the shortcomings of this Government. However, we have the

Report now and many of us are concerned to find some of the cover-ups used by this Government. We are interested in the Auditor-General's comments on the various departments. Those comments concern me, as a rural member. A few days ago, I read in the newspaper a report that the Treasurer addressed a meeting of directors of Australian companies and he stated that they were propped up and sustained by their own private armies of technocrats. The report states

This allowed the directors to perpetuate themselves and take control of corporate affairs, he told the silver jubilee luncheon of the South Australian division of the Australian Society of Accountants. What chance does the ordinary shareholder have against the massive economic power of directorates, buttressed by the near-monopoly of information provided to them by their technostructures, Mr. Dunstan said. Is it any wonder that few shareholders bother to turn up at the annual meeting?

I link this comment by the Treasurer with the people of this State and with the cunning and shrewd way that the Government is handling the activities of the State. The Treasurer has built up his departments, and that has been mentioned time and time again. As recently as about three or four weeks ago, he stated in a press report that he had asked Government departments to economise. It is amazing that he must make these comments with tongue in cheek.

The problem in the rural community at present is serious. Today, the member for Flinders asked the responsible Minister some soul-searching questions about how the Government will implement assistance to rural areas, and I believe that soon a decision will have to be made to assist people in those areas, because many of them will not be able to harvest their seed. Finance will be required to assist them to purchase that seed, and I hope that the Minister and the Treasurer will get busy with their departments and with the Minister of Agriculture to reach a decision as quickly as possible on how these people will be assisted. I support the Budget, but with concern, for many reasons. I have mentioned the way the Treasurer has presented the Budget to this House. I have listened with much interest to comments of my colleagues, who have taken various departments to task. I support the Bill.

**Mr. BECKER (Hanson):** Although as a matter of policy and principle we support this document, it does not mean that we as an Opposition, or as a Parliament, should accept it without some criticism or comment. I was disappointed in the manner in which the Budget speech was prepared and presented to this House. I should have thought by now that the Treasurer and his department, as those responsible for the financial affairs of South Australia, would be doing all they could to inspire confidence in South Australia. Instead of that they have taken this document as an exercise to bash free enterprise, belt the Federal Government, and prepare for what might be an early Federal election. More importantly they have taken a negative approach to the whole issue, and in doing so have done great harm to South Australia.

I think the Government and Opposition should be doing all they can to infuse confidence in South Australia to get rid of one of the worst bugs we have—unemployment. We should all be trying to ensure that industry is manufacturing to the limit and that buyer confidence is restored, and we should be doing everything we can to lift employment in South Australia. However, I have not yet heard of or seen anything in this document that will do that. I am very disappointed. The people of South Australia deserve better, and we must get down to reducing the present level of unemployment.

I become annoyed when I read in a Budget document (a

document in which one expects to see the best financial advice that can be given to a Government) such second-rate statements as the following statement made by the Treasurer:

I present the Government's Revenue Budget proposals for 1977-78 which provide for the use of all the Government's available resources in order to meet a forecast deficit on the year's operations of \$18 400 000.

To turn around and take the reserves of the State at this stage is poor financial management; we have to learn to live within our Budget.

I think the Government is facing the situation, having taken certain steps over the years and having implemented certain unproductive programmes at tremendous capital and ongoing cost, including interest and wages, where it is now unable to provide the confidence so necessary to lift South Australia. To take the reserves at this stage and absolutely clean out the cupboard in order to meet this present Budget seems to be very poor economic management. We saw with the Budget last financial year the promise of a balanced Budget, and it was near enough to being that, involving I think a deficit of about \$100 000.

We saw a very strange transaction. For some time the Treasurer and his officers have been talking about amalgamating the Loan and Revenue Accounts. This is deception as far as the taxpayers of South Australia are concerned. The reserves in Revenue Account went from quite a substantial surplus, under the present Government, into deficit, and then through sums from the Federal Grants Commission we were able to come back to an almost balanced situation until we sold the country railways.

Many have said that selling the country railways was the worst thing that we ever did, but let us be honest; we did get a pretty good deal in selling the non-metropolitan railways.

**Mr. Venning:** Was it worth it?

**Mr. BECKER:** We do not know. It started off at \$20 000 000 a year benefit and it is now written into the grants we receive from the Federal Government. There will never be a long-term figure one cannot put a figure on it. We finished with a surplus in Revenue Account as at June 30, 1976, of \$27 500 000, so we can say that that money was there partly through the proceeds from the sale of the railways. They were a liability and the deficits were getting up to between \$22 000 000 and \$30 000 000, and it appeared that the non-metropolitan railways would become such a tremendous burden that the taxpayers of South Australia would no longer be able to afford them. That is true if one studies the Auditor-General's Reports in that regard.

I get annoyed when we find that the Loan Accounts have gradually run over the Budget. At June 30, 1977, the Treasurer decided that he would take the deficit on Loan Accounts out of Revenue Account, amounting to about \$9 155 000. This reduced our surplus from \$27 500 000 to less than \$18 400 000 and has paved the way for the Government to take the whole of that surplus that we had had there for the past couple of years, so that we have nothing in the cupboard, it is totally bare, with nothing to act as a buffer against any problems that may arise.

Rural industry is experiencing problems, and we must be looking at ways and means of assisting it. It always pays to have a little in reserve, because continuously paying out on long-term loan interest and creating non-productive accounts leads to increased taxation. It gets to the situation where the taxpayer, as well as the property owner, can pay so much.

We have heard many statements in this House to the effect that property owners and taxpayers are starting to

feel the pinch because of the taxing methods we have in South Australia based on property valuation. This is a method of assessment whereby the Treasury of the State benefits through periods of high inflation. Many people are paying high rates in proportion to the amount paid in other parts of the metropolitan area. Whilst one can appeal within 60 days of a property assessment, and whilst a property is valued every five years, no allowance has been made for periods of extremely high inflation or for when that inflation ceases or the market demand ceases and property values drop. We have seen nothing introduced in this Budget to solve that problem. The problem is now arising in some parts of my district whereby many properties are for sale.

During the past few weeks, real estate agents have been saying, "There's a glut on the market. It's a buyer's market, and property values are falling." Undoubtedly, rates and taxes are not falling, because there is no way in which properties can be reassessed under the present scheme. This is where the Government benefits from periods of high inflation and demand. In this respect, I am disappointed that the Government has not recognised this problem. It appears that it will ride it out and let the taxpayers, particularly the property owners, suffer. The same situation involves property developers. Whether we like it or not, some are of a dubious character, but nevertheless developers have built many flats in my area. Unfortunately, they are a necessary evil, and we are finding that they, too, have capitalised on the system whereby people renting flats have been forced to pay extremely high rents, which have been forced on to the property owner and tenant alike because of the high taxes and charges. Although many of the flats are empty, property owners can afford to leave them empty at this time of the year in preparation for the summer, when they will be charging anything up to \$120 to \$150 for a normal flat, which they will advertise as a first-class holiday flat.

This is where the Government tends to overlook the whole situation of helping the person who really matters, namely, the man in the street. This is where the Budget fails, because it does little for him. The Budget does nothing in the area of creating employment or by assisting people to obtain satisfactory accommodation, either rental or purchase. Even if a house is purchased on a falling market, the rates and taxes are high in relation to the purchase price. That is why I am disappointed at the Budget.

Other significant remarks in the Treasurer's second reading explanation have been well covered by my Leader and other colleagues, but I was somewhat annoyed when I saw the oft-repeated statements about the number of unemployed. It seems to me that someone is trying to condition the people to accept these high unemployment figures. However, I make clear that I do not accept any unemployment figures, because in Australia today everyone should have the opportunity of working, and work should exist for him. The Treasurer said:

Such mass unemployment is not only a tragic waste of resources; it is also blighting the prospects of a whole generation of Australians, and is sowing a crop of major social welfare problems.

Although the Treasurer admits that unemployment is a tragic waste of resources, he has done nothing to create employment in South Australia, except in one area, namely, the unemployment relief scheme.

**Mr. Chapman:** That's only temporary.

**Mr. BECKER:** Yes; in the recent election campaign we were told that this Government had created 8 000 jobs and had spent \$X million. The Auditor-General said that 8 000 jobs had been created, but only for an average duration of

21 weeks. Overall, about 1 000 jobs were created on a permanent basis, not involving the unemployment relief scheme. The tragedy regarding all the money spent on unemployment relief is that no permanent jobs have been created. School leavers are the ones who must be wondering whether it is worth while reaching a standard of education and not be able to find a career position or even any employment at all.

**Mr. Chapman:** Do you believe that the majority of those unemployed are seriously seeking permanent employment?

**Mr. BECKER:** Yes, because I get quite a few each week seeking employment and, generally, I have been able to find something for them. However, in the past month or so, job opportunities have dried up, particularly in one part of my district, because of the savage effects of land tax, one company having had its property valuation increased by 300 per cent but reduced, on appeal, to 100 per cent.

**Mr. Chapman:** How will you cope with the many columns of situations vacant in our newspapers?

**Mr. BECKER:** The position is normal, but it does not satisfy the demand. Many of the jobs need to be looked at closely. A job was advertised this morning for a carpenter on a building block in my street, and everyone got the number mixed up.

**Mr. Chapman:** Are they mostly for skilled employment?

**Mr. BECKER:** Yes, and some are for commission-selling jobs.

**Mr. Chapman:** Shonky jobs, is that what you're saying?

**Mr. BECKER:** Possibly, because they are doubtful kinds of jobs. They are not the kind of employment to which young school leavers should be directed. It is unfair to use some job vacancy advertisements for comparison. What we are really looking for is career employment opportunities for the teenagers, but the Government has done little in that respect. This disappoints me, because the Government and free enterprise must work hand in glove to create employment for the young, as well as for all age levels who have been put off through no fault of their own. I agree with the Treasurer that this is a tragic waste of resources, and we, as a Parliament, must now do something about it. However, it is no good sitting and talking about it: we must take the interests of South Australia to heart and get together and do all we can to stimulate employment here. I, for one, am certainly only too willing to do what I can in that respect.

I was disappointed at the Treasurer's reference to the social effects of this high rate of unemployment. Although we are all aware of some of the problems, I thought it was in poor taste for him to refer to this matter in the Budget, because it gives wide publicity to the problems associated with unemployment. Some unemployed think that it is an easy way out. We should do all we can to boost their confidence and make them feel an important part of today's society instead of saying, 'You're unemployed. You're a suicide risk, a crime risk, or some other problem to society, and that, in itself, is an expense to the taxpayer.' Such remarks should be left out of the Budget.

I do not like the compounding of the Revenue Account and the Loan Account when we are discussing the Budget. It is not fair to bring in the two, as has been done, because each one should stand on its own, and taxpayers should have the chance to see exactly what is going on.

There are points in this document that I find disturbing. Land tax receipts represent a considerable increase from \$18 700 000 to \$20 500 000. The average person in the metropolitan area is loath to pay this tax: he objects to

paying it, because it is a penalty for thrift, a penalty for owning a property.

It is unfair because it has not yet been proven that the valuation method used to formulate the tax is fair.

**Mr. Evans:** What about people with mortgages?

**Mr. BECKER:** True, many people have great mortgages. Young people especially have massive mortgages on their properties in comparison with mortgages held by people when the member for Fisher and I purchased our first houses. These people, when hit with such extra charges, must find their personal budgeting much more difficult.

I would have thought that the Government by now would review the position concerning stamp duty. Stamp duty has grown to a massive \$85 600 000 and, although there have been no increases in this tax, there has been no relief, yet the Government benefits in its receipts through the effects of inflation. Succession duties, too, are now making a reasonable contribution to the State Budget of about \$20 000 000. I have always believed that South Australia should look at a way of totally phasing out this tax, because we need everything possible to assist progress and development.

Indeed, I understand that Queensland is doing well since it dropped its succession duties, massive sums having been transferred there in property and other investments.

**Mr. Evans:** Mr. Bjelke-Petersen is progressive.

**Mr. BECKER:** The honourable member can call him progressive in some ways, but I do not agree with all the things he does. We should be trying to phase out succession duties in South Australia. Also, I believe that gift duty is a further imposition and should go. This year the Government will receive \$1 800 000, and several other taxes should be abolished.

The member for Fisher expressed concern about taxes paid to the Government by charities and sporting bodies. Under "Publicans and other licences" the Government will receive \$10 800 000, an increase of \$2 200 000. I am informed that, if small sporting clubs were exempted from the payment of such licensing tax, it would be of great value.

You, Mr. Speaker, would be interested to note that on Saturday, when I attended the opening of a small privately-owned bowling club in my electorate (it has eight rinks with 80 members), I was disturbed to learn that, because the land is privately owned, the bowling club is liable for rates and taxes. The land tax on this lawn bowling complex amounted to \$1 000 a year, so each member contributes \$12 in subscriptions just to pay land tax, apart from other rates and taxes.

The council rates for this club are much less than the water and sewerage rates. The payment of such taxes is hard for club members because about 50 per cent of them are retired people, and there is no way that they can benefit from the concession that you, Mr. Speaker, and others worked so hard to obtain, that is, tax concessions for pensioners. It is difficult to see how the Government and the Treasury can tax a non-profit-making sporting body such as a bowling club, even if the property is privately and individually owned. Some scheme should be arrived at to assist that club in this respect.

I am pleased to see that the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron, which is located in my electorate, is to receive a further \$24 000 assistance, as well as an additional \$2 000 for fuel. This wonderful organisation with volunteer workers has worked hard and has built first-class premises, and it is now improving its radio and radar network, and this allocation of \$24 000 will be of much assistance.

Members of the squadron are called on frequently to

assist people boating and fishing in our waters, and they are also called out on standby in cases of emergency at Adelaide Airport, although we hope that will never happen. I am pleased to see that much money is being spent on promoting tourism in South Australia, although it is disturbing to note that the interstate branches of the Tourist Bureau have large deficits and are not rapidly increasing their commission earnings, but at least the Government is trying to do something in a limited way to promote South Australia.

**Mr. Evans:** Have you seen the report on the Queensland and Western Australian offices?

**Mr. BECKER:** I have not seen those reports, although I know that New South Wales and Victoria are struggling. Of course, to do any good, \$250 000 would have to be spent in each capital city.

I am pleased that at long last the new Director of Tourism (Mr. Joselin) has been appointed. However, Mr. Jocelyn has said that Adelaide Airport should become an international airport in order to boost tourism, and he does not think the anti-noise lobby has a case for opposing its use for oversea flights. I have news for Mr. Joselin: he is lucky he is employed and, if he keeps making such stupid statements, then he and the member for Hanson will certainly have a confrontation.

If he believes that the anti-noise lobby is not worth worrying about, where would he like me to bring all my constituents to show him that we will not be fooled around by anyone? There is no need for Adelaide Airport to be upgraded to international airport standard. We have a curfew applying now from 11 p.m. until 6 a.m., and it stays.

If honourable members believe that they have had a decent moratorium demonstration or any other demonstration, they should test us out. The feeling in my district especially in the new district, is that that curfew stays at all costs.

**Mr. Venning:** We could have it at Crystal Brook.

**Mr. BECKER:** I shall be pleased to see it transferred to Crystal Brook, but it is a long way to run a transport system. I was disappointed that it took the Government almost a couple of years to appoint a Director of Tourism, whose first statement is that Adelaide Airport should be upgraded to an international standard. It is unfortunate that he did not find out what went on in the area and who was there first.

Most of the residents were there before the airport was built and had established their houses before jet aircraft were even considered or thought of. Mr. Joselin had better look elsewhere in seeking to promote South Australia. Now we find that the Federal Government is looking to spend \$2 200 000 on redeveloping Adelaide Airport to bring it up to international standard, but I have news for the Federal Government: it will be wasting that money, too. The mood of the electorate since that announcement was made has been one of absolute surprise and disappointment.

We know that the Treasurer is on record as saying to a member of the Royal Family that Adelaide Airport would make a lovely international airport. I can assure him that the people of South Australia, especially those in my district, who live under the flight path from Tea Tree Gully to West Beach, will not have a bar of it.

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

**Mr. WOTTON (Murray):** I, along with other members on this side, support the Bill. I intend to express my concern, as have other members on this side, about the Treasurer's financial statement. It is yet another example of what I consider to be a one-act play by a one-act man.

The statement is full of a series of political tactics that I believe were included to confuse the South Australian public. I see it as an exercise in destroying people's confidence in their country and way of life.

Fortunately, I suppose we can say that it is only an act and nothing more; nevertheless, it is extremely serious when the Treasurer of this State reaches the level that he has reached in this document. What right has the Treasurer to condemn Mr. Fraser and his Government when we had to tolerate the situation that was brought about under the Whitlam Administration? It is strange that we see a blind support now for Mr. Whitlam (or is it Mr. Hayden now?) when only a few short years ago, when I first entered the House, members on the other side did not want to know anything about their Federal colleagues. They certainly did not want to know anything about Mr. Whitlam as Prime Minister of Australia.

Now the situation has changed, and I suppose that it has changed because it has become convenient for the Dunstan Government to know something about what is happening in the Federal sphere and to claim allegiance with its Federal colleagues. It is all part of a blind support for socialising South Australia. On page 6 of his statement, the Treasurer states:

The Budget which I present to you is based upon an economic philosophy.

What is the economic philosophy of the Dunstan Government?

**Mr. Keneally:** It's a winning one.

**Mr. WOTTON:** For a reply to that interjection we need only ask the people of this State. The majority of them are completely confused by the propaganda and public relations machine of the Dunstan Government. That is the only reason why the Government is in this place now. Many of my colleagues have taken up several of the points raised in this document. So I wish to mention only a few.

We read much about unemployment. I have a deep concern for those who are unemployed, particularly young people who leave school and are now unemployed. Many of them are genuine in seeking employment. The matters raised in this statement about unemployment are just a case of the kettle calling the pot black, because we are aware (and it has been made clear this evening by members on this side) that unemployment in this State is rising faster than in any other State in Australia, yet the Treasurer has the audacity to blame the Federal Government for that and for everything because it is convenient for him to do so.

We hear little about how the Federal Government's reforms and indexation will be worth \$1 857 000 000 in the next financial year. Tax benefits will amount to \$1 371 000 000 this year alone. We are not hearing much about those matters, though.

In his statement the Treasurer referred to the increase in the cost of fuel, but we did not hear much about how petrol price increases announced in the Federal Budget would inflate the consumer price index by only 0.9 per cent. We are certainly hearing nothing about the Federal Government's new energy pricing structure, which will encourage the search for new energy sources. We are not hearing about the the Government's tax reforms, social security schemes and, in particular, industrial legislation. They are just a few examples, amongst the decisive steps being taken by the Federal Government, to put Australia back on the right track after the mess into which the Whitlam Administration got the country.

**Mr. Keneally:** Is this the comic relief?

**Mr. WOTTON:** Members opposite may jest about the situation, but they are not really concerned about what is happening in this State or Australia generally. All they are



concerned about is confusing South Australians into believing that this State is the little State of the white god. However, it will not be long before people realise what is happening here.

Recently, we have seen fantastic examples of the scare tactics that are being used by the Canberra colleagues of members opposite. I refer especially to those statements made by their white-haired boy of the present, Mr. Hayden. I believe that the recent deplorable antics of the Opposition's spokesman on economic management have shown Mr. Hayden's true colours. He has indulged in blatant scare tactics as a means of making political capital. That is irresponsible behaviour.

**Mr. Chapman:** Do you think he is fair dinkum about the leadership?

**Mr. WOTTON:** If he is, Australia has much to be concerned about if it is to be led by a person who can make political gains out of such a serious subject. The announcement of a further \$850 000 000 from European sources has eased the pressure that has been building up against the Australian dollar. More importantly, it has clearly reminded all Australians and people in other countries that Australia enjoys a first-class reputation as a credit-worthy borrower. Let us not forget that. It is something of which we as Australians should be proud. Let us not be blinded by the abuse from members opposite and from Opposition members in Canberra at present.

**Mr. Arnold:** Do you think Khemlani—

**Mr. WOTTON:** I will not get involved in that. Despite the views of the Treasurer and his Federal counterparts, confidence has been expressed by the majority of Australians and, with that confidence, there has been a return of prosperity. I believe that is what all Australians should be looking for at this time. Enough of the federal situation. The early pages of the Budget statement completely sicken me.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. WOTTON:** They do, and if members opposite do not agree, if they are pleased to see the Treasurer Federal-bashing at present, and if they are proud of what is being said, let them continue to be proud; I am not. It does not give me any joy whatever to read that garbage from the Treasurer of the State of South Australia. I believe that South Australians are sick and tired of farcical excuses, and particularly sick and tired of increased charges. Many members have spoken tonight of charges that have risen—increased charges in car registration, water rates, increases better referred to as rip-offs. We have heard something tonight about the ripping-off of \$8 000 000 from South Australians when they paid nearly \$8 000 000 more in State taxation than the Government had estimated. This rip-off, I believe, has clearly exposed the hypocrisy of the Treasurer in relation to taxes.

How often have we heard the Treasurer requesting tax cuts from the Federal Government? He has said so often that tax cuts are the only way to cure the economy. Then we find in the official 1976-77 Financial Statement that the Treasurer has been robbing South Australian taxpayers of \$8 000 000 more than he had estimated was needed. It is all very quiet on the other side of the fence now. It would be too much, I guess, to expect him to reduce State charges. It shows very clearly the hypocrisy of the Treasurer in this regard, and it would be good if he were able to bring about a reduction in State charges when, in fact, he has overcharged the people of South Australia to the extent of a cool \$8 000 000.

The Treasurer continues to claim good housekeeping, despite the fact that this has been going on. Naturally, South Australia is better off in the revenue account. How could we fail with Government charges such as we have?

Many examples have been given from members on this side. This State has received as much from land tax and other increased State charges in 11 months of the last financial year as it had expected to get in a full 12 months. The money is coming from the pockets of the taxpayers, the people of South Australia, and still the Treasurer has the audacity to claim that the results come from good housekeeping. I suggest he would not know what housekeeping was all about.

I suggest that people in South Australia should wake up, throw away the side blinkers, and start to understand what is going on. For far too long, the Treasurer has relied on the people of South Australia being confused and accepting exactly what he says. If we look back over the statements released through the media and made by the Treasurer or by the Premier's Department, it is easy to see how confused South Australians have become. How many people understand what is happening regarding South Australia's financial situation at present? When we hear the Treasurer making statements about our so-called surplus, I guess the idea is that it is hoped that not many people will look too closely at what is happening.

I suppose that, if the Treasurer and his propaganda machine continue to blindfold and confuse people, we can expect that people will accept what is being said. We have seen the rip-off of some \$8 000 000 from the people of South Australia. The figures released show a figure of about \$7 800 000. The Budget estimate was for \$271 457 000 in tax, but receipts for the 12 months ended June 30 were \$279 326 000, a difference of \$7 869 000. We have been told that the only area of State taxation where the Government collected less than it had estimated was in succession duties: we will have something to say about succession duties later.

In stamp duties, collections were budgeted at \$73 700 000, and they actually rose to \$78 686 000, resulting in the Government's collecting an extra \$4 986 000. The Government collected an extra \$1 591 000 in pay-roll tax and increased collections in business franchise, liquor tax, racing tax, gift duties, and land tax, yet the Treasurer boasts of good housekeeping.

The Government's earnings from fees and charges in respect of public undertakings went over the Budget figure by \$1 757 000. That resulted mainly because of the extra \$1 197 000 collected for water supply and sewerage charges. We have heard examples cited tonight of increased motor vehicle licence and registration fees, which provided \$836 000 over the budgeted figure. So, South Australians have been overcharged left, right and centre, yet we are not seeing any reductions in these costs. We are not being given any more incentive through a reduction in costs to improve the situation in this State.

Many other matters have been raised in the Financial Statement. Much has been said tonight about succession duties, and I agree with the statements made from this side of the House that it would be very advantageous if succession duties could be wiped out completely. I believe the same should apply to gift duty. Succession duties are doing more to harm rural industry at present than is any other form of taxation or duty. The Government recently boasted about improvements in the succession duties legislation when it provided an easing for property passing between spouses, but I suggest that that is only half of what should be done in South Australia in relation to succession duties.

No incentive is given at present for people to work, especially those on the land. There is no incentive for a person to build up a property, a farm, or a business, knowing full well that he will be facing gift duty, succession duties and death duty. I suggest that the sooner

succession duties can be done away with the sooner this State will get back into a better frame of mind in relation to its rural industries.

People are looking for incentives to go back to work, especially in regard to the land. In the 1976 Financial Statement by the Treasurer, we read about drought relief and assistance for the man on the land. This year we follow the same pattern, as lip service is given to people involved in rural industries but little practical support is forthcoming. I am concerned for rural industries in many areas of the State because of the present climatic conditions. They need more than lip service they need practical support.

I shall be watching closely actions of the drought consultative committee recently set up by the Government and I hope that this committee, when considering the present situation and the effect that the drought is having on the State, will come up with something constructive regarding practical support for those involved. In my district it is a matter not only of those involved in rural industry but also of people who are employed, because seasonal conditions have an effect on rural industries and on industries that depend on them. I refer especially at this stage to a particular need in the Mannum area, and the unemployment situation that has occurred at Horwood Bagshaw in that district.

In considering local matters, I refer especially to what I believe has been propaganda regarding the filtration of metropolitan water supplies. There is a desperate need for an improvement in domestic water supply for river towns. As I have become more closely associated with people on the river, it has been brought to my notice that such an improvement is necessary in many areas. We see propaganda advocating the need to spend millions of dollars on improving the domestic water supply in the metropolitan area, yet so much of that water is wasted on lawns, gardens and swimming pools. The Government should seriously consider improving domestic water schemes outside, as well as within, the metropolitan area. I agree with a suggestion made by the member for Fisher that people living in the metropolitan area should rely more on rainwater storage, and the Government should seriously consider this aspect.

I have referred several times to another matter that concerns me, and that is the massive increase in land valuations, especially in my district, and also to the question of perpetual leases and the uncertainty that goes with those leases at present. The motion recently introduced by the member for Light (that land valuations used for rating or taxing purposes should reflect a value which relates more directly to actual land usage) has my support, because I believe that the form of valuation used at present should be considered more closely.

Another matter that concerns me in regard to my district is economic development and the need for a greater encouragement of decentralised industry. The member for Davenport referred to this matter this evening. I suggest that the Government's present policies are inadequate. There is a need for real assistance and incentives. In contacting many industries in my district regarding their intention to increase the size or improve the industry, it is obvious that real incentives are needed, including, for example, a reduction in telephone costs (although this is a Federal matter) and a reduction in State charges. In supporting the Bill, I express my concern at the contents of the Financial Statement delivered by the Treasurer.

**Dr. EASTICK** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General)** moved:  
That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** Mr. Speaker, I bring to your notice a matter that has concerned me since I have been a member of this Parliament. I am satisfied beyond all doubt that it would be better for democracy in this State if the person who held the position of Speaker was divorced as much as humanly possible from the political arena. In England it has been accepted that the Speaker's seat is not contested in an election, and that the Speaker does not attend Party meetings. In saying this, I remind members that it is something that I have had in mind for a long time, and this is the best opportunity to say something about the matter, because it cannot be interpreted that I am criticising you, Mr. Speaker, or your position, because at a time so early in your career there has been as yet no confrontation.

I believe that over the years there has been some discontent, disrespect, and distrust created by what I call a political appointment to the position of Speaker of a person who has been elected into Parliament to represent a district and under our system to represent a political Party and that that person actually attends Party meetings. I quote from the Fourth Edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Parliament*, published in London by Cassell in 1972, as follows:

It is no exaggeration to describe the development of the Speakership as a great and truly British achievement. It is a tribute to the fairmindedness and democratic spirit of the nation that the office is held in such high regard. Today the Speaker is the House of Commons' man in the strictest sense. Once elected, he forgets Party affiliations and is immune to external influences in any form. His salary equates with that of a Cabinet Minister.

It has been argued many times in this House that a person cannot serve two masters and it is true that under our present system a Speaker is expected to serve two masters, on one hand the philosophy he follows and on the other hand interpretation of Standing Orders for proper management of Parliament.

Mr. Justice King, when he was Attorney-General, argued many times that a person should not be expected to serve two masters but under our system there is no doubt that you, Sir, or any Speakers in the past have been required to serve two masters. We have seen the Premier or a Minister looking at the Speaker with some disgust on his face, virtually saying, "Pull them up" or "stop them", yet when the same thing was happening on the other side—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. EVANS:** I am reflecting on the attitude of Ministers in being domineering in their attitude towards the Speaker, and no-one can deny that that has occurred. Anyone who thinks otherwise is trying to fool himself, the other members of the House, and the people outside. A second quotation from the fourth edition of that encyclopaedia states

"In 1642 the King came to the House attended by an armed escort and demanded of Speaker Lenthall the surrender of five members on a charge of treason. Lenthall's famous reply left no doubt as to where the Speaker's first duty lay. Falling on his knees he said: "May it please Your Majesty, I have neither eyes to see, nor tongue to speak in this place, but as the House is pleased to direct me, whose servant I am here, and I humbly beg Your Majesty's pardon that I cannot give any other answer than this to what Your Majesty is pleased to demand of me."

In other words, his responsibility was to the House, to the Parliament, not to any Government or any political Party. It is automatic that there is a certain distrust of the individual's philosophy and actions by those who have a different philosophy and, of course, they are usually members of the Opposition, because under our system the philosophy of those members is in opposition, so there is some distrust from the beginning. A further quotation from the publication states:

The dissociation of the Speaker from Party politics, however, has not been achieved throughout the Commonwealth in so complete a manner as has been found possible in Great Britain.

It is admitted in that encyclopaedia that we in Australia have not divorced the Speakership from Party politics. That is true. We all know that we have not done that. The quotation continues:

It is still possible for an active politician to discharge the duties of Speaker with fairness, although it is unlikely that he can acquire the same position of detachment and prestige which characterises the Speaker of the House of Commons and which is such a desirable attribute of the office.

I do not think any of us can deny that, either. Under this system, we cannot achieve that detachment that we need in order to get the respect and credibility for the position that a person may hold. In saying this, Sir, I do not reflect on you or on the position that you hold. Another quotation from that encyclopaedia states:

In Australia the Speakership has long been regarded as a political appointment, and while some Australian Speakers have striven to discharge their duties with impartiality, others have been openly partisan.

I do not think that that can be disputed, either. We all know it is the case. It has happened in this Parliament. I am suggesting a way to improve the position and take it out of the political arena.

Another quotation from the publication states:

Mr. Speaker Dhillon was the first Indian Speaker to resign from membership of his Party on being elected to the Chair in August, 1969.

Also, Sir, even though some people may not like my referring to this part of the world, I believe that the Standing Orders of the Rhodesian Parliament, which were revived some time before the unilateral declaration of independence, provide that the Speaker has neither an original nor a casting vote. He does not get a vote in the Parliament at all, he is entirely a Chairman to take charge of proceedings. Another quotation states:

An interesting provision exists in the Constitution of Singapore whereby a Speaker cannot be removed from office save through a dissolution of Parliament.

I do not say that I support that, but it is an interesting comment. Another quote from the encyclopaedia states

In Canada an important precedent was established in June, 1968, with the re-election of the Speaker in his constituency as an Independent with the support of the two major Parties. He was subsequently re-elected to the Chair unanimously on a motion of the Prime Minister, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition. The principle of the independence of the Speakership having been established in Canada, it remains to promote the continuity of the office, the successful accomplishment of which will depend on further agreements between the political Parties.

I would hope we could accept a proposal that a person would be appointed to the position of Speaker with, for argument's sake, a term of five years and the opportunity for more terms if willing and accepted. This person's appointment should be supported by a two-thirds majority of the House, then he would be free to act, not only appearing to be independent, but in fact being much more

independent, but without the right to vote. This would mean that the elected member of the Parliament who would normally be appointed Speaker would be able to take his place on the floor of the House, speaking more often than occurs now and where necessary cast his vote as every other Parliamentarian does. This would certainly mean that the person holding the position as Speaker would lose the stigma in the eyes of some people of being the one Parliamentarian with more power in this House than any other member.

I strongly support the principle of giving more independence to the Speaker and, in fact, having an independent Speaker appointed to the position. I hope nobody takes this as a reflection on individuals but looks back over what has happened in the past and will accept the proposal if it is brought into this House as a motion asking that that action be taken, because that is my intention.

**Mr. OLSON (Semaphore):** Prior to the State election on Saturday, September 17, the radio listening and television viewing public were fed a crockful of hash by the Liberals with a flavour of "Stop Labor's rot". The result of that election clearly demonstrates how much credibility was placed in the Opposition's hands by the electors returning the Dunstan Labor Government with an overwhelming majority. One thing that is positive is that the electors stopped the Liberal Party's rot by showing Australia how. This was not unexpected when the Leader had made no secret of the fact that he fully supports the policies of Fraser, which in turn are creating chaos throughout the length and breadth of this land.

This was not unexpected when we have a shadow Minister in the Chamber, the member for Alexandra, who advocates that the only way to get the most out of workers is to starve them through their stomachs. His muck-raking comments about events that happened two years ago not only amount to a breach of Parliamentary privilege, but he has bitten the hand that has fed him inasmuch as he has destroyed the credibility of the Public Accounts Committee where no longer can witnesses appear before that committee and give evidence which will remain in confidence.

Is there any wonder that the electors turn to the Dunstan Labor Government to keep showing Australia how? The policies of the Fraser Government, aided and abetted by honourable members opposite, have failed completely to reduce inflation, which is still running at 10 per cent, and failed to reduce unemployment, with 91 000 more people out of work than in the corresponding period of last year. We have no fewer than 350 000 people, representing 7 per cent of the work force, who are without jobs at the present time.

We have the situation of 350 000 people being out of work, and only 29 000 vacancies advertised for those seeking work, not considering the number of people ineligible to register as unemployed because there are two incomes in the one family. For how long have we heard from the Opposition of the need for more skilled tradesmen? Why does the Government not do more about training apprentices, we are asked, but what do we find? Apprentices in South Australia are being sacked and retrenched within two months of completing their indentures because of the Fraser Government's repressive policies. Only in the latter part of last week six apprentices approached me after having been sacked from a firm called Merv Roberts Plumbing Proprietary Limited, at Hindmarsh, which is a front for M. F. Sarah and Sons Proprietary Limited, because of the firm changing its management to Hindmarsh Plumbing.

Another case brought to my attention concerned an apprentice who was working for a self-employed subcontractor and who was dumped on the ground that his employer was in financial difficulty. The unfortunate aspect of the matter is that, under present legislation, there do not appear to be any legalities whereby people who employ apprentices may be restricted from so doing. Is it any wonder that lads are not interested in apprenticeship when unscrupulous employers take advantage of those situations?

**Mr. Becker:** What have the unions done about it?

**Mr. OLSON:** They have done plenty, and it is a pity that Fraser did not do more about it, instead of baiting the employers and removing the bait after dangling it in front of them. Under this set of circumstances, employers should not be permitted to indenture apprentices unless lads can be assured that their apprenticeship will be completed. Big-hearted Fraser and his friends comment on what we are doing about it. He introduced his policy for training apprentices, and, like the Opposition, he, too, was also concerned about the lack of tradesmen, so he said, particularly in the building trades. Yet, what do we find? He even introduced a special Federal assistance grant to enable employers to train suitable lads.

What do we find? Life was not meant to be easy, because, conditional on this grant, the employer was compensated only on a quarterly basis. In other words, if the employer ran into some financial difficulty (he may not have orders or contracts), he simply put the lad off, and did not qualify for the provision made in relation to compensating the lad for part of the cost of his labour. This policy is a two-edged sword because, first, it prevents an employer from engaging apprentices. Where they have been engaged, it leaves them only partly trained, with a certificate of sweated labour. That is about all they get out of it.

It must be considered that an apprentice works at a lower rate than does any other lad employed in a similar industry, and all he comes out with at the end is simply a lesser amount than he would have received had he been an improver. It is nothing short of tragic for the Government to deny such young people job opportunities. These are the very people Mr. Fraser prefers to call "dole bludgers", yet 96 kids in my district who left school last December are still seeking their first job. Lads successful in obtaining apprenticeships are being retrenched through no fault of their own.

In conclusion, I make a strong appeal to the Minister of Labour and Industry to examine whether there is a possibility of amending the Apprentices Act so that such anomalies, which are presently occurring, can be curtailed. Further, I make a strong plea to the Minister of Works to investigate the possibility of permitting apprentices, with only two months remaining to complete their indentures, to be employed in a Government department. This would clearly demonstrate to the Fraser Government and to members opposite that they are to stop their rot, and that the Dunstan Government is showing Australia how.

**Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** This evening I have a commitment on behalf of a couple of my constituents and, had that commitment not been made, I would readily have taken up the invitation extended by the member for Semaphore, but I will touch on that matter briefly. The honourable member referred to my disclosure during the election campaign of certain matters from the Public Accounts Committee. He referred to several other matters I raised during that campaign. I remind the honourable member that what I said was documented fact, that what I dealt out that time as a member of the Opposition was

only half the cards in the pack. The balance will be forthcoming at the appropriate time.

I also remind the honourable member that he, as a member of that committee, has a commitment to this place. He has a commitment along with his other colleagues now to bring forward a report, which has been hanging around and which has been processed by that committee since December 2, 1976. I emphasise that it has been "hanging around", because in the six months prior to the election I attended 13 meetings of that committee, yet the committee's Chairman attended only four meetings.

**Mr. Olson:** Because of illness.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** Irrespective of the reason (and I acknowledge that the Chairman was sick during that period), the fact remains that only four of those 13 meetings were attended by the Chairman. That was a significant reason why that report was not tabled in this Parliament before September 17.

Now, by direction of our committee prior to the election, the committee's staff have been directed to prepare a draft report as quickly as possible. I have absolutely no doubt that the committee's staff as competent as I know it to be, have proceeded with that direction and, if that draft report is not ready, it should be at this stage. I challenge the member for Semaphore and all other members who have been appointed to that committee since the State election to get that draft report into its positive form and get it before Parliament as quickly as they are able to do.

Then, if not before, I will proceed to deal the rest of the cards from the pack. On the basis of that report there will be adequate evidence to justify the actions taken by this Party as a whole, and by myself, before the State election.

I should now like to come to the subject which I am committed to raise in this debate. On September 28, 1967, the Premier introduced into this House a Bill for an Act which required that builders in South Australia be licensed.

I commend the Premier for the action that he took on that occasion because clearly he pointed out in the second reading speech that his intent was sound and in the interests of those people he was seeking to protect—the potential homeowners and builders of structures within the precincts of the State. Amongst other things, he stated:

This Bill satisfies a long-felt need in South Australia and is principally designed to improve the quality and standards of building, to afford protection to the home builder and home buyer in this State and to protect the building industry and the public from exploitation by unqualified persons who, without accepting any responsibility for their negligence and incompetence, make full use of the industry to promote their own interests to the detriment and often the financial loss of many.

The principal method by which this Bill will achieve its objects is by requiring certain persons who carry out building work to be licensed and qualified in every respect to carry out the work. The Bill provides for two kinds of licence:

I believe that we all understand that the first of the licences was the general builder's licence which authorised the holder thereof to undertake and carry out building work of any kind. The second class of licence was a restricted builder's licence and related to the builder of a specific kind of structure and accordingly restricted work in the industry. As I said, the intent was clear. It was a sound piece of legislation and, although criticised by the then Opposition Leader, Steele Hall, in certain respects, the principle was sound and it was generally accepted in this place.

The Bill went to the other place where certain

amendments were moved. One of them referred to a further protection for the public. At the time it was described as the building indemnity fund. It was to create in the Builders Licensing Act a fund which, in the event of a builder becoming bankrupt or becoming unlicensed for one reason or another, created a protection and a fund to protect financially people who could be affected by builders going out of business.

I have read part of the *Hansard* report of that debate and it seems that there was a fair hassle at the time about accepting the amendment. As a result, a conference was held and the amendment was accepted and the Act was passed in 1974. The amendment established a fund that was to be maintained and administered by the board. Generally speaking, the fund was to protect a person in the circumstances I have described and required an amount to be paid into the fund by each home owner in each case where a building was to be erected so that twice each year on a day to be fixed by proclamation the fund could be drawn on for the payment of any fees resulting from a default that had occurred during the process of building, etc.

After researching the subject, I was absolutely amazed to ascertain that that amendment has never been proclaimed by Executive Council. Although the amendment passed both Houses after a conference, that vital provision of the Builders Licensing Act has never been proclaimed by the Government. We in South Australia are therefore not enjoying the most protective and vital section of the Builders Licensing Act. As a result members from both sides of the House from time to time cite builders who have been deregistered or have been refused

further licences and who, as a result of going out of business, have failed to complete the houses in question and the public generally is denied this protection.

So, the whole damn thing is a farce. We have gone through the whole process yet again of setting up an Act to protect the public. We have this great facade and a great heap of words in the Statute, and we find in this instance that we are now debating that the vital element of it breaks down because it has never been proclaimed by the Government. I ask the Attorney-General, the only Minister present for the time being, to seek the reason why that vital amendment has not been proclaimed, and indeed to bring a report back to the House if he is able to do so. To me, that was a classic example of a case where the intent was sound, the work was done, the officers around the place had done their job to produce the Act on the Statute Book, and the damn thing is virtually useless.

In the few minutes remaining to me I should like to cite a particular company which appears to have exploited the situation and so has affected a constituent of mine. A builder named Laundy, of Seaford, has been delicensed in recent times, or his licence has been refused by the Builders Licensing Board. He was the builder of a house in my district, and a whole list of requirements has been placed on him by the Builders Licensing Board for matters to be rectified in this building, which is unfinished. Because he is unlicensed, the intent of the Act cannot be forced, and the whole blasted thing breaks down.

Motion carried.

At 10.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 12, at 2 p.m.