

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 12, 1977

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

PETITION : SCHOOL STAFFING

Mr. **HARRISON** presented a petition signed by 2 411 electors of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government not to reduce ancillary staff hours in individual schools, to appoint ancillary staff to schools with less than their full quota, and to implement the recommendations submitted by the South Australian department for the national survey of educational needs. Petition received.

PETITION: LOTTERY AGENCY

Mr. **GROTH** presented a petition signed by 1 597 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to provide a lottery agency at the Parabanks shopping centre, Salisbury. Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS: 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**: In tabling correspondence between myself and Mr. Wilson, S.M., yesterday, I tabled the correspondence which I then had to hand; however, I tabled it after having made inquiries in my department as to whether there had been any response to my letter to Mr. Wilson, the last piece of correspondence that I tabled.

Mr. **Millhouse**: You weren't told—

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

The **Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN**: I was informed by my department that there was not a response from him. However, I was told after Question Time later in the day that there had been a response, and the department apologised to me for not personally giving me the response before that. I then promptly informed the press that there was a further letter and that I would be tabling it today. I have that letter, and I table a copy of it.

Mr. **Millhouse**: You're not going to read it?

The **Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN**: The honourable member will have an opportunity to read it if he wishes to do so.

The **Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. PETER DUNCAN**: I wish to take this opportunity to make some further comments concerning the refusal of the Supervising Stipendiary Magistrate, Mr. D. Findlay Wilson, to hear and determine cases involving the State Government. He has taken this action, as members well know, following the reporting of comments I made on an A.B.C. talk-back radio programme. The comments referred to have been reported in the *Advertiser* as follows:

In answer to listeners' questions, Mr. Duncan said he felt the sentences imposed on three doctors for misuse of Medibank moneys had been too light. "Those penalties weren't satisfactory and the penalty that should have been

applied in my view should have been significantly greater", he said. Mr. Duncan agreed with a listener's proposition that there seemed to be one law for the rich and another for the poor. However he said it was generally a dangerous practice to compare sentences.

"I think the sorts of cries for blood that are about at the moment publicly and are being fired around are undesirable," he said. "I don't think that the public generally nor the Government for that matter is in the best position to determine what sentences are to be applied." "The courts," he said, "should be independent and be able to exercise discretion independently."

As I have said previously, Mr. Speaker, I was not misreported in the *Advertiser*, and stand by those statements. I was, however, misreported in the *News* on September 20, 1977, and in the *Australian* of September 21, 1977, wherein the following extract appeared (I think it was the same article in both newspapers):

Mr. Wilson declined to hear State cases in the Magistrates Court following an allegation by Mr. Duncan that in Mr. Wilson's court there was one law for the rich and one for the poor.

On September 21, 1977, in the *Advertiser* I took the opportunity of denying that I had made that statement. My statement on that occasion was:

I did not say as was reported in the afternoon newspapers that in Mr. Wilson's court there was one law for the rich and one for the poor.

My statement in agreeing with the listener's proposition that there seemed to be one law for the rich and one law for the poor was intended to have general application, and in support of this I refer to my disclaimer of September 21, 1977, and my disclaimer on the day that the original statement was made, that it was generally a dangerous practice to compare sentences and that I did not believe that the Government or the public generally were in the best situation to determine what were the best sentences to be applied.

Throughout this saga at no stage has Mr. D. F. Wilson, S.S.M. sought to discuss this matter with me directly. In the light of Mr. Wilson's statement from the bench, I took the course which I considered to be most proper, and that was to instruct the solicitors appearing in the matter of *Lawson v. Marion Road Car Sales Pty. Ltd.*, which is the case in which the magistrate had refused to proceed with the hearing, to state clearly in open court that the Government had no objection to the magistrate continuing to hear the matter.

It is of interest to note the transcript of the hearing of that matter on October 4, 1977, when Mr. Wainwright, appearing as an officer of the Public and Consumer Affairs Department, was asked by Mr. Wilson, "Mr. Wainwright, do you wish to say anything?" The transcript states:

I am instructed, Sir, that the complainant consents to your continuing to hear these complaints. I am not—

His Honour: Do you wish to say anything, Mr. Firth?

Regrettably the magistrate did not apparently permit Mr. Wainwright to continue his remarks and the magistrate subsequently again ruled as follows:

I am afraid that what you have said does not remove the ground of disqualification. On each complaint I hold that I am disqualified from further hearing and from determining the complaint, and I desist from further hearing it.

It is interesting to note that both the complainant and the defendant had no objection to the magistrate hearing the matter. In other words, at the hearing both parties did not raise objection to the magistrate hearing the matter and expressed positively their desire that he should continue to hear the complaint. Nevertheless, Mr. Wilson felt unable to do so.

I took the step of instructing the solicitors in the above case to make clear to the magistrate the Government's position that we did not consider him to be biased and that we had no objection to his continuing to hear the case. I did so in light of my regard for the capacity, probity and devotion to duty which he has shown.

As to my agreeing with the listener's proposition that there seemed to be one law for the rich and one law for the poor, that was a comment on the general structure of the criminal justice system as it operates in this society and was not intended as a personal reflection on Mr. Wilson.

I would have thought that that was a comment which would have had the support of most persons with any knowledge of the law, and in support of that proposition I quote from the findings of the Royal Commission (the second report) on Law and Poverty in Australia, page 1, as follows:

Lawyers and laymen alike consider it unthinkable that the legal system should discriminate against a person simply because he is poor. Yet even on these uncontentious criteria the law has failed to accord equal treatment to all people and has therefore contributed to the perpetuation of poverty in Australia. This report shows that some people, simply because they are too poor, too ignorant or too frightened, do not have access to the courts nor do they obtain the legal assistance they need to enforce their basic rights and to protect themselves against grievous injustice. It also shows that there are areas of substantive law of considerable importance to the everyday lives of poor people that are heavily weighted against their interests. Certain disadvantaged groups find that the legal system has been slow to adapt to their special requirements, so that for them the law sometimes reinforces inequalities rather than redresses them.

Clearly the elimination of poverty requires the law to overcome its bias against poor people. But we think that the principle of equality before the law, in its broadest sense, demands more than the remedying of the most obvious injustices discussed in this report.

This quote, Mr. Speaker, equates my views, and adequately explains the reasons for my statement concerning one law for the rich and one for the poor.

QUESTIONS

MAGISTRATE'S TRANSFER

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Premier take immediate steps to have the present dispute between Mr. D. F. Wilson, S.S.M., and the Attorney-General adjudicated by either the Supreme Court or a Supreme Court judge, and take additional steps to ensure that in future all such differences or disputes between members of the Judiciary and the political head of the law services are resolved not by the Premier or his department but by either the Supreme Court or a judge of the Supreme Court? The letter tabled today from Mr. Wilson concludes by saying:

All things considered, I think I have been treated most shabbily. Nevertheless, even at this stage if Mr. Duncan is prepared to indicate publicly that his remark implied no reflection on me personally and that he shares the confidence in my integrity which you yourself have been good enough to express, I am perfectly willing, as I have been all along, to forget all that has occurred, and to hear cases in which the State Government is involved, including the part-heard case which I have held that I am otherwise disqualified by law from determining.

The whole matter, which has arisen from a most unfortunate remark by the Attorney-General, seems to have been blown up out of all proportion. Pending any investigation by an independent body such as the Supreme Court, I believe the Premier should restore Mr. Wilson to

his previous position as a magistrate in the Adelaide Magistrates Court. The suggestion that a Supreme Court judge at least should adjudicate rather than the Premier pass judgment is a worthwhile one indeed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know how the honourable member proposes that this should happen. I do not know whether he is suggesting that we should issue a writ of *mandamus*.

Mr. Millhouse: You should have done that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I rather doubt whether the honourable member, when he was Attorney-General, would have done it. I can tell him that the present Attorney-General does not intend to, nor would I advise him to. The matter has been dealt with departmentally and properly. It would be grossly improper for me to advise a Supreme Court judge outside his office as judge to adjudicate between me and a member of my department, and I do not intend to do that. The reply to the question is "No".

HOUSING AGREEMENT

Mr. BANNON: Can the Minister for Planning provide information on the present state of negotiations on the new Commonwealth-State housing agreement? Some time ago the Federal Minister (Mr. Newman) announced that negotiations should commence for a Commonwealth-State housing agreement in order to renew the existing agreement that expires some time next year. He indicated some guidelines on which the negotiations would take place, including the concept of market rents and a concept of reducing the funds available to the State housing authorities, in effect forcing them to deploy the funds they had available elsewhere. This has caused much concern in the community particularly among rental housing tenants, and I refer not only to those in the Housing Trust or public sector but also to those in the private sector whose rentals are influenced very much by what happens to public sector rentals.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think most people would have read the reports of the Commonwealth Government proposals on this matter. At this stage, under the current agreement, which expires at the end of June next year, money is made available to the States for both rental and home-purchase purposes at 4 per cent. That 4 per cent money is lent-on to the State Bank and the State Bank is involved in lending that money at 5¼ per cent. Long-term loans are made available to people who qualify under a means test that is part of the existing agreement for the purpose of purchasing a home. The existence of this low-interest money has enabled the Housing Trust to continue to provide rental accommodation at reasonable rents, and has enabled the State Bank to continue to make available loans to home purchasers who would otherwise not be able to afford the costs associated with owning their own home.

There has been considerable concern at the proposals of the Commonwealth, which seem directed to increasing the costs both of those who rent public housing and those who borrow, in South Australia's case, from the State Bank. The proposals as they stand at the moment are that money will be made available for home purchasers at 4½ per cent to the State, and the State is then required to on-lend that money to the State Bank, in South Australia's case, at 5 per cent in the first year, 5½ per cent in the second year, and rising by ½ per cent steps each year until the bond rate is reached. The bond rate at the moment is about 10.4 per cent. The State Bank, having paid interest at that rate to the State Treasury, let us say, would then cover its own administrative costs and make loans to customers on that basis.

The Housing Trust, on the other hand, was to be lent money at 5 per cent, 1 per cent up on the previous agreement, and was required to charge market rents for all of its properties as soon as possible. When the Commonwealth and State Ministers met in Perth recently we achieved some modification in those proposals. First, it was agreed that the States would not be required to charge market rents as soon as possible. The words "as soon as possible" were struck out and the concept of market-related rents was substituted for market rents. The Commonwealth Minister indicated that he would regard as market-related rents the New South Wales policy, for example, of charging public housing tenants 80 per cent of the market rent. That 80 per cent of the market rent would be market related. In that modification it was made clear that it was up to the States to determine their policies in this respect.

So far as lending for home purchases was concerned, we put to the Commonwealth Minister very strongly that the maximum interest rate should be no more than 1 per cent below the bond rate. I would have liked to see an agreement on a figure of 2 per cent below the bond rate. However, the Commonwealth Minister agreed that he would put to the Federal Government the proposition that the maximum interest rate would be kept at a figure of 1 per cent below the bond rate. It was also agreed at the conference that a provision would be inserted in the agreement that surpluses made by the States on either home lending or rental would not be taken into account in determining the allocations to be made to the States in years ahead under the agreement.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: MAGISTRATE'S TRANSFER

The SPEAKER: I have received from the honourable member for Mitcham the following letter dated October 12, 1977:

I desire to inform you that today, Wednesday, October 12, it is my intention to move that this House at its rising do adjourn until 1.30 p.m. on Thursday, October 13, for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely:

That this House disapproves of the action of the Government in transferring Mr. D. F. Wilson, S.S.M., from his duties in the Adelaide Magistrates Court and greatly regrets the failure of the Premier yesterday when making his statement on the matter to table all the correspondence which has passed between him and Mr. Wilson by omitting to table Mr. Wilson's letter to him of October 7, 1977.

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

No member having risen:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, well, well—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: After you've—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! I will name the honourable member for Mitcham. As the motion is not supported by the requisite four honourable members, it cannot be further proceeded with.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, did I hear you say that you had named me?

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope you will pardon my being very angry at what has just happened.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: These fools down here—

The SPEAKER: Order! I will name the honourable member if he does not remain quiet.

Mr. RODDA: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I object to being grouped among members who have been called "These fools down here," and I ask that that be withdrawn.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I will not retract it; that is precisely what members of the Liberal Party are. On a very important matter of principle—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham must resume his seat. I cannot uphold the point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am quite happy to defend myself, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTIONS RESUMED

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S STATEMENT

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: When the member for Mitcham is controlled I should like to ask a question in relation to a matter which we believe can be aired in Question Time quite as effectively as it can be aired by way of an urgency motion by the sole member of the New Democrats, if that is what they are called. I wish to pursue the matter further by way of question.

Mr. Millhouse: You'll regret this.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: My only regret is that we cannot quieten that magpie on the cross benches.

Mr. Millhouse: I know. That's—

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are becoming far too frequent, and I am unable to hear what the honourable Deputy Leader is saying.

Mr. Millhouse: You're not missing anything.

The SPEAKER: I can assure the honourable member for Mitcham that this is his last warning. The honourable Deputy Leader.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We can now get on with the business of the House, I hope. Does the Attorney-General believe that his statement reflects in any way on Mr. Wilson, S.S.M., and, if he does, will he make a public retraction, as has been requested, as that will reassure Mr. Wilson and the other magistrates? The implication in the Attorney's statements is clear. In fact, the Premier yesterday indicated that he believed the Attorney and other Ministers were free, if they so wished, to criticise magistrates. I will read to the House an extract from the letter which was tabled by the Premier earlier today in which the senior magistrate, Mr. Wilson, states:

I turn finally to the fact that in your letter of September 20 you suggested that Mr. Duncan's remark contained no implication of a want of integrity on my part. I certainly read it as clearly implying such a slur, and so do the very large numbers of persons who have since contacted me on the matter to express their indignation. It has been pointed out that Mr. Duncan's remark also constituted a reflection on the Judicial system generally in this State. If that is all he meant to imply, and he neither felt nor intended to express any reflection on my impartiality or integrity, then elementary justice suggests that he should indicate this publicly, in view of the fact that so many people have taken his comment to be directed to me personally.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I have already made a statement today, and I repeat it for the honourable member's benefit, as follows: "My comment was a comment on the general structure of the criminal justice system as it operates in this society, and it was not

intended as a personal reflection on Mr. Wilson, S.S.M."

MOTOR CYCLE LICENCES

Mr. WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Transport consider grading motor cycle licences in order to prohibit people from riding a machine of more than 250cc capacity for such a period as would enable riders to learn to ride motor bikes safely? An article has been attributed to Mr. Frank Franklin, a leading motor cycle administrator, as follows:

At present, a 16-year-old could sit for a learner's licence and go out and buy the biggest super bike on the market without having the slightest idea of how to handle it. There is little doubt that sooner or later he will come to grief.

He went on to say:

The law should prohibit him from riding a machine of more than 250cc capacity for at least two years so he can learn to ride properly and safely.

He also said that in New South Wales the Government has instituted laws along these lines, and that now our Government should seriously consider this matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is now quite some time since I referred this point to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and asked him to consider the desirability of grading motor cycle licences. At this stage, the matter is still subject to consideration by the Registrar. No report has been submitted to me, but as soon as it is I shall be pleased to let the honourable member and the House know. The Registrars of Motor Vehicles from the various States had their annual conference last month, and this was one of the items discussed with a view to seeing whether some uniformity could be obtained in the grading of licences throughout Australia.

AIRLINE ADVERTISEMENT

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier say, in relation to the display for the Malaysian Airline System (M.A.S.) which appeared recently in the main window of South Australia House, London, why such a display appeared; who in the Premier's Department gave the instruction for this display to be set up; why a Malaysian company was promoted in preference to the Australian international airline (Qantas) or any other South Australian company in another field; and who owns Clayton Travel Proprietary Limited? The display, mainly promoting the Malaysian Airline System, recently appeared in the main window of South Australia House, London. I have three coloured photographs of that display which clearly indicate its nature. When a visitor from South Australia inquired why a Malaysian display was being given prominence in the window, the person was told that the instruction had come from the Premier's Department in Adelaide. The display advertises that bookings and travel details can be obtained from Clayton Travel Proprietary Limited, and that is clearly indicated on the front of the display. I am mystified why the Premier is giving preference to promoting Malaysia over South Australia on South Australian property.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not personally aware of the display at all. However, I shall call for a report and give it to the honourable member.

BUSES

Mr. DRURY: Can the Minister of Transport say when the rate of completion of air-conditioned buses will be

such that additional services to the suburbs south of Adelaide can be provided?

8 The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The buses are not coming off the production line as quickly as the contractor foresaw when he provided us with a time table a few weeks ago. We expected that the rate of production would reach a bus a day before this and that it would climb to 25 buses a month in November. That target has not been achieved and, at this stage, we are getting only about 12 to 15 buses a month. Notwithstanding that, we have been able to effect several improvements in services and, as more buses come off, more improvements will be effected. Regarding the area referred to by the honourable member, we still hope that we will meet the time schedule of the feeder bus to the Sheidow Park area in February or March. We expect that, concurrently with the opening of the new Christie Downs railway facility, we will introduce improved levels of service into that area. Probably the most important factor from the honourable member's viewpoint, and indeed, from that of the Minister of Education, is that we hope that, at about the same time, the Seaford bus service, which was discontinued by the former private operator, will be recommenced.

WOMEN'S SHELTER

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether the report in the *Advertiser* yesterday relating to the referral of a woman to a women's shelter in North Adelaide is accurate and, if it is, will he, as the Minister responsible for matters associated with women's shelters, say how a mentally disturbed woman with a record of violent behaviour came to be referred to the Childers Street women's shelter?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Although I have no direct knowledge of the incident, I did see the report in the paper. I shall be pleased to make inquiries along the lines that the honourable member has suggested.

BIRKENHEAD RAIL CROSSING

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Transport say when rubber inserts will be installed on the railway line at Dunnikier Road, Birkenhead? This crossing has been responsible for numerous accidents to motor bike riders and cyclists because of the angle at which the railway line crosses the roadway. Last Sunday a woman cyclist suffered severe facial injuries when the wheel of her bicycle lodged in the line. Will the Minister expedite the installation to overcome this hazard?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will refer the matter to the State Transport Authority and ask it to give the honourable member's request its immediate attention.

ATHELSTONE LAND

Mrs. ADAMSON: I direct my question to the Minister for the Environment, the former member for Coles. Will the Minister say whether the Environment Department or the National Parks and Wildlife Service intends to purchase all or part of section 814 at Burton Road, Athelstone, and, if it does, can he say for what purpose the land will be purchased, when it will be purchased, and when the present owner will be notified of the Government's intention?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am delighted that the

present member for Coles has directed her first question to me. Although, in my new capacity as Minister for the Environment, I have not yet had time to investigate her question, I am certainly aware of the property about which she speaks. If it is at all possible to do so, I would be anxious to purchase the property. The honourable member would appreciate that the problem is really one of money, but it would be highly desirable to purchase the property as an addition to the nursery and the wild flower garden that it will join when part of the road that is being closed is closed. I do not know when the matter will be resolved. I will consider the question raised in the light of what the honourable member has said and try to attend to it as quickly as possible. I will do the best I can to satisfy her needs in this matter and provide this service to people in the area. I will bring down a report for the honourable member as soon as I possibly can.

JUVENILE CRIME

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Community Welfare confirm that the annual report on the administration of the Juvenile Courts Act is an endorsement of the enlightened system of juvenile justice in South Australia? I am disturbed, as I believe all members should be disturbed, to hear so often from members opposite that South Australia is practically in the grip of a juvenile crime wave. It is obvious from the report that this is not the case. Does the Minister consider that such claims are a slander upon the vast majority of young people in South Australia who never come into conflict with the law in the manner suggested?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I would like to commend the honourable member for the confidence he has expressed in the young people of South Australia, a confidence shared by the Government and me. I agree with his assertion that the greater majority of our young people are not involved in any anti-social or criminal behaviour, as might have been suggested by recent press campaigns. The facts disclosed in the report clearly show that 6 799 individual juveniles appeared before juvenile courts or panels in the financial year 1976-77. The facts also show this was a reduction of 131 on figures for the previous year, so the kind of statement that has appeared in the press on occasions does not appear to have much substance. The report also shows that fewer than 1.6 per cent of the 427 000 young people in South Australia ever get into conflict with the law. That fact is also entirely overlooked by the press and media generally. The report has been tabled for several days and I am surprised that no-one has noticed it and pointed out that the facts recorded in the statistics of the courts do not bear out the assertion by some people that we are undergoing a juvenile crime wave.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Good news is not newspaper news.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I could not agree more, and I wish that trend would change. Young people today, although subject to greater pressures and temptations than we were in our day, manage to resist the inclination to misbehave. The figures I have given to the House clearly show we have every reason to be proud of the young people in our State.

Mr. Mathwin: How many are recidivists?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I refer the member for McNally (I mean the member for Glenelg) to Judge Newman's report, which he has apparently not read although it has been tabled, in which the judge says that

the picture is not bleak and that there is no cause for pessimism.

RAILWAYS

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Transport confirm the news report of September 8, 1977, that indicates that a new \$10 000 000 train fleet, or at least the first 26-unit order, will be in metropolitan service within 15 to 18 months?

Among the Minister's many pre-election statements and promises as reported (I repeat "as reported"), this one seems to be the most incredible of all. We have heard this afternoon, following a question from the member for Mawson, an explanation by the Minister about such a report, but it has been put to me that the Government is seriously embarrassed by its Minister of Transport's earlier statements, at least as reported, in which he claimed, for example, that 310 Volvo buses would be available for metropolitan and near-metropolitan service by a given time. I am informed that of the total order of 310 buses only about 50 buses have been completed. My information, notwithstanding the remarks this afternoon, is that fewer than one a week is being delivered and, therefore, it seems that by the end of 1977 only 60 buses will have been delivered of the 310 buses promised in November, 1974, for completion by 1977. I agree that this afternoon the Minister has to some extent negated that report: I repeat "to some extent", because he said that about 12 to 15 a month were being delivered by the contractor. However, that is simply an example to demonstrate the importance of the public being on the right track with respect to statements by the Minister of Transport, at least as he has been reported in the press. Accordingly, the confirmation sought on this occasion would be most welcome, rather than the Opposition's relying on and continuing to repeat further press reports.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting, and I ask him not to do so.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I acknowledge your request, Mr. Speaker. I have no further explanation. If we can obtain confirmation about the press report I have referred to, it would be handy, and hopefully it would clarify the position for everyone concerned.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should resume his seat when the Speaker stands. The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the House should take note of a couple of phrases used by the honourable member and apply those phrases to his approach. He says he has been "informed" that such and such is the case. Obviously, his informant, whoever it is, and the honourable member carefully chose not to name him—

Mr. Chapman: "As reported", I said.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has already asked his question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member has apparently forgotten what he said, because he said that he had been reliably informed that fewer than one bus a week was coming off the production line. Only two hours ago I checked that information, and I can tell the honourable member as a fact that as of last Friday 57 buses had been delivered from Pressed Metal Corporation.

Mr. Allison: In 12 months. That is one a week.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The pipsqueak from Mount Gambier can have his say in a moment.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What about the bruiser you put up against him?

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. I cannot hear what the Minister is saying, and I do not know whether anyone else can. I hope that interjections will cease for the remainder of Question Time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I offered to the honourable member the same facility that was offered to his predecessor, but which was never taken up: that is, that the services of my officers are available to him to have the whole question of transport explained to him in such detail as he desires. I should like to think that he would take up that offer.

Mr. Chapman: I will probably thank the Minister for that offer.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The question he asked was whether the rail cars for which tenders were called would be in service within 15 to 18 months. The answer depends entirely on the successful tenderer. The private enterprise tenderers who have been approached have indicated to us that that would be the case. However, I remind the honourable member that the private contract tenderers who are providing us with buses are not up to the timetable that they envisaged, and certainly I am unable to assure the House that the successful tenderer will be able to meet the time commitment. We sincerely hope that they will, and that is the best we can do. We have called tenders; they will be examined, and a tender will be awarded. Then we can only hope that the tenderers live up to their expectations.

BROKEN PROMISES

Mr. KENEALLY: My question, which is directed to the Premier, is prompted by a remark made last night by the member for Eyre when he mentioned some 200 fictitious promises. Can the Premier tell the House whether a work of fiction by the Leader of the Opposition, which was to have been published by that honourable gentleman's Party, has been a commercial success?

For some months the Leader of the Opposition has been carrying on about a work of fiction he was writing called "broken promises". This publication was given quite some publicity in the press and on a number of occasions the Leader announced it's imminent publication. I can quote from one of the Liberal Party's main mouthpieces (the Bill King column) in the *Sunday Mail* of August 3, which said that an initial print run of 10 000 copies costing \$4 000 was planned and that the book would be released soon. Again during the election campaign the Leader continually said that this elusive publication would be coming out shortly. Are these repeated claims in fact broken promises from the Leader of the Opposition, and do they indicate as little commercial flair as they do political veracity?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not been able to ascertain what commercial success there is in this venture, simply because I have not been able to obtain a copy. It would appear that the long-promised publication is being continually delayed. It would also appear that the Liberal Party, despite all the announcements it has made about broken promises, has about as much veracity in this as it had about the claim that I had called an early election in order to avoid a scandal in the Auditor-General's Report, about which they have been remarkably silent since the tabling of that report last week.

YUGOSLAV ADVISORY EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Minister of Education say to what extent the organisation known as the Yugoslav

Advisory Education Committee is acknowledged by the Minister and/or his officers to be the official mouthpiece regarding the educational needs of Croatian, Macedonian, Slovenian and Serbian speaking people resident in South Australia?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I have not heard of the organisation to which the honourable member refers. We have in South Australia, following recommendations from the Schools Commission, what is called the Migrant Advisory Committee. That is serviced by Mr. Jim Giles, the Deputy Director-General, Schools, in the department. There is on this committee a representative of the South Australian Serbian community and a representative of the Croatian community.

I would have preferred that there was a Yugoslav representative, full stop. However, it was not possible to obtain this solution (what we might call the "Yugoslav solution") to the problem. If, in fact, the committee to which the honourable member refers is seeking a Yugoslav solution to the problem, I would applaud its efforts, but I am very much in the hands of the community or communities, and we would want to respect their wishes in this matter. At this stage it would appear that it is the wish of the communities that there be separate Serbian and Croatian representation and that is the current state of play.

ST. AGNES CENTRE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education obtain for me a report on whether land has been reserved for the purpose of erecting a child-parent centre on land now held by the South Australian Land Commission that faces Smart Road, St. Agnes, for the provision of a future primary school?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes.

WOMEN'S SHELTER

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare say why he was unable to provide a reply to my question regarding the referral of a woman to a North Adelaide shelter when he is the Minister responsible for women's shelters? This incident occurred on October 7 (almost a week ago) and, if he cannot answer the question, perhaps he could obtain a reply from one of his brother Ministers.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has already asked that question.

SCHOOL TRANSPORT

Mr. ARNOLD: Some time ago I raised with the Minister of Education the matter of the Government's intention to increase excursion bus fares for school students, particularly those in the country. Can the Minister say whether the Government still intends to proceed with the gazettal notice stated and, if it does, does he agree that this would place an unfair burden on parents and students in the country?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: In the flurry of election activity, this matter seems to have passed beyond my ken temporarily, but I will obtain an up-to-date report from the department.

TRANSPORT STUDY

Mr. WILSON: I hope that the Minister of Transport does not think I am picking on him by asking him two questions in a row. Can he say whether the terms of reference of the North-East Area Public Transport Review study include a reference to the projected future development at Munno Para and, if they do not, will he consider widening the terms of reference of the study to include this matter? I understand that the Government has plans to establish up to 90 000 people in the Munno Para area eventually. If this is so, there will be obvious transport problems, and it seems to me that this matter could well be included in the study.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Proposals exist for expansion in the north-east area, in the Golden Grove area and in other areas of Munno Para to which the honourable member has referred. This is well known to the study team and, to the extent that it has application, as far as I am aware it has been fully taken into account. However, I think that the honourable member would know from the geography of the area that all of the expected population in that area would not use the north-east corridor. Indeed, my understanding is that only a relatively small number would do so. To the extent that this has application, it has been taken into account.

STIRLING DISTRICT PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Transport ask his department to consider improving transport services to the Stirling district area and to the Mitcham hills? I note that members of the Minister's Party have asked for improved services in the area south of Adelaide. Likewise, in the south-east, people in the Hills section suffer serious disadvantages. In many parts of those areas no bus service at all is in operation after 6 p.m., and bus services are infrequent during day-time periods. Will the Minister consider the possibility of giving a better service for that area? Many students have to hitch-hike back to the Hills, which is a dangerous practice nowadays. They do not all have their own transport, and if there is no public transport at suitable hours they have to hitch-hike, or parents or friends must drive to the city to pick them up and take them back to the Hills. The lack of a service is also a disadvantage for elderly people who do not wish to drive at night because they think it could be dangerous for them to do so. They do not have suitable transport services to go to the city to attend any night-time functions. Will the Minister ask his department to give serious consideration to providing improved services in this area?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The service (or lack of it) is well known to the department, and the Hills area, like other areas, has been the subject of consideration in an attempt to upgrade the services. The honourable member's area, like the ones I was asked about earlier by the member for Mawson, suffers from the disability that we have been virtually forced, through lack of new buses, simply to carry on the level of services that we inherited when these routes were taken over. I hope that the new Stirling depot, about which the honourable member knows, will be opened in the not too distant future. I cannot give a date, because the General Manager of the Bus and Tram Division and I are having discussions at present to try to determine a date. Certainly, it will be within the next few months. With that and, hopefully, the buses that will be coming, we will be in a position to provide the improved service which everyone desires and which certainly is the subject of the honourable member's question.

MAGISTRATE'S TRANSFER

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier make a full explanation to the House of how he happened yesterday not to table the letter of October 7 to him from Mr. D. F. Wilson, S.S.M.? Before explaining the question, I congratulate the Premier on his avoiding, with the co-operation of the Liberal Party, a debate on this matter today.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member does not comment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No.

The SPEAKER: I hope not.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was just offering congratulations. This is, of course, par for the course for the Liberal Party. They regard me as a greater enemy than they regard the Labor Party.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have made inquiries about this matter and I find that the letter dated October 7 from Mr. Wilson was delivered by hand to the Premier's office a few minutes after 3 p.m. last Friday. It was in an envelope to the Premier, and the envelope had on it "Personal". I find it extraordinary that, even though we had a long weekend, and, leaving out the three days of the weekend, four days later—from Friday to Tuesday later—the Premier still was not aware of such a letter, particularly as in his answer to my question to him on Thursday, the first day of the session, he anticipated an answer from Mr. Wilson to his letter, because he said this:

I do not intend to make one today—
that is, a statement—

the reason that I do not intend to make a statement today is that I have written to Mr. Wilson today in certain terms and wish him to have an opportunity to reply to me before I make a statement.

It is incomprehensible to me that the Premier could have come into the House yesterday without having himself made an inquiry in his department to see whether or not a reply had been received.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is now commenting. I hope that he will discontinue doing it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They are the two points that I make in my explanation. First, I know, because I have spoken to the person who delivered the letter, that it was given to the Premier's receptionist on the 11th floor of the State Administration Centre a few minutes after 3 p.m. last Friday. I have made the other point, on which you have pulled me up, that the Premier must have anticipated the reply from Mr. Wilson by what he said to me in the House last Thursday, yet he came here yesterday afternoon—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

Mr. Millhouse: Sir, I have not quite finished the explanation yet.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting. I have warned him on that matter. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have explained to the House how this occurred. However, I will further endeavour to enlighten the honourable member.

Mr. Millhouse: I should damned well think you would. You kick someone's backside in—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Oh, tut, tut! Really, the honourable member's pettiness and tetchery are becoming notorious.

Mr. Millhouse: If you can't get a letter on an important subject like this inside 24 hours—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: —there's something wrong with your department.

The SPEAKER: Order! I name the honourable member for Mitcham for—

Mr. Millhouse: Come on, what are you naming me for?

The SPEAKER: For persistently or wilfully obstructing the business of the House. I therefore name the honourable member for Mitcham. The honourable member for Mitcham has the right to be heard in explanation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I certainly did not desire to transgress in this way, but the Premier was quite disparaging in the way that he was replying to me. I have put to him a question about an obvious lack of efficiency in his department by referring to a letter that was delivered, I know, by hand last Friday afternoon but had not reached him by the time he came into the House yesterday to table correspondence that should have included that letter. When I interjected during his disparaging remarks to that effect he said that I was being tetchy, or something like that. That is enough to try anyone's patience. The Premier knows (and I know by looking at Government members and their supporters that they take this matter as seriously as it should be taken) that this is a serious matter and that that letter contains material which Mr. Wilson has written in his defence to the Premier and which should have been included, in fairness to him, when all the other correspondence was tabled.

If I have transgressed because I interjected on this matter, having already been rebuffed by the Liberal Party once today and then by the Premier in his reply to me, I am willing to apologise to the House for doing so, but I can only say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I believe I have been sorely tried by members on both sides; first by the Liberals in their failure to support me on what is obviously a matter of principle and controversy in the community that has had much publicity. All the Liberals did this afternoon was to play up yet again their view that I am a greater enemy to them politically than is the Labor Party. That can be the only reason why they refused to support me this afternoon on the urgency motion.

Then, when I took up, in the only way that is left to me, this matter with the Premier he disparages me and tries to excuse what is inexcusable inefficiency on the part of his department or a deliberate misleading of the House by him, which I do not suggest has happened. However they are the only two alternatives. Either the Premier must have known about the letter yesterday when he tabled the other correspondence and, because it is a spirited defence by Mr. Wilson on his own position, he decided not to include it with the other material, or it is inexcusable inefficiency on the part of his own department on a matter which his departmental officers must have known has been a matter of controversy in the community for a long time and a matter of controversy within the ranks of the Government. It is well known that the Government has an opinion on the matter as to what should be done with Mr. Wilson, and so on. Everyone should have been alerted on this matter so that, if a reply came from Mr. Wilson (and a reply was invited by the Premier when replying to me last Thursday), it should have gone straight to the Premier, yet 24 hours elapsed (and I omit the three days of the long weekend) before that letter got from the reception desk to the Premier's office on the 11th floor and, on his own—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —admission, to him.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is disobeying the Chair again. I want the honourable member to stick to his apology. The honourable member is going back over the same thing again and again.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am making an apology, and am explaining how I have been sorely tried today by both

sides of the House during Question Time. If I have transgressed, I have done so unwittingly. I certainly did not intend to transgress by interjecting, and I would not have done so had I not been taunted in the way that I was by the Premier. The Attorney may snigger.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This whole mountain (the Attorney calls it a "saga") has been blown out of a mole hill because the Premier has been loyal enough to stick by the Attorney-General, who made some ill-considered remarks on a radio programme.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not part of the apology. This is the second time I have warned the honourable member. The honourable Attorney-General was out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order now, and I hope that he will stick to his apology.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is just all this taunting that I am getting that has made me so angry. I unreservedly apologise to you, Sir. You are a new Speaker, and I respect you. I certainly do not wish to transgress either Standing Orders or your rulings. I hope that my apology will be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must withdraw from the Chamber.

Mr. Millhouse: Give me time just to pack up first. I assure you, Sir, and other honourable members that the last has not been heard of this matter.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order, and he knows it.

The honourable member for Mitcham having withdrawn from the Chamber:

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

That the honourable member for Mitcham be suspended from the service of the House.

Motion carried.

COMMISSIONERS OF THE PEACE

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Attorney-General in recent months considered alterations to the age limit that shall apply to commissioners of the peace and the duties they will be called upon to perform within the community?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Some consideration has been given to those matters. In order to present the honourable member with a full report on what steps have been taken in that area, I undertake to get a full report for him. Recently, several matters involving justices of the peace have been raised. As those matters are somewhat lengthy, I will obtain a report for the honourable member. I know he has a particularly keen interest in this matter. The question he has asked today is part of a long-standing interest he has shown in the House in this matter.

RAILWAYS TRANSFER

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister of Transport say what stage has been reached in negotiations between the Federal Government and the State Government regarding the transfer of the non-metropolitan railways? This matter has been negotiated by the Minister with the Federal Government for some time now and regrettably without proper reply or action by the Federal Government, and I think we are all most anxious

to know whether negotiations are proceeding on a more amicable basis than has been the case.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Negotiations are still proceeding and I do not know how long it will be before finality is reached. The areas in dispute have been narrowed quite markedly. Probably about the only major areas outstanding would be those relating to the application of approved long service leave, workmen's compensation and a redundancy scheme. It has become abundantly clear to the officers negotiating this transfer that the final determination on these matters will probably have to be made on a Minister-to-Minister basis. In this regard, although attempts have been made for the Federal Minister and I to get together to have discussions, I regret to say that so far it has not been possible to arrange a mutually agreeable time. The Federal Minister has offered me two or three appointments of about one hour's duration at some odd time in Canberra, but because of the sittings of the House it has not been possible for me to go there. I suggested to him that perhaps tomorrow in Melbourne before the Transport Ministers Conference he and I could sit down for a couple of hours and try to thrash out these matters, but the information I have received from his officers is that he is not willing to do so. I hope the matter can be finalised soon because some of the problems now arising have arisen only because of the protracted negotiations.

At 3.11 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from October 11. Page 107)

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I was interested to find that when the Treasurer made his Budget speech he was keen to assert that he was the author of the statements. He preened himself in his place in answer to interjections and embraced the fact that he was the author of the statements contained in this document. One has only to read the document to accept that it was prepared by a person seeking to get cheap political gain and prepared to go against what has become a tradition in this place, namely, the presentation of a document of some import that offers a true and faithful representation of the economic affairs of this State. This document, which by tradition every member of this House will support, is only a masquerade of what a financial statement used to be, because of the cheap political propaganda in which the Treasurer has indulged in bringing the matters before this House. Had Mr. Wran brought down his Budget before the Treasurer brought down his Budget last Thursday, some matters would have been presented differently, because what Mr. Wran said in New South Wales last evening is in stark conflict with some of the attitudes that the Treasurer has espoused in this place.

Let us not forget that Mr. Wran is the protege of the Treasurer of this State and has been following the pattern set by this Government over a long period. In some of the statements Mr. Wran made last evening it would appear that he is determined to take over the mantle of being the front runner. I hazard a guess that many of the decisions taken by the Wran Government last evening will have precisely the same effect on that economy as the front

running activities of this Government have had in eroding the financial benefits that South Australia formerly enjoyed.

This document, which should be a statement of fact but which I claim is not, asserts that inflation has not been reduced. In the short session in July and August before the recent election, I asked the Deputy Premier, who was in charge of the debate at the time, what rate of inflation associated with wages, salaries and services the Government would use for the 1977-78 period. Whilst the Deputy Premier acknowledged the validity of the question, he said that he could not answer it at that time, and he undertook to obtain a figure for me. A few days later I received a letter stating that the increase would be about 10.5 per cent to 12 per cent. After discussion with the Commonwealth and probably at various Premiers' Conferences, the Government was planning its Budget on the basis of a 10.5 per cent to 12 per cent increase in the inflation rate. That factor is borne out by a statement buried in the document we are now debating. I ask the Treasurer to go back to a similar document introduced on September 7, 1976, in which he talked about a 21 per cent increase in the inflation rate for the 1975-76 period.

Mr. Allison: That was a vote of confidence, wasn't it?

Dr. EASTICK: Exactly. Who was in charge of the economy of Australia at the time the Treasurer was talking of a 21 per cent increase in inflation associated with salaries and wages? Yet the Treasurer now has the audacity to indicate we have not had any decrease in the inflation rate. It is interesting to see what many people of substance in Australia have to say about inflation and its importance. The most recent Annual Report of the Chairman of Commonwealth Banking Corporation (1977) states:

Economic policies for the 1977-78 fiscal year have been formulated upon the basis that Australia still has some way to go in restoring the preconditions for lasting economic growth. Reduction of inflation remains the Government's primary economic objective. Rapid recovery and economic activity is not anticipated and is not being sought, but fiscal and monetary policies are being aimed at moderate, non-inflationary growth.

The report of the President of the Australian Finance Conference for 1976-77 states:

In the last three annual reports of conference the dominant theme has been the need to control inflation and restore the economy to balance. Considerable concern was expressed about the effects of inflation, stagnant economic activity and turbulent financial markets. In the past 12 months I believe that solid progress has been made on the long road towards the control of inflation. Despite some conflict in economic indicators, the underlying rate of inflation has been falling and an increase in real growth seems to be emerging. Undoubtedly, there will be adverse movements in some economic indicators, particularly of a short-term nature, in the months to come. However, it is essential that the significance of the underlying trend be recognised so that it can be reflected in confidence in the market-place.

That is a very responsible attitude, and certainly in direct conflict to the attitude expressed in this place last week by the Treasurer, an attitude that is almost completely a mirror image of the Hayden attitude of recent times, and one that is totally against the best interests of the Australian economy.

I believe that the Treasurer has joined with Hayden in seeking to destroy the most important issue in economic recovery, be it State or Federal, and that is confidence. At the root of gaining that confidence is the importance of coming face to face with inflation. I do not stop at that point because there are other people who say the same

things in almost identical terms but with some slight variations that I believe should be recorded. In the report of the National Bank of Australasia Limited at the 118th Annual Meeting, the Chairman's address at page 8, under the heading "A difficult period of transition", states:

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

I will quote at some length, because I believe that the theme developed by these people is important to enable us to grasp the true impact of what they are saying. The report continues:

However, it would be a pity if developments such as these were to obscure the progress which has been made during the past year in restoring a sounder economic and financial environment. There are several important points which need to be made. The success achieved in containing Government spending is especially pleasing to those of us who have witnessed at first hand the disruptive impact of burgeoning Government activities on the nation's economic and financial system. Nobody should expect the difficult transition from excessive reliance on Government spending to a more balanced economy to be achieved overnight and without some difficulties. Facing up squarely to our responsibilities is not always easy or painless but it must be done if economic prosperity in this country is to be restored.

Surely, we are looking for economic prosperity in the whole country, certainly in the context of this place within South Australia, but if we believe that South Australia is not a part of the whole Australian scene, we fool ourselves. I believe that the Treasurer, in his announcements last week, wanted it to be seen in the whole Australian scene. His cheap political activity was in the belief that there may be a Federal election before the end of this year.

Another authority on the same matter who is worthy of comment is the Chairman of the Australian Chambers of Commerce. In a special issue commemorating the 73rd Annual Conference, in a copy of *Canberra Comments*, volume 31 Nos. 5 and 6 of May and June, 1977, in his presidential address Mr. Hickson states:

Inflation still remains Australia's number one economic problem and the Government deserves the widest measurement of community support for the determined efforts it is making to bring the problem under control.

Under the heading "Fiscal Policy" he states:

A cornerstone of the Government's policy has been to redirect resources away from the public sector to the private sector. It has not done this out of some act of favouritism for the private sector, but to bring the economy back into better balance after a prolonged period of excessive governmental expansion at the expense of the private sector. In commending the Government on the efforts it has made to cut Government spending, we have put the view to responsible Ministers that further reductions in Government spending are not only possible, but desirable.

As we discuss the lines of the Budget, there will be many instances in which Opposition members (and indeed Government members, if they would dare to question the activities of their Treasurer and his Executive) will be able to show where major reductions in expenditure are possible in the Budget. A reference in the National Bank's monthly summary for June, 1977, under the heading "Australia's Economy in Perspective" states:

The latest national account statistics confirm the setback to

activity during the first quarter of 1977. After allowing for the impact of seasonal factors, real gross domestic production, that is, the aggregate volume of goods and services produced, declined by 0.4 per cent during this period. The major soft spots to emerge were in the areas of consumer spending and dwelling activity. Outlays by consumers, which normally constitute one of the most stable elements of spending, fell by almost 2 per cent while expenditure on dwellings declined by 6.5 per cent following almost two years of recovery. The other major sources of demand, fixed capital expenditure by private business, exports of Australian goods, and Government outlays, also fell.

They have looked at the thing in perspective and have come up with the fact, which is known to anyone who considers the matter in its proper perspective, that one cannot take a simple political ideological view, such as the Treasurer did last week, and look at any one part of the Budget in isolation from the overall involvement. A person well known to the Treasurer, and certainly politically aligned to him, made the point clearly when he delivered an address in July this year. I have referred to these comments before, but they are so good that they should be repeated. They are as follows:

There is an overwhelming recognition by nearly everybody, including trade unionists and especially their wives, that 20 per cent wage increases are of no lasting benefit if they are followed by 20 per cent price increases. Everywhere I go I find widespread acceptance of the view that we must not go back to the madness of two or three years ago.

Yet that is precisely what the Treasurer, in the pronouncements he made last week, was asking us to do. The author of these comments, which are of considerable impact, was none other than Mr. Callaghan, Prime Minister of Great Britain. His comments are also fortified by a statement by Mr. Healey, Chancellor of the Exchequer in Mr. Callaghan's Government, who made the following point:

The Government continues to regard the mastery of inflation as the pre-condition for success in returning to full employment.

If a responsible Minister in the House of Commons can see these things as being of vital importance, why cannot the Premier of this State see precisely the same facts when those facts are there almost in neon lights for everyone to see?

I now refer to various issues in the Auditor-General's report, from which it is possible to determine the actual sum of money which has been made available from the Federal Government to the State over a period of years and, further, to relate the increase that applies in each of those years to a percentage so that one can see what percentage increase there has been. This is purely statistical detail, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Commonwealth Income 1971-77

Financial Year	Commonwealth Funds \$	Annual Increase \$	Percentage Increase
1971-72	175 865 777	—	—
1972-73	200 823 941	24 958 164	14.19
1973-74	229 954 578	29 130 637	14.5
1974-75	312 354 810	82 400 232	35.85
1975-76	388 286 910	75 932 100	24.31
1976-77	465 270 632	76 983 722	19.82

Dr. EASTICK: Reference to these statistics will show that in the year 1972-73 there was a 14.19 per cent increase in the amount of Commonwealth money made available to this State over that available in 1971-72. There was a 14.5 per cent increase in 1973-74, rising to a 35.85 per cent increase in the year 1974-75. They are the same mad years (three or four years ago) which were referred to in entirely another context in the English scene, but which are completely applicable to the South Australian scene, and the figures show an increase from the Federal source which could not be sustained.

I point out to members opposite that much of that increase in fact (about 68 per cent) was in directly controlled grants. Another Government apart from the South Australian scene was determining the policies and, more particularly, determining the priorities that would apply to the undertakings associated with the public spending sector. Never would I want to see the situation, no matter what the political persuasion of the Government in control in South Australia, of a return to a situation where the Federal Government was predetermining for the State Government the areas in which the State's funds would be applied. I believe that the State Government has a far better knowledge of the requirements of its people and, as it is answerable to them, it should have the right to apply its funds according to the priorities it has determined.

A situation which has returned to this State, and indeed to every other State under the present Administration, a situation which is applying today with the approbation of members of all political persuasions so far as local government is concerned and which is one of the real achievements of more recent years, is that the money now being made available directly to local government is available for expenditure in its own areas of priority. That situation should apply also in the State field in relation to the money it gets from the Commonwealth.

If we go a little further with this document we find that for the year 1975-76 the amount of Commonwealth money made available was only 24.31 per cent more than that which had applied in the previous year. I repeat the two figures so that members can appreciate this point: there was a 35.85 per cent increase for 1974-75, and a 24.31 per cent increase for 1975-76. The further point I make is that both of those amounts were determined by a Federal Labor Party Treasurer and that the massive decrease of 11.54 per cent which applied between 1974-75 and 1975-76 was introduced to this Government not by a Federal Government of Liberal and National Country Party persuasion but by a Federal Labor Party. I refer to the Hayden Budget of 1975, which had that effect. In fact, the decrease which applied for 1976-77, which is the period applicable to the Lynch Budget or Liberal and National Country Party Budget of 1976, was of only 4.5 per cent over the previous year. That was a reduction from 24.31 per cent in 1975-76 to 19.82 per cent in 1976-77.

I believe that the charade of the Treasurer in this place last week does him no credit. It is certainly no credit to the Government that he leads that its members should idly sit behind him, not one of them having risen to enter this debate on such a vital issue to expose the folly of the cheap political points that he was making.

Much comment is made by the Treasurer in the document about the State's unemployment relief scheme. He picked up the point that for the current financial year there is to be an increase to \$22 000 000 in spending. He claimed that members on this side of the House had dubbed his programme as "squandering money". I am proud to be able to stand in this place and say that I have been critical of the Government's programme, and I will

continue to be critical of it—not that I want to see misery upon the shoulders of those who are unfortunate enough to be unemployed. I believe it is an unfortunate fact of life that unemployment is so high, not only in Australia but in many areas of the world. Australia has come into this situation later than have many other countries in the world. I am glad that I am getting some acceptance of that point from across the way.

Instead of a charge of squandering being laid against members of the Opposition, it should be laid against the Government in relation to that scheme, because instead of employing six men on a certain sum of money it is employing only five men, as it is paying a 20 per cent loading for what amounts to permanent employment, not just a temporary job necessitating a 20 per cent loading: it gives the authorities undertaking the work the opportunity either of providing the people with employment and picking up a percentage for sickness, holidays, or whatever, or of giving them straight out employment plus 20 per cent.

Evidence is available to show that most of the people are being employed on plus 20 per cent on somewhat fictitious levels of job names or job specifications. Many people in the community who could be employed are being denied employment because of the Government's measures. I go one step further and point out that the Government has accepted workmen's compensation liability for people on those schemes: in this House, in answer to a Question on Notice it was stated that it was paying in excess of 15 per cent for workmen's compensation to the S.G.I.C. for the employment of a large number of these people, whereas local government bodies, who are the employing agencies, could obtain cover for those people at below 7 per cent. So, there is a squandering of more than 8 per cent because of the payment to the S.G.I.C., and that is against the principle of further or better employment of the people in the scheme. I am prepared to show members opposite the figures I have just stated. They are documented in *Hansard*, and they were given in replies by Ministers.

There are many other areas on which I would have liked to touch, but time does not permit me to do so. However, I will refer briefly to the per capita taxation situation applying in Australia today. From official statistics taken from figures produced by each Australian State, using the same headings from the budgetary documents, it can be seen that the highest per capita tax of all of the smaller States is paid by South Australians. I make the point (lest there be any misunderstanding) that no other States include in the figures they determine for per capita taxation the amount they receive from royalties. At \$241.67 a head, South Australians are paying more tax than are Tasmanians, West Australians, or Queenslanders, and the amount they are paying is only marginally greater than the amount paid by people in the larger States of New South Wales and Victoria. I believe that this gives the lie to the incorrect statements made by the Australian Labor Party at the most recent election when it kept misrepresenting the true facts of the per capita amounts associated with the Australian States. It is necessary to state and restate that we in South Australia are, unfortunately, being heavily taxed. If we move away from the involvement of the individual, as such, and into the field of taxation and costs levied against business we find that yet again the South Australian Government is exporting jobs from South Australia to other States at an ever increasing rate, because of the trends which have been introduced and which have been against our interests.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time

has expired. Before calling on the next honourable member, I ask that he be shown the courtesy of the House on this occasion. The honourable member for Mawson.

Mr. DRURY (Mawson): First, Mr. Speaker, I wish to acknowledge your appointment as Speaker. With your 15 years of experience, I know that all of us will be well protected. Secondly, I pay a tribute to the former member for Mawson (Hon. D. J. Hopgood). In my 14 years of residence in the district, I can say that no-one who has represented us has had so much respect or has brought to the institution of Parliament so much respect.

In supporting the Budget, I wish to refer to several issues concerning my district. The first is the continuing problem of unemployment. It is a distressing thing to be unemployed, and those who have experienced it will know what I mean, because such distress brings with it a certain lack of confidence and an inability to be able to maintain a family and a home. Indeed, in the past few days I have had representations from constituents of mine who have got themselves into trouble because they have purchased houses, with small deposits, in the belief that they could maintain them. Unfortunately, several of them have become unemployed, and now they are facing difficulties. I bring that point to members' attention, because not only does unemployment bring distress in relation to the purchase of a home but also it brings a certain degree of lack of respect for the head of the family if he is unable to provide.

The following figures were supplied by the Morphett Vale Commonwealth Employment Office: at the end of August, 1977, 754 adult males, 265 adult females, 424 junior males, and 320 junior females were unemployed. At the end of September, 1977, 720 adult males, 288 adult females, 378 junior males, and 284 junior females were unemployed. At the end of August, 1977, the total was 1 763, whereas at the end of September, 1977, it had dropped slightly to 1 670. This drop has been attributed to a combination of two factors, namely, seasonal conditions, and the existence of the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. I commend the Government for providing \$22 000 000 in the Budget towards this scheme to provide work for the unemployed, because it gives them an opportunity to say to an employer, "Yes, I have been employed." That employment may be for only a short time but, nevertheless, it does much to increase their confidence and give them some experience in some form of work. Indeed, in my electoral district, considerable areas of footpaths have been laid under unemployment schemes. On collector roads such as South Road we can see evidence of the benefit of the unemployment relief schemes, and I can verify, as can many parents of small children coming home from school, that in the winter these footpaths are well appreciated.

During the past couple of days, members have heard much about the problem of inflation. Inflation has been with us for some time, and it is interesting to find out whence this phenomenon came. Prior to my being elected to Parliament, I was a valuer by profession, and I can recall back in the mid-1960's having made searches of properties sold under a lease-back arrangement whereby the purchaser leased the property back for a term of, say, 10 years, with rent reviews every three years. Prior to that, the system was that a property would be built (I refer to income-producing property) and a return would be expected from it. Part of that return would be set aside for what was called a sinking fund, so that, at the end of a given number of years, the fund would have grown to such a sum that the building could be replaced. Unfortunately, I think that the lease-back system contributed to inflation even 13 years ago, because what was being done every

three years was reviewing the rent for a fixed amount of space. Basically, that is what inflation really is: an extra sum of money for the same product.

I refer also to the implementation of the total wage, which was introduced in 1966 at the instigation of the Employers Federation. Prior to that, we had the basic wage and margins concept, which has put us in good stead for 60 years since 1907, when the first basic wage was awarded in the harvester case. However, with the rejection of the basic wage, we have seen the rejection of a certain set of values. A situation could arise, and did arise, where the bread-winner, the head of the family, an adult tradesman, found that his teenage son was earning more than he was earning. The son may be unskilled, but still could be earning more than his father. Therefore, the head of the family could suffer loss of esteem. I am well aware, from what my parents have told me, that the basic wage and margins concept was not a king's ransom. We still had difficulty in making ends meet, as indeed everyone in receipt of wages has had for as long as I can remember. So, inflation in that sense is nothing new. The introduction of the total wage in 1966 has not, I believe, helped to control inflation. I believe that the total wage concept has added to inflation, because what it did in its initial stages was to bypass the arbitration system, and a free-for-all developed whereby those most in demand received the greatest sum at that time.

Another factor which I believe has contributed to the inflationary spiral has been the lack of action on the part of pre-Labor Governments, the Gorton and McMahon Administrations. In 1971, we had an extraordinarily high export boom. Unfortunately, there was no compensatory reduction or revaluation in the currency. One of the first acts of the Whitlam Government after coming into office in December, 1972, was the revaluation upwards of the currency. The Whitlam Government, so much maligned nowadays, is not given credit for anything. Unfortunately, its action was too late. It should have been taken at least a year earlier.

I can recall that, when the present Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. Snedden, was Treasurer, he was complaining at that time about high unemployment and what was then rising inflation, and he coined the word "stagflation". I recall that, on a television interview, he quite bluntly said that he had no answer for it. A partial answer could have been found if the Government of which he was a member had taken a little bit of action.

Another factor contributing to inflation in the whole of the Western world has been the Vietnam war, and we are well aware of the inflationary nature of that. Fortunately, it has passed, but we still have the leftovers in the form of inflation. The mineral boom of 1971 also contributed to inflation. People were bidding on the share market for pieces of paper. In the Poseidon venture, for instance, shares rose to as much as \$400 without a single spade having been turned in the earth to mine the metal.

So much for unemployment and its effects. I turn now to another matter affecting my district, the matter of public transport. Ever since I moved to the southern suburbs in December, 1963, public transport has been a problem. I recall that, when I worked in the city, there was no bus service after 6.30 p.m. so that, if one worked overtime or had evening studies, one had to catch another bus service to Darlington and walk up the hill, hoping to get a lift home from some passing motorist. That system prevailed for several years until action was taken by local residents and an evening bus service was introduced. This was a 9 p.m. service from the city, and initially it had very few passengers. However, as it became better known it had quite a few passengers. Eventually another later bus

service was introduced for those who had been to the city for entertainment.

When the much-maligned Whitlam Government came to office, we received the Christie Downs railway, one of the greatest boons to the development of the southern suburbs. Those who have travelled on that railway to the city, commuting to their places of work, have had nothing but praise for it. It is definitely a winner. People who had previously travelled by car to the city have expressed great admiration for this service when they have used it. To my knowledge, few indeed have gone back to their motor vehicles.

After the introduction of the Christie Downs railway, the bus service was run by the State Transport Authority. Unfortunately, this was at a time when buses were not as freely available as they could have been. However, things have gradually improved until only several months ago a new feeder bus was established from Morphett Vale East to cater for the opening up of the newly developing residential areas. This bus carries passengers to the Lonsdale railway station. The big advantage of this service is that, if one gets the bus at Hackham East and travels to the train, one pays only 50c, which is the same as if one drove to the Lonsdale railway station to pick up the train there. In effect, passengers get a free bus ride, greatly facilitating the opportunity for housewives during the day to get to the city for shopping and relaxation.

I noted with pleasure in the Premier's policy speech that a feeder service would be provided from the Sheidow Park and Trott Park area to the Brighton railway station. I am happy about this announcement, because that area to some degree suffers from a form of isolation. It consists of two subdivisions on no public transport route, and is a considerable distance from the South Road and from the trainline at Christie Downs. Of course, the buses that have been provided have come from State revenue, from the funds we obtained from the sale of the railways to the Commonwealth Government. This fact seems to have been overlooked during the past few days.

In addition, this Government has provided fare reductions. It might sound strange in this inflationary period to find something reduced in cost, but fares which once cost 75c by bus from the city to Morphett Vale now cost 50c. Unfortunately, we have seen action on the part of the Federal Government to increase the price of petrol. By the end of 1978, petrol will be increased in price by 11c a gallon and by 1980 by 50c a gallon. This will cause a certain amount of hardship to constituents, especially in the District of Mawson and the adjoining District of Baudin. Not only is the centre of the District of Mawson 17 miles from the city, but we also have to climb the hill from Darlington on our way home, consuming more petrol.

Overall, I think that whilst the transport situation has improved somewhat in the southern suburbs in the 14 years I have lived there, there is still room for further improvement. I sincerely hope that the Government will pursue this improvement. In particular, constituents of mine from Happy Valley have requested a feeder bus service from that area to the Lonsdale railway station, passing through the Reynella shopping centre, which again is a great advantage for housewives during the day.

Moving away from the district, I wish to applaud the Government on one issue. I refer to the \$5 000 000 investment for the exploration of the Cooper Basin. In a district such as Mawson, great emphasis is placed on either public or private transport services, so the search for fuel will be most important. We will be faced with an energy crisis at some time in the future; some say it will be as early as 10 years hence. It is pleasing to see that the Government is taking action now to do something about

that projected crisis so that it will not hit us so badly. The Mines Department, according to the Budget papers, has had established an energy branch at a cost of \$800 000, and no doubt this will spearhead the search for additional fuel.

I wish to bring to the notice of the House that, over the past few days, we have heard several comments about high valuations of land. The value of land is determined by reference to sales of similar properties, and this is not the whim of any particular valuer of real estate or of any Government assessor or valuer. It is a practice laid down since before Federation and continued to be laid down after Federation by the courts of this land. The valuer is merely carrying out the requirements of the courts in valuing land by reference to sales of similar properties.

During an inflationary period of high values obviously there must be a correspondingly high assessment: it cannot be any other way. Moves have occurred in the past, not only recently but as long ago as 30 or 40 years, that land valuations be based on productivity. Unfortunately for those people who have made such moves and, fortunately for the profession, that line of action has been rejected by the courts, which have adhered definitely to the concept that the value of land is determined by reference to the sale of similar property, that is, property put to its highest and best use.

In the past few days reference has been made to the British Labour Party and to the way it is tackling the problems besetting that country. From what has been said, it would seem that Labor Parties throughout the world are part of one great monolith. Unfortunately, people who make such insinuations do not seem to recognise that national characteristics and boundaries are involved. When one considers the British Labour Party, one must accept that it has lived with that glorious institution known as the House of Lords for as long as the Party has existed. According to press reports, only recently the Labour Party in Britain has moved to curtail the power of the House of Lords.

When I was in Israel last year I ascertained, to my grief, that the Israeli Government sells its surplus arms and weapons to the South African regime of Voerster and company. At that time the Israeli Government was a coalition of religious and political groups, the largest group being the Israeli Labour Party, and it grieved me deeply to think that it should find reason, even if it was to gain extra currency, to sell surplus weapons and arms to a regime whose leaders were interred during the last war because of their obvious fascist sympathies.

I cannot see how one can allude to any so-called monolithic practice of Labor Parties throughout the world. The Australian Labor Party is not necessarily the same in all respects as the British Labour Party. True, we have a basic philosophy—security for all our people. That would be indisputable. We do not, however, always use the same means of achieving our philosophic ends.

The Mawson District contains many aesthetically pleasant spots: the Hills face backdrop, the green belt that includes the C.S.I.R.O. development farm, and the Happy Valley Reservoir. It would be sad to see any attack on those open spaces. As the member for Mawson, I will defend most rigorously the maintenance of those open spaces and I hope that, during my period of tenure of this seat, I will push for as much improvement as I can in the form of recreational facilities. Leisure time can be likened to fire, since fire is a wonderful servant but a terrible master. Leisure time, too, can also be a wonderful servant and a terrible master. Unless we provide recreational facilities so that people can use their leisure time more profitably such things as vandalism will continue to

increase and cause a continuing cost to the community. Again, I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to your office and hope that in future you will give your judgment with impartiality.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): In joining the debate and following the new member for Mawson (the first of the new members to make his contribution) I congratulate him on his speech. He would not expect me to endorse the philosophies he espouses, but I do with good fellowship wish him well in the House and commend him for the way in which he addressed himself to the matter before the Chair. I, too, join him in extending congratulations to you, Sir, on your election to the highest office that this House can bestow on one of its members. I also look forward to your impartial discharge of your duties. I am sure the experience you have had in this place and in other fields of human endeavour will qualify you to carry out the trust that Parliament has placed in you.

The member for Mawson said that he was most distressed to see people faced with unemployment. In that regard we all agree with him. Different Governments espouse different philosophies about why people are in that situation. My colleagues, who have addressed themselves to this measure, have dealt in some detail with the manner in which the Treasurer's document was drawn and to his preamble and the dressing provided for the election which his Federal colleagues have forecast and for which they hope. This matter is given much prominence on the Australian scene by Mr. Hayden. Early in his speech the Treasurer states:

This Budget was brought down against a backdrop of a steadily deteriorating national economy with markedly increasing unemployment and no reduction in inflation.

Many reasons exist for that, and the blame for it cannot be laid at the door of the Federal Government. Coming nearer home, one should consider the policies of the State Government. The Labor Party, with an increased majority, has a commission to govern that was granted at the election, an election held on new electoral boundaries. That increased majority gives the Government increased responsibility. To the new members who have joined their colleagues on the Government benches, I say that I hope they will bring a refreshing approach to the Government. They are all young men. Today we hear so much about young people that I hope those new members will, for the sake of South Australia, bring a refreshing and invigorating approach to the State economy.

A State Government is responsible for the administration of the State. The new members having considered the needs of their districts should be well qualified to use their influence on this Government, which is not without some need of being propped up in certain areas. The member for Spence smiles. Perhaps he has been moved to the middle ranks for stability purposes.

On this side of the House we have argued about the Workmen's Compensation Act. We do not deny that there should be adequate workmen's compensation provisions, but it should not be more profitable not to be at work than it is to be attending a place of employment. The Government must surely look at this situation. It is all very well, as we heard by way of interjection last week, to blame members of the Opposition for the situation in which we find ourselves today because they did not support certain legislation. For the benefit of new members it is well known that an amending Bill was introduced which became the subject of a conference with the other place. As the conference reached a stalemate, the situation was back where it started. Certain people with a "Wimbledon back" can still become a drain on society and employers and that limits job opportunities.

This may be in essence only a small thing, but, especially in view of the present level of unemployment, the Opposition must take a responsible attitude to this matter and do everything it can to bring it to the notice of the Government and the public. Reference to that particular overhead that impinges on private enterprise has fallen on deaf ears.

The Treasurer started this speech with several pages of abuse of the Prime Minister and his Government for what they are doing to the economy. This would be the worst document describing how the Government proposes to spend its money to run the State we have ever seen. It ill behoves the Leader of the Government to spend the first 20 minutes of his address in spreading scandal about a Government that inherited probably the worst economic situation we have seen in the history of Australia. This situation has been worsened by strikes and industrial action, such a strike occurring now in an Eastern State. The flow on from these disputes causes much difficulty.

One area in which the State Government can make an impact on the local scene is pay-roll tax. This has already been referred to by the member for Light but attention should be drawn to it again. In his policy speech a few weeks ago the Leader of the Opposition said that in Government his Party would make an effort to relieve the impost of pay-roll tax on the employers of this State, thereby creating job opportunities. That statement fell on deaf ears because the then Government is again on the Treasury Benches. It is interesting to see that yesterday the Premier of New South Wales, who is of the same political persuasion as this Government, announced that his Government will put aside \$10 000 000 to finance a full rebate of pay-roll tax. I acknowledge that the Government has made a partial move in that direction but it is interesting to see that the announcement of David Tonkin has been taken up by the Premier of New South Wales. This must be a sign to the Government and I hope that Cabinet will do something about it.

Mr. Wran's announcement is similar to the scheme announced by the Liberal Party during the recent election campaign. It is interesting to note that this scheme was criticised and rejected during television appearances by the Treasurer during that campaign. I think the increase in the exemption from \$48 000 to \$60 000 announced by the Treasurer does not go far enough. I believe an amendment to the Workmen's Compensation Act to make it more profitable to be at work than away from work and the abolition of pay-roll tax are areas in which the Government should join forces with Mr. Neville Wran to get the economy of South Australia running again.

The member for Mawson referred to the Leader's comments regarding the British Labour Government and the West German Social Democrats taking action to cut public spending. The Leader's comments were designed to give the lie to the Treasurer's assertion that the Australian Government's policies are in direct contrast to those of every Government in the Western world. In relation to public spending cuts, the British Labour Government and the West German Government have adopted similar approaches to Mr. Fraser's approach in this fiscal year.

The member for Mawson clearly does not comprehend what the Leader has said, nor has he read properly the Treasurer's speech. That is typical of the attitude of members of the Government in contrast to the attitude of the members on this side of the House. I do not know whether Bill Hayden is the shadow Treasurer or the future Leader of the Labor Party, but our own South Australian representative on financial affairs, the Commonwealth member for Adelaide, seems to be truly the shadow Treasurer. It is obvious the debate on this Budget is clearly

directed towards an early Federal election, but no-one knows when it will be held.

My colleague, the member for Light, referred to the question of per capita taxation, and I point out, too, that in considering the claims of the Treasurer we should bear in mind that South Australians are paying about \$245 a head more tax than are people in Tasmania and Western Australia and Queensland, and this emphasises how the people of this State are being fleeced. This situation is laid at the door of the Government for the way in which, after 10 years on the Treasury benches, it is discharging its duties at present. Yet the Government makes extravagant claims that South Australia has the lowest unemployment rate and the lowest tax rate of any State. The Australian Graziers and Woolgrowers Council report, when referring to rural industries, states:

The rural sector has always been of major importance to the Australian economy and it continues as a major earner of export income, as the foundation for decentralisation, and as the livelihood of small and large rural towns and cities.

However, there has been a loss in direct rural employment of 110 people a week for the past 23 years.

That emphasises the situation obtaining in rural areas of this State and pretty well throughout Australia. The report continues:

Rural problems are fundamentally caused by restricted and unstable market access overseas and rapid inflation in Australia.

The question of inflation is the bug-bear of all Budgets and has been given an airing again, as it will be many times during this debate. The graziers council sees this as a real problem for rural industries in Australia. I point out to the Government that, whilst the Australian rural scene is largely Federally orientated, it also plays an important part in the economy of this State.

At present we are in the grip of one of the most severe droughts that this country has experienced. A line in the Budget allocates finance for drought relief, and I was interested to see that a meeting was held at Cleve this week at which about 350 farmers were present. That is one of the worst affected areas of this State, and I hope the Minister of Agriculture, who I understand is responsible, will have the machinery to allot the necessary capital inflow for those people who, through no fault of their own, are now extremely short of cash. Their properties have been ravaged and will take more than two or three seasons to return to the previous high levels of productivity. In that regard the local administration is much a part of the State scene, and it is tied up with what is included in the Budget. When we discuss the lines, I will refer to these and other matters, but at present I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. KLUNDER (Newland): The Treasurer in his second reading explanation said that the Budget was based on an economic philosophy opposite to that followed by the Federal Government. It was interesting to hear the Leader of the Opposition indicate on the same day that, apart from the introductory section, the Budget was similar to one that would have been introduced by the Liberal Party. For someone following the Federal Liberal line so closely that he was in danger of treading on their heels, it represented such a switch, that I looked forward to newspaper headlines with some degree of interest. I was disappointed: there were no such headlines and not even a statement in *Hansard*. What started as a switch in policy on Thursday had, by the following Tuesday, diminished to the level of a simple spelling error or a mistake in grammar. I hope the Leader, when he comes back into the Chamber, will explain how he managed to do that,

because I am sure if we learned that trick we would be better debaters, at least in retrospect.

I refer mainly to education expenditure indicated in the Budget, and formulate most of my remarks around two distinct contrasts: one in a personal experience sense and the other in an over-view of the finance for education. I started teaching in South Australia in 1963, and my first school had a staff of 18 and 350 students, which gave a student-teacher ratio of about 19.5 to 1. The staff consisted of a headmaster, three senior masters, and 14 staff members, many of whom had not been trained as teachers. Apart from the two cleaning ladies that was the entire staff; we had no deputy headmaster, no librarian, no bursar, no teacher aide, no printer, no laboratory assistant, no library aides, no groundsman, no handyman, and no office staff.

My first class consisted of 52 boys, many of whom had been unsuccessful at a curriculum that had not been designed for their ability and needs. But the curriculum was not blamed; rather, the students were told they were failures. The accommodation in temporary buildings without heating or cooling was less than adequate. With 52 boys in the room my desk was pushed so close to the blackboard that, had I been of more generous proportions, I would not have been able to sit down that year. I taught 39 lessons out of the 40 lessons a week, and that represented a non-contact time of 2½ per cent. It was almost impossible to treat these young people as individuals, each with his own needs and problems. They were lined up like cannon fodder and marched up the hill to the Intermediate examination. Those who did not make it were branded as failures and conveniently forgotten. In 1963, Sir Thomas Playford was Premier of South Australia.

The last school at which I taught had 1 430 students and 95 teaching staff, which included one principal, three deputy principals, and a large senior staff including two senior student counsellors. The ancillary staff included all of those people whom I enumerated as being absent in 1963. Official non-contact time was between 15 per cent and 20 per cent, but most staff members used some of this time for individual and small-group contact with children.

Where necessary, the curricula were tailored for individual students after consultation between the teachers, students and parents. The contrast between individual care, concern and attention of the present and the assembly-line techniques of the past is staggering. The Premier of the State in 1977 is Don Dunstan.

The second contrast is between the State and Federal Government's treatment of education. Members will have noticed that at a time when receipts for the year 1977-78 in South Australia will remain virtually the same as in 1976-77 and the aggregate payments will rise by only 1.4 per cent, the education budget will rise from \$300 000 000 in 1976-77 to \$352 000 000 this year; that is an increase of 17 per cent. It is a substantial increase even after allowing for inflation, and it reflects the importance which the State Government places on education.

What about the Federal Government, and in particular, the performance of the Schools Commission under the Liberals? Basic to the Liberal argument is the supposedly better deal the States should have got under the New Federalism. In the Schools Commission's guidelines for the 1978-80 rolling triennium this is stated in the following way:

The Government notes the significantly improved capacity of the States under the revised Commonwealth-State financial arrangements to contribute to these activities from their own resources.

During the period that this was stated, the Budget

document titled "Payments to or for the States and local government authorities" enables one to cull accurate information to refute this claim.

From 1975-76 to 1976-77 there was an increase to South Australia in the General Purpose Revenue Fund of 19.9 per cent, an increase of 5.1 per cent in the General Purpose Capital Fund, an increase of 2.9 per cent in the Specific Purpose Revenue Fund, and a decrease of 6.4 per cent in the Special Purposes Capital Fund. The overall effect is that of a 7.7 per cent increase at a time when inflation was running at approximately 13 per cent. In real terms it was a decrease of over 5 per cent.

That is what the Federal Government was pleased to call a "significantly improved capacity" on the part of the States. It was under these "favourable" conditions that the Federal Government removed \$2 000 000 from State Government schools and gave it not to the poorest but to the richest of the private schools. Nor should it be imagined that this will be a unique occasion.

On June 5 of this year Senator Carrick, speaking at the opening of a new library and administration wing at St. Augustine's School in Salisbury, in referring to this transfer of money from Government to non-Government schools said:

... that is a start. It is not a huge amount. But it is a headland. That is important.

I find that an incredible statement from a Minister responsible for the education of all Australian children. The Federal Government removed a further \$3 000 000 to assist building programmes for non-Government schools in expanding areas and allocated a further \$3 100 000 to non-Government teachers colleges. It also removed a very modest 2 per cent growth rate it had promised to schools for 1978 and reduced to 1 per cent the projected growth rate for the rest of the triennium.

I quote two responses to the removal of that 2 per cent increase. The first comes from one of the universities, and is as follows:

The university's reliance on the assurances given by the Government in 1976 means that its planning has been based on inaccurate assumptions. The adjustments which must now be made in response to the Government's failure to honour its earlier assurances are correspondingly more abrupt and more difficult.

The second quote comes from the Australian Teachers Federation and the Australian Council of State Schools organisation, and is as follows:

The meaningless nature of the term "rolling triennium" has now been demonstrated by the recent guidelines. Instead of the planned 2 per cent increase for 1978, schools are to receive no increase. The \$571 000 000 actually provided is 29.5 per cent below the needs level calculated by the Schools Commission in its report of June, 1975, and is \$11 400 000 less than the amount promised. Instead of the 2 per cent increase promised for 1979, schools are now promised a 1 per cent increase. In the light of experience, no credence can be given to this commitment.

The Australian Teachers Federation represents about 100 000 teachers. We all know what the Schools Commission thought of the guidelines provided for it.

Let me summarise. Approximately 33 per cent of capital costs and 12 per cent of recurrent costs of Australian primary and secondary schools are met from Federal funds. The freeing of funds through the commission means a reduction in purchasing power of approximately 12 per cent. The diversion of money from Government schools to rich, non-Government schools, directly in the face of the previously established needs basis, is insult upon injury, as is the non-supplementation of capital costs.

To hide some of this, the Federal Government resorts to

a rather quaint form of semantic confusion. For instance, Senator Carrick, on April 5 this year, spoke of "significant increases" in the expenditure of the four commissions from 1976 to 1977 and indicated an increase, "in real money terms", of \$47 000 000, or 3.2 per cent.

Two things are interesting about this piece of hypocrisy. One is that this "significant increase" is a cut of nearly 10 per cent in purchasing power. The second is that actual phrase "real money terms". The phrase "in real terms" has always been shorthand indicating that allowance has been made for the effects of inflation. Senator Carrick's phrase "in real money terms" clearly does not imply this. One is at a loss to understand what he does mean unless one accepts it either as an attempt to mislead or that the Federal Government is about to distinguish between real money and imaginary money. If that is the case, it can be assured that such a distinction is fast becoming less and less necessary.

In concluding, I wish to make the following points. The Federal Government, pursuing its ultra-Friedmanite policies, is still bent on increasing unemployment. This can clearly be seen in its education spending, where it seems intent, by reducing purchasing power, on creating unemployment in the education as well as the constitution field.

It has been estimated by Mr. J. F. Gregory, the President-elect of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, that the Federal policy can cost the State 210 teachers or 1 050 pupil-building places. By contrast, this State, under the leadership of a Government that cares about its future citizens, has lifted its Education Department spending 17.4 per cent from \$243 000 000 last year to \$286 000 000 this year, its Department of Further Education spending 24.5 per cent from \$29 500 000 last year to \$36 700 000 this year, its library spending 40.7 per cent from \$4 500 000 last year to \$6 300 000 this year, and its payments to non-government schools 23 per cent from \$7 100 000 to \$8 700 000.

We have a Government that believes in good education for its citizens and, axiomatically, a Government that believes in the future of South Australia. I support the Bill.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I, too, support the Bill, by tradition, but indeed not by desire. I point out to the House that the financial statement before the Parliament at this time is designed to bring before the House various details of financial statements by the Treasurer and has been, by tradition, a presentation to the Parliament at the beginning of each financial year, or as soon after as possible since Parliament was initially established. This time the Treasurer's financial statement includes the Commonwealth Government general purpose grants, the receipts on revenue accounts (estimated and actual), and comparative figures on the actual costs for the past two years, payments to revenue accounts, principal items of receipts and revenue accounts, and principal items of payments and revenue accounts as they apply to the forthcoming financial year.

Between the covers of this document many other references are made by the Treasurer with respect to his present and intended management of the finances in South Australia. He, like his predecessors in that position, has taken advantage of criticising, wherever possible, the Federal Government for the social and financial ills in the economy in Australia generally, and as they particularly apply to South Australia. Accordingly, the Opposition takes the advantage on these occasions to reply to and direct criticisms at the Government. I do not intend to enter into the criticism that has been delivered on this subject so far, because my attention is drawn to a

paragraph on page 11 of the document, in which the Treasurer refers to the function of the Public Accounts Committee. He says:

On the matter of the review of the Government's accounting systems to facilitate the development by Treasury and departments of budgets and financial management systems which place greater emphasis on individual responsibility and accountability, further progress has been made. I expect a proposal to be put to the Government shortly on the matter.

He went on to say (and this is what attracted my attention most of all):

It is my intention to refer it to the Public Accounts Committee for consideration.

We have heard much about the functions of that committee in South Australia recently, and on this occasion I would like to direct just a few comments towards that subject. First, I point out that none other than Professor J. N. Cutt (and, for the benefit of those members who have never heard of Professor Cutt, he is the Professor of Administrative Studies in the Faculty of Economics at the Australian National University), on June 9, 1977, made some observations about the functions of Public Accounts Committees, both at State and Federal levels. I had the good fortune, along with you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to be present on that occasion. He said, among other things, that the committee should be an apolitical body answerable to Parliament and not to the Government; it can be most effective as an arm of its respective State and/or Federal Auditor-General; its true and idealistic function is to assert Parliamentary scrutiny and control over the Executive on the one hand and the Public Service on the other, and its objective is to improve value for money performance in the various expenditure, revenue and regulatory functions of Government. Unfortunately, with the system under which we in South Australia work, the committee is both Government-orientated and Government-dictated. As a result, this Parliament has no control whatsoever over the finances with respect to its general revenue management. In fact, this Parliament has no control over State revenue at all. The whole subject of the previous Budget debate is a farce, in my view. We have no more control over this State's revenue than we have over nature's tide, which ebbs and flows twice in every 24 hours. Notwithstanding those remarks, which were supported, I quote Professor Cutt, as follows:

We looked for examples of procedures to implement the recommendations and findings of Public Accounts Committees. I think perhaps the one crucial thing that emerged from that, particularly from the South Australian presentation, was the ultimate dependence on departmental and Ministerial goodwill and the importance of emphasising the positive or helpful role rather than the negative, destructive, or excessively critical role that perhaps in the past has sometimes been associated with these committees.

That was a very real observation by Professor Cutt. In fact, what he said there is what has happened in South Australia: despite the efforts of individual members of past Public Accounts Committees, we have been directed and controlled by the Government-orientated numbers on those committees. Indeed, until we reach a situation in South Australia where the Opposition either has the numbers or at least has the right to appoint a Chairman of those committees, we shall continue to be so directed and controlled.

Let us have a look at the function as it has applied since I have had some experience on our Public Accounts Committee. I was appointed to that committee on August 5, 1975. At that time, we were dealing with research into

the Woods and Forests Department, under the Chairmanship of none other than the member for Peake. We went on, after tabling a report on that subject, to deal with an investigation into the function of certain aspects of the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Mr. Venning: Was he a good Chairman?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I will come later to the respective Chairmen under whom I have served on that committee. I come now to the important subject of the Hospitals Department, which was drawn to the attention of the Public Accounts Committee during my second year in office on that committee. Naturally enough, the subjects brought to the committee's attention invariably stem from the Auditor-General's annual Reports. Indeed, on the subject of the administration, control and security of hospitals in South Australia back as far as his 1974-75 report, the Auditor-General is on record as having been seriously critical of the Hospitals Department generally. On page 128 of the report, tabled in the House in 1975, he said:

A review of procedures covering salaries and wages carried out during the year showed that there were weaknesses in internal control and checking . . . was being carried out.

He went on to be generally critical about the administration of the Hospitals Department. In 1976, he became a little more specific. On page 138 of the 1976 report, under the heading "Food costs" (again within the Hospitals Department), he said:

An investigation was made into the procedures and controls over foodstuffs with particular reference to the Northfield Wards. The examination disclosed that internal control was weak or non-existent, budgeting poor, reporting ineffective, and the records inadequate.

Again, we find that, in 1977, he said exactly the same thing. He repeated his criticisms under the budgetary control column on page 159 of his report. Indeed, under the heading of "Food costs" in particular, his words are identical. He commenced by saying:

I reported last year that an investigation was made into the procedures and controls over foodstuffs . . .

He then repeated the paragraph I have just read to the House. It was from the report tabled in the House in September, 1976, that our Public Accounts Committee commenced its inquiries into the Hospitals Department. From the actual statement made by the Auditor-General, we called him before the committee to discuss the subject. He recommended that we proceed and investigate the control or lack of control in the Hospitals Department. He recommended that it was such a massive subject, in our capacity as a Parliamentary committee, that we ought to try to concentrate on a particular aspect of it. By his drawing the matter to our attention and by his recommendation, we settled for the subject of food costs, in particular.

Among other inquiries the committee has made, we called on the Auditor-General's Department to assist us. We asked him whether any in-depth studies had been done that caused him to make those remarks in his annual report to Parliament. He agreed that there was such a report. He directed to our attention the Hospitals Department itself, which he understood had carried out an investigation at his request previously and which was holding such a report.

From the Hospitals Department, we obtained what has been referred to and what is, in fact, the Epps report. Mr. Epps was then, and is still, an auditor in the Auditor-General's Department. In fact, he is a senior auditor in that department. He signed a document following a full investigation into losses and thefts of food from hospitals in South Australia, and particularly from the Northfield

Ward of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. He signed a report on April 6, 1976. The committee was given a copy of that full report. It is of 30 pages, and I do not intend to refer to the whole of it, but I propose to refer to some of the significant points from his conclusions in his supplementary report. He said, among other things, that labour costs for kitchen and dining-room staff were not aggregated to evaluate whether the labour employed was appropriate to the level of activity. In relation to costs per meal, he said that the cost of foodstuffs per meal served at Northfield was 93 cents. This cost was 44 cents a meal or 91 per cent higher than the cost at the Mount Gambier Hospital. He said that the budget was useless because of poor preparation and planning. The budget was based on past costs which were loaded with the cost of goods stolen and wasted. Comparison of actual costs with the budget did not reveal high costs. The report said that effective reporting was non-existent and that the cost statements did not show where things were going wrong and gave no assistance to management in control. Costs were not related to the number of meals served.

The report further states that the former head cook was convicted of two charges of larceny as a servant and that a weekly-paid cook was also charged with larceny, but the case was dropped through lack of evidence. On the subject of estimated losses at Northfield, he said that the estimated losses at Northfield through thefts, wastages and lack of quality control were \$80 000 per annum and that these losses could have occurred over several years. He concluded with these remarks, and I do not think the press or anyone else is aware of this paragraph, as follows:

The inescapable conclusion is that management was not fulfilling its control responsibilities. It failed to organise itself so as to control the expenditure of large amounts of public moneys according to principles traditionally applicable. Insufficient regard was given to the exercise of due economy and to the application of prudent financial and security techniques. The audit examination disclosed that internal control was weak or non-existent, budgeting was poor, and reporting ineffective.

It is from that auditor's report that the Auditor-General in South Australia made, not his historic and irrelevant statement, but his recent statement in the Auditor-General's Report in 1976 and again before this Parliament only a few days ago in 1977. He went on to reinforce his earlier statement, where he said:

As a result of these deficiencies the department incurred losses through thefts, excess wastages and lack of quality control. It is estimated that the extent of these losses was approximately \$80 000 per annum.

We started to call witnesses before the Public Accounts Committee to check the senior auditor's statements. One of the witnesses was none other than the Director-General of Medical Services, Dr. Brian Shea, who not only gave our committee evidence as a witness before it, but gave it before the *Hansard* staff of this place. Since that date, he has received a copy of his evidence and has had an opportunity to check it and to come back to our committee, so I have absolutely no reservations whatever about bringing his remarks before this place. The whole subject of food losses and thefts was brought to the attention of Dr. Shea. From page 3 of the evidence which we took from him on December 2, 1976, I draw to the attention of the House the following comments of Dr. Shea:

Some months ago we formed an interdepartmental committee between the Auditor-General's office and my department to discuss certain adverse conditions disclosed by investigations that occur from time to time. . . . It is certainly true that a reply has not been received by the Auditor-

General. There was no written request, but it was discussed at departmental level.

One of our committee members then asked the following question of Dr. Shea:

You were aware of that situation for some time before it became the subject of a departmental enquiry?

To that question, Dr. Shea replied, "Quite correct." He was asked a further question, as follows:

There seems to have been a substantial reduction in the quantity of food consumed in 1975 compared to that consumed in 1974. There must have been a substantial reduction in the number of patients, or else food was being misused.

Dr. Shea replied as follows:

There is little doubt in our minds that it was caused by pilfering.

He confirmed, after the documentary material we had received from the hospital itself indicated that the bed patient numbers were identical or lower in 1975 than in 1974, that there was no reason to suggest that there were more people to consume more food. It substantiated the auditor's claim that stealing had been going on. A further question was put to Dr. Shea on that occasion, as follows:

How much do you think the pilfered food would have cost your department?

That is the pilfered food I referred to earlier, as noted in the auditor's report. Dr. Shea replied:

A substantial sum. The charges ultimately laid and proven were modest, but we believed it was a tiny iceberg that was proven in court and that a much more substantial sum was involved.

I put to this Parliament and to the public generally that it was on the basis of that evidence, linked with the actual auditor's report, that our committee proceeded to prepare a report for this Parliament. We have heard a hell of a lot about it in the past few weeks. We have heard about it particularly in the past few weeks, because immediately prior to the election, despite desperate attempts by the Opposition members on that committee to have the report completed and brought into this place, it was snowed, and we were continually snowed by Government members on that committee, not the least the Chairman himself who, as I reported in this place last night, attended only four out of the last 13 meetings of the committee. He was sick, but our committee was snowed in its efforts to do its job and bring before this Parliament as soon as possible a report on the activities of what was going on down below. We know the history of events since then.

Mr. Abbott: How many meetings did you attend?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I attended as many meetings as did any other member of that committee, and no member in this place on either side can deny that I pulled my weight at every meeting I attended after my appointment. I challenge any member to deny that. I refer to attending on time and consistently, and pulling my weight on that committee during its functions and operations.

Let us look at what happened prior to the election, when this thing came out. First, the subject was put to the Opposition as to whether or not the matter should be disclosed. Indeed, the decision was made that it was a matter of public interest and it should come out, notwithstanding that it was immediately prior to an election and that we would get hammered like hell for having done so. It was a matter of public importance and it was decided that it should be ventilated.

Among other press releases, statements, reports, and so on, it was quite incredible to note one statement in particular that the Premier made in his defence. He was being interviewed on September 9, 1977, by Mike McEwen on 5DN. Mike McEwen, incidentally, was one of

the media representatives in South Australia who set out to do his homework on this subject. He set out to ask questions of the Premier, and when he got the brush-off he asked again and again to get a fair exposure of this important subject. On that day, he said:

The so-called Northfield food scandal has raised two, possibly three, vital questions. The first two are these: did the Government know about and deliberately cover up the undoubted wholesale theft at Northfield, as reported on to the Government by the Auditor-General's Department; and secondly, has the Government taken the Auditor-General's Report seriously enough to implement the recommendations in it . . .

Now, Sir, in reply to some of the questions put to him, and to one question in particular, the Premier had drawn to his attention the 30-page report of Mr. Epps. The Premier was asked whether he had seen that report and he said, "I didn't see the report, but I was told the results by the Auditor-General."

Minutes later the interviewer asked, "Well, are you prepared now to look through that report and refute it?" The Premier replied, "I have been through Mr. Epps's report," an absolute reversal of the statement he made minutes before.

Mr. Mathwin: That's an untruth he told.

Mr. CHAPMAN: He cannot be right both times; he must have told a lie on one of those occasions. I know that that is an unparliamentary term, but it is a matter of fact: that is what happened. When the interviewer referred to the report as establishing that about \$80 000 a year was involved, the Premier replied, "No, it didn't." Let us consider what Mr. Epps said. There is no need to go through what he said now, because it is already on record. It was a theft, and losses at that hospital amounting to \$80 000 a year over a number of years were involved. Let us consider Mr. Epps's report about how we happened to trip over this fellow Mr. Kennedy, the man who was fined about \$150 for having a utility load of material. It is not that the Opposition was worrying about a few boxes of chicken, a few dozen eggs or a leg of ham that someone put in his kitbag before Christmas, or a pound of butter that was knicked by a maid as she left the kitchen on leaving work; we were interested in the hundreds of thousands of dollars involved. We all know that pilfering in the petty sense has gone on in the Army, the Air Force and other public institutions. Undoubtedly it will continue, and it is hard to police.

Why, at 9 a.m. on a Sunday in early April, 1975, were the police hiding behind bushes at Ayers House? That was another question our committee pursued. The police happened to trip over a fellow named Kennedy (the head cook at Northfield Hospital) with a utility load of chickens, or whatever. Goodness knows what he was going to do with them! I do not know whether that was established. Kennedy was ultimately charged and fined, and the case is on record. The committee had Assistant Commissioner Draper's report on that incident. We questioned another senior officer about what the police were doing there. Only recently Commissioner Salisbury said that he had undertaken no investigation. Why were the police there at all? Anyway, on interviewing this senior police officer we were told that as far as the police were aware they were there to catch someone else from another hospital altogether. It was simply by accident that the police tripped over Kennedy; that was unfortunate for him.

On the basis of those few remarks (and my time is limited on this occasion), I ask whether it is now appreciated by this Parliament that there was some justification for the Public Accounts Committee to

investigate this issue. In no circumstances was it a historic, irrelevant or minor issue. It has been clearly established that it was a matter involving hundreds of thousands of dollars in recent years. In no circumstances has the matter been cleared up by the Premier in his desperate effort to defend himself during an election campaign or since. In no circumstances has it been cleared up by the Auditor-General in his reports, because his current report says exactly what his report said last year. In no circumstances does the Premier's statement in the *Advertiser* of September 6, 1977, stand up, nor do several other of his statements.

Let us now consider the *Advertiser* report of September 6, 1977, when the Premier stated:

The subject was taken up by the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee which has discovered no improprieties. That is wrong. In what capacity can the Treasurer say what the Public Accounts Committee has ascertained? That committee had not brought down a report to which he could refer. Does what he has said demonstrate what I implied a few moments ago, that the Government has dictatorial control over that committee as it has over other Parliamentary committees in this State. Those committees are useless in the exercise of their duties and will continue to be, until we adopt a system where they have an equal number of members from each side of the House or, better still, the Chairman comes from the Opposition so that he is not dictated to by the Government of the day. That is the message I get out of this whole exercise. We have been purposely snowed since December 2, 1976, in our efforts to bring before Parliament the true situation regarding thefts and the vast misappropriation of funds over several years, as has been drawn to the attention of the public in snippets here and there.

I know that in the few minutes available to me today I have been unable to refer to all the anomalies and untruths that have been directed to the public during this cover-up situation we have experienced in the past few months. I know that, and make no apology for using this time to deal at least a few more cards out of the pack in a situation that is the most scandalous I have had anything to do with both inside and outside Parliament. It is no skin off my nose personally. I do not have to justify my position here by racing around to the press or taking up issues that I am specifically blamed for taking up for political purposes. By careful attention by the Liberal Party over the years, the member for Alexandra has enjoyed heavy support from the electors of that district. As the member for that district I have two alternatives. I could sit on my backside and keep the seat warm, as several members opposite do. I could do my work in my district, make a good fellow of myself and undoubtedly retain my position as the member for that district. The other alternative is to come into this House and do a job. That is why I came here: it is what I commenced to do and what I aim to finish. Neither you, Sir, with respect to your new position, the Premier nor anyone on this or the other side of the House will prevent my doing just that.

As far as I am concerned, whether it is the pork chop issue at the hospital, any misappropriation or any identified laziness or anything else that involves a public servant or anyone else who is not doing his job and over whom we have any control, I will stand up in this place or wherever I choose to stand up and ventilate that issue. Several members are upset about this subject. I could not care a damn for them or for the type of allegation that was directed to me by that fellow on my left—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra has been here for some time.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Long enough to realise—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Alexandra. He knows that members on both sides are referred to as "honourable member".

Mr. CHAPMAN: I apologise for the reference I made, but I could not think of his name; he so seldom gets on his feet that I failed to realise who he was, but it was the member for Semaphore.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before the next honourable member speaks, I point out that I hope that he will receive the courtesy of the House.

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): It gives me much pleasure to represent the people of Napier. My election to this place is the result of a redistribution of electoral boundaries which, for the first time in the history of South Australia, has given the citizens a fair and equitable electoral system. Naming my district "Napier" recognises the service given to the State for many years by that diligent South Australian, Sir Mellis Napier. Sir Mellis, like me, was a migrant to South Australia. Having read about his background, I have ascertained that he was never accused by the anti-British in Australia as suffering from the British disease, a charge, which I might add, is resented by people in my district who have settled in South Australia from the United Kingdom. I am sure that that resentment will be shown in the Bonython by-election that will be held soon.

Much has been said in this debate about unemployment, with members on the other side refusing to accept the facts put by the Treasurer that it is the result of the Fraser Government's disastrous economic planning and its insistence on keeping a high level of unemployment to bring down inflation. That statement was made by Federal Treasurer, Philip Lynch, to the Chamber of Manufacturers in June this year. Unfortunately, in my district we have one of the highest unemployment figures in the State, but I might add that these figures would have been even higher had it not been for the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. The two local government bodies in the area have received substantial assistance through unemployment relief, which has not only provided employment for the young people but has also provided facilities which are of value to the community.

Charges were made in the election campaign that no Government money was ever spent in safe Labor seats. To refute that, I will read a list of projects which were carried out in my district and which received money from the Government. In the District Council of Munno Para the following projects were carried out: Munno Para drainage schemes stages 2A and 2B; landscaping at the "Barkuma" Centre for Handicapped Children; extensive kerbing and guttering, Virginia; extensive playground improvements in the district; the Angle Vale road drain; Eldred Riggs Reserve development; Uley Road Reserve development; the restoration of the Uleybury school (which members may know is one of the oldest buildings in my district); the establishment of a hard refuse disposal complex; development of a Little Athletics Centre; mobile library sites; and the establishment of the Munno Para Community Centre. Those works cost \$776 757.

In the Corporation of the City of Elizabeth the following works were undertaken: Elizabeth Downs open drain sections 1, 2 and 3; purchase of vehicles; lining of the open drain; an adventure playground at the Broadmeadows Primary School; Argana Park development, stage 1; extensions to the Shedley Theatre; Argana Park development, stage 2; interim staffing at and grants to the Y.M.C.A. leisure centre; and Elizabeth Oval development. Those works cost \$526 755. A total of \$1 303 512 was spent by the Government in the district. On page 10 of his speech the Treasurer, when referring to

unemployment, said:

It has become a massive problem which not only denies people work opportunities and work experience but also creates significant social problems.

Perhaps the Treasurer could have enlarged on these social problems. No research studies have been carried out in this State, but studies carried out overseas and by the Victorian Department of Mental Health have shown that the rate of mental disease and attempted suicides have risen in line with the level of unemployment. Although the Fraser Government has been made aware of these studies by the Victorian Department of Mental Health, it has continually refused to change its policy concerning the unemployed.

I return to the criticisms by the Opposition of the unemployment relief scheme and the statement by its Leader that he would cut out unemployment relief programmes in this State, a statement that was rejected completely by the electorate on September 17. It is interesting to note that, whilst the Opposition has said many times that the State unemployment relief scheme is not the answer to our unemployment problems, their masters in Canberra are at long last taking an interest in such schemes. It is a pity they did not do so a long time ago.

Opposition members yesterday blamed the present high unemployment level in Australia on the previous Whitlam Labor Government, implying that under Fraser things were stabilising. They said that we should not knock their bosses in Canberra and that, if all Australians did a fair day's work for minimum wages and if we dismantled the equal pay concept, soon we would be the envy of the rest of the world. They have had their two years to create that El Dorado and look what we have now! I will compare the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures for August, 1977, with the figures for August, 1976, for the 15 to 19 years age group, which represented 16.7 per cent of the unemployed in 1977, compared with 13 per cent in 1976, an increase of 3.7 per cent. Of that 16.7 per cent, 19.1 per cent were young females and 14.6 per cent young males, compared with 14.4 per cent and 11.8 per cent respectively in 1976. No wonder the 18 to 20 years age group consistently votes for the Australian Labor Party. Moreover, the estimated number of unemployed persons in the 15 to 19 years age group seeking their first job increased by a staggering 40 per cent from 1976. As I have said, these figures are from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Mention has been made about those 200 mythical promises that the State Government has allegedly broken since 1975. Unlike the Leader of the Opposition, I am not prone to exaggerate, so I will give just one example of a broken promise that the Fraser Government inflicted on the people in my district. This concerns the recently completed leisure centre in Elizabeth. In December, 1975, Mr. Fraser committed Federal funding to a project in which the community was heavily involved, with local government, industry and the community all pulling together to get the leisure centre built. When the application was made to Canberra for a grant to cover escalation costs, Mr. Fraser reneged on his promise. The result was that the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department, which was already substantially involved, and the community, had to make up what the Federal Liberal Government denied us.

When the Treasurer criticised the Fraser Government's cuts in the public sector, members of the Opposition were quick to point out that those criticisms were completely against the policies of the United Kingdom Labour Government and that therefore we should support cuts in public expenditure. A considerable proportion of these

cuts has been in the reduction of staff ceilings in the Public Service, particularly in the Social Security Department. These reductions in staff ceilings are causing real concern in my district, with cheques arriving late and claims being processed weeks after they are lodged. Misery and hardship are being experienced by constituents in my area.

I would like to congratulate the Government on the creation of the Housing and Urban Affairs Department, which will co-ordinate all policy aspects of housing and urban affairs. This department has already laid the ground work for the orderly planning of future subdivisions in my district, and I cordially invite the Leader of the Opposition to meet with local government and community leaders in my district who applaud this orderly planning. He may then retract his claim that the development north of Munno Para is a \$2 000 000 000 bungle. I support the Bill.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): According to tradition, I support this Bill, which is normally referred to as the Budget. I take the opportunity of congratulating you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on your appointment. I thank my own supporters in my District of Flinders for having confidence in me and returning me as their member. I do so in the knowledge that we are facing a new set of circumstances in the State Parliamentary scene and, although many Government members have lauded the new equal-size electoral system now operating, we are finding what it is doing to country representation. Of the 27 Government members, 25 live within the metropolitan area, and this indicates, from the point of view of country representation, what is happening, and raises the problem of how we will get the country voice back on to the floor of Parliament.

The principal issue that comes to my mind concerning Budget finance is based on the disastrous drought conditions now facing many people in this State. The Treasurer has acknowledged the seriousness of the drought, and it is gratifying to know that the Government has considered the matter. However, the consideration has been minor, although it has set up a drought consultative committee that will advise the Government on the best way in which assistance can be given. All members welcome the establishment of that committee, but what concerns me is to get the recommendations of that committee to operate as soon as possible. Yesterday I asked a question regarding the criteria to apply regarding the eligibility of unemployed farmers for assistance. Establishing such criteria is extremely difficult, particularly in relation to a means test or some other criteria on which one could judge the problem. Many farmers are on the breadline, and many sons of farmers cannot be sustained on the property because there is no income and no prospect of any income for, in some cases, up to 18 months.

The drought has devastated many parts of the peninsula, and I am especially concerned with that area. It has effected other parts of the State, but in my district there is 120 000 hectares of drift, and that is a considerable amount of devastated country. This assessment was made by the Agriculture Department officer at Cleve two days ago. The recent rain has enabled some re-sown areas to recuperate and get a cover on the ground. The trouble is that no cash crop will eventuate from these re-sown areas, even though there is some ground cover and drift areas are being controlled. Recently, I have travelled through the areas often, and many farmers are unable to retain their stock: first, because they do not have the feed; secondly, there is no water; and thirdly, the drift has been so bad that fences have been damaged so much that the stock just walk out.

I am trying to impress on members the seriousness of

the situation; farmers cannot continue as they know that it will be at least 18 months before any cash crop will come in. The basic problem is sustenance and a living allowance for them, but the real problem will be restocking and rehabilitating the farms. The severely drifted areas are so affected that many will take at least five years to get back into reasonable production, and in many cases it may take longer. The fertile band of top-soil that has been developed by good farm management has been blown away and thousands of tonnes of it are now on roadways and of no use to anyone. In the Cleve district there are, 114 blocks on the road, with sand drift so severe that it requires mechanical equipment to make the roads passable. Councils are in an invidious position, because they know that, if they spend X thousands of dollars clearing the roads, the next wind (perhaps within a week) may bring the drift back again, and the money would be wasted. Until neighbouring land can be stabilised councils would be unwise to spend large amounts in these areas.

One of the ideals necessary to establish a rural unemployment scheme is that the monies be directed to those affected by drought and not used in areas that are covered by other unemployment schemes. The eligibility for rural unemployment assistance has to be defined, in order to enable those who have been affected by drought and who have been forced from their property or have left their property in order to look for work, to be assisted. I could suggest some ways of helping: in many cases a three-day week form of unemployment relief would be worth while, because it would enable the farmer to return to his land for the other four days so that he could maintain his property and create some re-establishment. It is also necessary for these schemes to be administered by the local council and not through the Commonwealth Employment Service offices which, in many cases, are situated hundreds of miles away from the affected person. The council and its officers know local conditions and the plights of individuals and, as a result, more sympathetic consideration can be given to those most in need.

Another aspect should be considered concerning drought assistance. The present drought is considered by most people to be the worst that has been experienced in this State. Members would be aware that the Government has made available through the drought relief programme a 50 per cent subsidy on the cartage of fodder in order to maintain stock, and a 50 per cent subsidy on freight charges for stock going to and from agistment. Certain criteria are attached, since the stock has to be breeding stock and it has to be returned to the original property.

We could probably argue over the need for such requirements, but it would be in the interests of good management, when stock had been taken from the property and the property from which it was taken was not recovering or would not recover for another 12 months, to allow the stockowner to sell his stock direct from the agistment property to the market. The present system forces the primary producer to keep his stock on someone else's agistment, pay for that agistment, and then bring the stock back to his property. If he does not have them brought back to the property and kept on that property, he is not eligible for that 50 per cent freight subsidy.

I was hoping that I would be able to ask a question today that revolved around the eligibility of primary producers who are forced to cart water for stock and household requirements. I do not think this situation is appreciated by many people. Many people have been carting water for 18 months, and that situation should be of concern to the Government, because we now have an electoral system that maintains that all people are equal, and the people in the Mangalo area are saying to me that if we are all equal

they are all entitled to a reticulated water supply. How can I answer such a charge? If people are considered to be equal throughout the State, surely they are entitled to equal services? One can go on to argue about the merits of a subsidised transport system in the metropolitan area and about other such matters.

I will now quote from a letter received from a constituent at Mangalo. I will do so because I believe it outlines the basic problem which confronts so many country people. It is as follows:

I am asking for your help to have a water pipeline connected to the Mangalo district farms.

Whilst I mention the Mangalo district, this applies in Mangalo, Edililie, Wanilla and other areas. The letter continues:

The farming community is in a poor situation. The men are carting water for their stock, travelling long distances on dirt roads, to and from Cleve. For the past two years, we have carted water for all of our needs. This supplies sheep, cattle, fowls, the garden and fruit trees, and for household needs for the bathroom, laundry, toilet and kitchen.

Now, 100 Alceppo pine trees planted 30 years ago for wind protection around the house are gradually dying from lack of water. Ten have already died and another 10 have yellowed. Water is being carted from Cleve in an effort to save the rest. On this farm alone, water consumption for one year amounted to 322 000 gallons. This was for the period from May, 1976, to April, 1977.

This water is all carted from a standpipe controlled by the Cleve District Council. The letter continues

This is costly to the farmer, as there is wear and tear on the trucks, fuel costs, diesel tax, payment for water taken from the standpipe, many hours lost in labour from farms, stock (sheep and cattle) kept to a minimum, lowering income and sales from wool clip, and the provision of fat lambs and beef to the market.

The person concerned has written an addendum from which I would like to quote:

Farming losses: Many farms face ruin (some have already sold out and only long established farms have retained original ownership) on account of:

- (1) Stock losses (cattle, sheep, pigs, and one poultry processing plant has gone out of business because of the exorbitant cost of carting water) decrease in wool and fat lambs, and no water for fruit, vegetables and trees. Tree planting and garden programmes have been seriously affected during the last two seasons of drought because first priority in water carting has had to be concern for stock—the farmers' livelihood. (2) Expense of water carting has been exorbitant in labour and maintenance of trucks and fuel and the damage to unsealed roads. Seeking employment elsewhere is impossible while water-carting to farms.

I think members will appreciate the reason why I suggested that having an unemployment relief scheme of three days a week for the primary producer would enable him at least to maintain his property in some sort of working order.

I raise these points because included with the letter is a list of all the farmers who have carted water from the Cleve standpipe. It runs into four foolscap pages. A few of the volumes of water carried by individual farmers by truck from that standpipe are as follows: 211 700 galls, 189 000 galls, 35 000 galls, 80 000 galls, 56 000 galls, and 159 000 galls. These amounts give some indication.

I hope members can appreciate the hardship that has been brought to bear upon these people, who are obliged through circumstances beyond their control to spend this sort of money, all of which is lost because it is totally

unproductive, being spent on just a sustenance or maintenance programme, to enable them to stay on their properties and the district to survive. I bring those matters to the attention of the House because of their seriousness.

The Government, as a result of the Drought Consultative Committee, has broadened the terms of reference of the Primary Producers Assistance Act to enable rural loans to be made available at 4 per cent interest. I attended a meeting a week ago last Monday at which officers of the department outlined to bank officers, accountants, and in some cases lawyers who were invited guests how the department intended to administer this programme. I am pleased that the criteria which existed, that the primary producer had to be virtually bankrupt before he could apply for such assistance, has been lifted, but the criteria still stands that the primary producer has to be able to forecast that he will be short of funds, or have no funds available for him to carry on.

The fact that this criteria has been broadened is some indication of a sympathetic view being extended to those in need. It would be ideal if all primary producers could get loans at 4 per cent. I think, however, that only the most optimistic person would believe that that is possible. It is therefore necessary for some scheme to be adopted whereby those in the most need gain the benefit. It will require some effort on the part of all landholders, but if they are operating their farms under a system which has facets that are not operating effectively, they will have to tighten their belts and demonstrate that they are prepared to make some sacrifice. If this is done, I believe that every assistance should be given to the primary producer.

I should further explain the comments I made about water, because I did not originally set out to say that these people who are obliged to cart water should be eligible for the 50 per cent freight subsidy on such cartage. I noticed from the Treasurer's speech and accompanying documents that a small amount will be made available under the Chief Secretary's line, but I regret that it is only \$1 000. Members would appreciate that \$1 000 would not go anywhere when it comes to carting millions of gallons of water to many areas of the State. I hope that the Government will consider extending that line and making greater provision for assistance to primary producers who are obliged to cart water.

The following comments about the Kimba water supply situation come from the Public Works Committee. I appreciate that the report is dated March 10, 1965, and that it was presented to the House prior to the commencement of the building of the Poldo-Kimba pipeline. I quote the evidence that was given by the landholders, however, because it is pertinent to an identical situation that applies now. The report states:

The witnesses who spoke on behalf of landholders in the area made the following points in support of the proposed scheme:

- (1) There were no useful supplies of underground water in the area and good holding ground for dams was difficult to find in many parts of the district.
- (2) The improvement of pastures in the catchment area of dams by contouring and the use of superphosphate had reduced the run-off and lessened the intake.
- (3) For many years much time and money had been spent by landholders in carting water.
- (4) With an assured water supply the stock carrying capacity of the area could be substantially increased.
- (5) An assured supply would encourage further development particularly on the fringe of the area which would be served by the scheme.
- (6) An assured water supply would permit the installation

of domestic amenities and support some home gardening, both in the township and on the farms. The provision of amenities would aid decentralization by helping to retain people in the area.

- (7) Because of almost permanent restriction on the use of water in the town of Kimba, retired farmers who might otherwise have settled there had left the district. Nevertheless, Kimba was a growing township and the need for an assured water supply was increasing.
- (8) There was a fire hazard, both in the township and at the hospital. The hospital and the school were both short of water and grassed sports areas and a swimming pool could not be established.
- (9) Water could not be provided to maintain a dairy sufficient to supply the fresh milk requirements of Kimba. Because of the lack of water at the existing dairy and the adjacent slaughter yard, there were problems with hygiene.

Those comments, I think, are simply a logical assessment of any area that does not have a reticulated water scheme. After all, we are all residents of South Australia, and each and every one of us has a right to have a reasonable service of some kind or other. In its conclusions, the committee made the following comments:

- (1) That it is desirable that an assured water supply should be provided for the growing township of Kimba.
- (2) That the best and most economical means of providing such a supply is by the bringing of water to Kimba from the Poldo basin.
- (3) That the necessary trunk main from the Lock pumping station to Kimba would permit the carrying of increased numbers of stock and encourage further development in the wide agricultural area it would serve.

Members would appreciate that that scheme has been put into operation. However, there is one problem the scheme is now inadequate. There are many areas which the scheme could serve and which were recommended in the report that it should serve, namely, the farming areas adjacent to that line, but the pipeline is at capacity. This means that the area at Mangalo cannot technically be served from the Poldo-Kimba pipeline, nor can it be served from the east-coast pipeline, because both are at maximum capacity for the area. I question the planning that has gone into this scheme and raise further the problems of residents in the Mangalo-Cleve area who surely have a right to a reticulated supply.

The question before the Government is how best to approach this problem. Should the supply be brought from the Murray River through the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline scheme? Should we duplicate Poldo-Kimba pipeline, bring the pipeline in from the Kappawanta Basin, or duplicate the east-coast main? What is the best answer to the problem? This is the problem which is confronting these people and which, I believe, is one that the whole State, and particularly the Government, must look at seriously.

Mention has been made by numerous speakers of the succession duties issue. I raise this point because South Australia is on the tail end of the scheme when it comes to relief. All members would be aware that Queensland has abolished succession duties and that it has benefited by many millions of dollars as a result. I was trying to look up the statistics that appeared in June, but I have been unable to locate them. However, one of the statistics I recall, namely, the large numbers of people who moved into Queensland, could be gauged by the fact that the Federal electorate between the border of New South Wales and Brisbane (I think it is McPherson) was having, in June, a weekly enrolment increase of 1 000. Much of that

phenomenal increase was put down to the fact that many people in New South Wales and in other Australian States were moving to Queensland because of that abolition. We could probably argue whether they all went there for that reason, and I would be the first to admit that that was not so. It was claimed by the Minister that a significant proportion of that increase was the direct result of the abolition of succession duties in Queensland. Western Australia has also embarked on a programme for the abolition of succession duties and, by the end of its current term, the Government will have completely abolished them.

We also know that recently the Victorian Government has announced the abolition of succession duties. That report was published in the *Victorian Land*, I believe, ten days ago, and was referred to in the Victorian Budget. Mr. Speaker, you would probably have appreciated this morning's news, on which it was announced that in the New South Wales Budget the Government was embarking on a programme for the abolition of succession duties. However, South Australia is coming close to last on this issue. One sad result occurs from this situation, in as much as the last man in has the least to gain, because no people from other States will be moving in. No-one could deny that.

When I commenced speaking, you, Mr. Speaker, were not in the Chair, but I take this opportunity now of congratulating you on your appointment as Speaker, which is the highest office the House can bestow, and I will give you my full support.

Having referred to water and having said that South Australian residents are entitled to equal representation and equal services throughout the State, I now refer to the equalisation scheme. Why should an extra fee be placed on fuel landed at Port Lincoln? The fuel comes in on the same tankers and, in many cases, takes a shorter route but, because it is landed at Port Lincoln, people in that area have to pay an increased fee. I am unable to state exactly what it is, but it is not the same as the bulk fee charged at Port Stanvac. That anomaly should not be permitted. There should be an equal price throughout the State, particularly where the fuel is landed from bulk tankers at depots, from which it should be sold at an equal price. I go further and refer to the transport system. On last Tuesday evening's news, it was announced that the average fare paid on buses was 22c, whereas the average cost of carrying each passenger was 51c. So, every fare-paying passenger using the local transport system is being subsidised to the extent of 29c.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. Before calling on the next speaker, I hope that the House will show him its usual courtesy. The honourable member for Ross Smith.

Mr. BANNON (Ross Smith): In normal circumstances, I understand that at this stage of Parliamentary proceedings we would be debating the Address in Reply and that members, particularly new members in the House, would be ranging over a wide number of issues—personal, philosophical, and political. However, because the election has intervened and because it is extremely important for the Government that this Budget should go through as rapidly as possible, the Address in Reply debate has been deferred and our remarks, I think, should be confined by and large to the matter before us, namely, the Budget, the Government's financial policy, and its economic and financial management of this State. It is to an aspect of that that I shall be confining my remarks on this occasion.

I congratulate you, Sir, on your election. I hope that you will forgive the omission of most of the usual courtesies,

which can be reserved for a later date. It follows from what I have said that I will not be making specific reference to my district, to its interests and problems. I shall reserve that, too, for a later occasion.

However, I think it is most appropriate on this, the first occasion on which I speak in this House, to make some reference to my predecessor as member for Ross Smith, Mr. J. J. Jennings. Mr. Jennings entered Parliament in 1953 as member for Prospect at the same time as our Premier entered Parliament as member for Norwood. Both defeated sitting Liberals in order to enter the Parliament, and both were regarded as men of high promise and great potential achievement in the service of this House and of the State. Both have lived up to that promise.

In the case of Mr. Jennings, it was said when he entered this House (and an examination of some of the *Hansard* speeches and records of the House would indicate) that, if one were trying to distinguish between Mr. Jennings and the Premier in terms of potential as leaders of the Labor Party and Premiers of this State, it would be hard indeed to pick who would emerge.

As it turned out, in the case of Mr. Jennings that early promise was not totally fulfilled. He rose to become Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee, a job he has carried out with some distinction for a considerable number of years and is still occupying in the transition period. He has made a tremendous impact on the House with his qualities, particularly of mordant wit and the ability to find the ridiculous in a situation or to pick up discrepancies or irrelevancies in people's commentary.

Ill health, the very reason that forced him to retire and gave me the opportunity (which I am pleased to accept, although the circumstances are perhaps to be regretted) to take his seat, was the circumstance that led, I suspect, to Mr. Jennings reaching the level he did and no further. He served this House long and well, as members who have been here in previous years can testify. I would like to pay him a tribute as a previous member for Prospect, Enfield, and Ross Smith, and personally to thank him for the assistance he gave me throughout the period in which I was campaigning for the seat and trying to familiarise myself, after election, with the ways of the House.

The theme I wish to raise will come as no surprise to members. It is the theme of employment or, rather more specifically and regrettably, unemployment. I should like to deal with it in the context of the budgetary measures and the action taken by the State Government to deal with it, and perhaps also the way in which members on the opposite side of the House have approached this problem and commented on and criticised the Government's performance.

This whole area, particularly because of its crucial importance at this stage, has become somewhat confused. A haze of statistics and point-scoring surrounds it, and that is regrettable. It is certainly the key issue of the day. The ordinary man in the street will say that. It is borne out by the public opinion polls, and I think that not only was it shown by the results and what was discussed in the recent State election but also it will be shown in any future Federal election. It is a key and crucial issue of the day. We deserve to give it some attention, as others of my colleagues have done today.

First, in relation to South Australia's performance, what are the facts? We are told from the Opposition side that over the past 10 or 15 years South Australian manufacturing industry has run down, that we have lost the cost benefit we had regarding labour costs with the Eastern States, and that all that has built up a situation

whereby South Australia's future is looking very grim indeed. Unfortunately for them, and for that argument, the facts do not bear that out. It has been constantly pointed out that this Liberal myth of the great Playford era of manufacturing and industrial development in South Australia is just that, a myth. Certainly, there was industrial development in the Playford years, and I do not think any member on this side of the House would gainsay that. It is fortunate that there was, because without it we would be in an extremely parlous state today.

It could be said that in the Playford years a basis was laid. However, it is the last 10 years or so that has seen a significant advance in most of our manufacturing and industrial areas of employment and in the basic health of our State economy. The employment figures bear that out, the figures of our share of the work force bear that out, and numerous academic treatises and examinations have borne it out. I think it was most graphically illustrated last year when the *Advertiser* embarked on a series of articles, using two of its most senior staff writers, Stewart Cockburn and Ian McKay, to look at the previous 10 years—to compare Playford with Dunstan, as it were.

They found (and on reading it in the way in which it came out they found out despite themselves or by surprise) that, far from losing our former position relative to the larger Eastern States, we had actually improved it over that period. The figures were there for all to see. Where manufacturing employees in Victoria had increased marginally, where the numbers in New South Wales had actually declined, South Australia's numbers had increased quite significantly. That development should not be forgotten when we examine the current state of employment in South Australia.

We should also remember that, historically, South Australia has suffered fairly acutely, in times of recession, because of the nature of its economic base. We rely on motor vehicles, on white goods, and on consumer durables, and when the economy turns down those are the things that people stop buying, and that is where our employment gets hit very hard indeed. Numerous figures can be brought into play to illustrate this. A series I took out recently related the percentage of the unemployed in South Australia to the total Australian unemployed. One must bear in mind, in looking at figures such as this, that over quite a long period our work force has ranged between 9 per cent and 10 per cent of the total work force in Australia. If we were on par, on the average, one would expect our relative unemployment percentage to be about 9 per cent or 10 per cent during that period. That has not been so.

Over the past 10 years there have been one or two recessions—the 1966 recession, particularly in South Australia, but also the 1970-71 situation. One could see that South Australia comparatively was worse off in employment levels than were the other States. We have hovered around 12 per cent to 13 per cent of the total percentage of unemployed in South Australia compared with our 9 per cent to 10 per cent of the work force. From about 1973, a significant change began to appear, a change which, despite the deterioration commented on vociferously by the Opposition, is still evident. By June, 1974, our percentage was 9; in 1975, it was 7.8; and in 1976 it was 6.6. In other words, we had the lowest unemployment rate, and it was about 3 per cent less than one would have expected it to be in South Australia.

Since then, that has increased. It is inevitable that it should have done so because of the nature of our economy and the fact that the promised recovery nationally has not occurred. The longer it does not occur the harder it is to

maintain our peculiar position in South Australia. It has been prophesied by the Premier and Treasurer, by the Minister of Labour and Industry, and by others on the Government side, and it has come as no surprise to anyone that in fact our situation at the moment is deteriorating.

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

Mr. BANNON: Before I was so abruptly interrupted at the dinner adjournment, I was developing the theme of unemployment in the Australian and South Australian economy, and analysing in detail its effects and the facts as they relate particularly to the South Australian economy. I have talked about the facts and the size of the problem. Its severity is another issue at which we should look.

The duration of time for which unemployed persons remain unemployed has been increasing rapidly over recent years, and that carries with it a number of problems, social and other, to which I shall soon refer. Perhaps more importantly and more disturbingly, unemployment is falling increasingly heavily upon young people. For instance, the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics figures (which are sometimes preferred to the Commonwealth Employment Service figures as being either a little more accurate or certainly subject to better statistical verification), in August, 1977, found that the unemployment rates were 3.3 per cent for males 20 years and over and 4.4 per cent for females 20 years and over. That, in itself, is fairly disturbing. It is double what one would have reason to believe was a "natural" unemployment rate. It is certainly at the upper level of what was considered to be the "natural" unemployment rate in past years.

However, when one looks at persons aged between 15 and 19 years, the corresponding figures are 14.6 per cent for males and 19.1 per cent for females. That is fairly devastating and disturbing. The problem of youth unemployment has been recognised increasingly over the past few years as one of the major problems that will face us in future in the employment market, the labour force, and the economy generally. It was recognised early (significantly early, in fact) by the Dunstan Government. That was shown at the beginning of this year, when the permanent head of the Federal Education Department returned from overseas, having attended a conference that the O.E.C.D. had run on the problem of youth unemployment in Europe.

The O.E.C.D. examiners had been around the Australian States the year before, in 1976, collecting statistics and information. It had its examiners' meeting in Paris, which Mr. Jones, the permanent head of the Federal Education Department, attended. On his return, Mr. Jones wrote a number of articles publicising the problem, its severity and the findings of the O.E.C.D., and suggesting certain steps that should be taken to try to do something about it. It is significant that most of the things that he was suggesting (a special group to monitor the situation; research into the severity of the problem; and the needs of unemployed youth; and major initiatives to co-ordinate policies to deal with the problems) had all been initiated in South Australia in the preceding 12 months.

We have led Australia in this field, and in this respect, as much as in any, the slogan used by the Labor Party in the recent election was true. That has been indicated by the interest shown in the activities of the Youth Work Unit and the related schemes undertaken to solve the problem of youth unemployment in South Australia from other States. People from Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia have all come to see what we in South Australia are doing. In turn, South Australians have

attended national conferences on the subject, and it is significant, when one goes to them and looks at the material presented by the various States, to see how far advanced in concept, philosophy and practical schemes the South Australian Government has been. That is then the severity of the problem, particularly the youth unemployment problem.

However, the effect on the individual of unemployment is often glossed over, forgotten, or treated cynically, both in the media and at the political level. The psychological and social effects of unemployment, and the ill-effects deriving therefrom, can be and, one would argue in the present situation, are as great as the economic ill-effects. It indicates total cynicism and cruelty on the part of the Government (and I lay this charge at the feet of the Federal Government) that it uses unemployment as a weapon to solve the economic problem of inflation.

It is all very well to argue, as that Government does, that one can cure the unemployment problem only by curing inflation. That is true to a certain limited extent; we are well over that limit now and, indeed, have been for the past 18 months. It is cruel to use unemployment as an economic weapon at any time when one examines the personal and individual effect that it has on large numbers of people. There are 30 000 unemployed persons in this State and more than 300 000 of them in Australia as a whole.

The effects of which I am speaking have been documented and analysed. They are the same today, despite the cushioning effect of better unemployment benefits, as they were at the time of the depression. Psychologists and social scientists have perceived the same type of pattern in each individual and in groups of individuals who are unemployed for any length of time. Their mood goes from shock, surprise that they are in that situation, to optimism and a belief that they will soon get a job and that their skills and qualities must be recognised. It then plunges down into a feeling of pessimism. In the course of the plunge from optimism to pessimism, all sorts of important decisions are made, and all sorts of personal attributes and personal self-perceptions must be thrown aside as one continues to be unemployed and finds it more and more difficult to get a job.

In this period, the person asks himself whether he should take a lower wage. Faced with monetary worries, he asks himself, "Should I abandon my skills?" if there is not a job in the field for which he has been trained. Should he, as a university graduate, or a skilled tradesman, go into a semi-skilled or unskilled job? That is a significant decision for him to make because he is, in a way, abandoning his expectations and training. He asks himself whether he should go to another district: should he get on the road to search for a job? That is yet another crucial and major decision to be taken.

This mood of pessimism goes on to the stage of giving up trying altogether; it is a period of fatalism. Once the person goes from that declining self-respect to the feeling that it is not really worth trying, anyway, he becomes less and less employable and less and less attractive to an employer if a job opportunity arises. That is the sort of situation in which many people find themselves today. That is why it is so important, in the face of a continuing lengthening economic recession, for Governments, of whatever political complexion, to take some action.

What remedies are there, apart from some magic wand-waving or general up-turn? It is ironical that we are discussing this matter in a State venue and that it is a lively State political topic, because most of the remedies that Governments can take to assist the unemployment problem must be taken on a national basis and at a

national level. We are talking about the national economy, and its relationship with the overseas economy, and the sort of long-term economic strategy that really only a Federal Government can bring about.

The burden has fallen on the States, as it has in so many other areas, because the Federal Government has abandoned its commitment. The cuts in the general Federal economic policy have meant that the States are landed with a social problem. This is really, one increasingly comes to believe, the new federalism as defined by Mr. Fraser.

It is not a question of States' rights being elevated: it is, in fact, States being given responsibilities, having them forced on us whether we like it or not, without the resources to cope with those responsibilities, and this is particularly true of the economic and employment problems today.

South Australia is more vulnerable than most States. We lack natural resources. We do not have the ready resources that, say, Queensland or Western Australia, as large developing States have, with large mineral deposits, and so on. We have always been vulnerable in our economic and manufacturing base, as I said before the dinner adjournment this evening. In fact, the finest resource that we have had in the past few years is the Dunstan Government, its Cabinet, and the A.L.P. policies that it has sustained.

Planning and manpower policy is a national issue. That is one reason why we joined the Federation, but the Commonwealth is denying any action on it. I should like to consider three areas of action. The first is planning and manpower policy itself, which surely is the basis of any long-term ironing out of recession and depression. The Federal Labor Government, from 1972 onwards, was beginning to build up a capacity to handle that sort of problem; it was looking ahead to see where the labour demands would be so that it could try to meet those demands and prepare for them so that structural adjustment could take place. A capacity was being developed, a number of experts were being employed, and forecasts were being made.

Following the end of 1975 and the change of Government, all that stopped. The experts sat around for about six months waiting to be called on. Nothing much happened and they gave up in disgust. For instance, I know of two who went to the United States and another who went into academic life somewhere else. They did that because they were not being used. We have lost them; they will not come back; they have had their experience. It is interesting that manpower planning was down graded and became really irrelevant in terms of the priorities of the Federal department until quite recently. The only reason why it has re-emerged in any form has been because of the persistence that has been shown by the South Australian Minister and the South Australian department in getting the matter raised again and again at meetings of Labor Ministers and the meetings of permanent heads of labour departments. "What about the manpower planning area? It cannot be done at State level. Why do you not take some action?" This has been said time and time again and finally, reluctantly, the Commonwealth, seeing the parlous state that the whole economy is in, has decided to do something.

Another irony is that when the Commonwealth decided to do something it asked South Australia to do it. The head of the Labour and Industry Department in South Australia (Mr. Bowes) has been asked to chair the committee, to take the initiative and organise the national manpower planning initiatives. That is very odd. We will take up the burden but, as I have said, this is a reason for

Federation. The matter should be handled at the national level.

The second area of action is that of education and training. My colleague, the member for Newland, has spoken of schools. They have been criticised for raising the expectations of people but, good heavens, is that not what they are all about? They are there to try to instil in pupils skills and with them the expectations that they can do better, that they can be more productive and lead a more productive community life. When the children are turned out of school with those skills and that expectation and find that there is no suitable work available for them, the experience is fairly distressing. The Education Department is moving successfully to meet that challenge.

At the other level of apprenticeship training and national industry training generally, in South Australia we have again tended to fill a vacuum. We built up our own State training council when the National Training Council seemed to be moribund or treated as a joke. For instance, it is intended to have responsibility for the National Employment and Training Scheme (NEAT). The first that the National Training Council and its Chairman heard about recent major changes to the NEAT scheme was when they read it in the newspaper. There was no consultation and no advice taken. It is for that sort of reason that we have maintained the training council here.

The final area of action and the one that has been subjected to most criticism is that of the State unemployment relief scheme. Job creation schemes are a vital element, particularly in the period that we are going through at present. The Premier and Treasurer, in his Budget speech, outlined the statistics and stated that 8 000 have been employed over a period and, more importantly, that 1 000 people have gained full-time employment from the scheme. These schemes do have value, and I am amazed that members opposite, and even their Federal colleagues, still pretend that they have no value.

It was interesting during the Federal election campaign in December, 1975, when the notorious caretaker Government was in office, that the Liberal and Country Parties, with a great fanfare, offered a five-point plan to deal with Australia's "record unemployment" at that time, as they saw it, including retention of Labor's controversial Regional Employment Development scheme and special aid for mass unemployment centres. Within a few months of the undertaking being given and publicised (within a few months of the election, of course), the scheme was abandoned completely, and again the State had to pick it up.

What is the value of the scheme? There is value to the individual, because he gets employment experience, and he also has a chance, because he holds a job for a certain time, to raise his morale and become more employable. There is importance to the community and the sponsor in the project itself which has a lasting value, and, in the spin-off in the district where people employed are spending money in the local stores and generally helping to sustain that local economy. There is value for the State in the long-term tourist and recreation facilities that the scheme leaves behind. There is value in the services area and in many of the research schemes that are being instituted. An unemployment relief scheme is flexible in the numbers that it can employ at any one time. It can be dismantled or reviewed, depending on the state of the economy. It is responsive to fine tuning. It can be localised to specific districts of high unemployment. It can deal with specific skills.

Our scheme at present has concentrated particularly on clerical work and other areas where young unemployed people find it hardest to get jobs, yet that scheme has been

criticised. It has been said to be shoddy in its administration, yet its administration costs are minimal. It has been said that it does not lead to permanent jobs, yet, as I have said, 1 000 people have gained permanent jobs as a result of it. It has been said to be inflationary, yet the fact that it has concentrated on less skilled groups and high unemployment areas means that it really generates little or no inflationary pressure at all. The member for Light has told us that workmen's compensation payments result in its being a waste, but they would be paid anyway if people were in employment. In any case, the State Government Insurance Commission is handling the insurance and the money is being kept in the State and used for State development.

Finally, there is the pay-roll tax myth, which has been dealt with at length by the member for Davenport. There is no evidence that significant remissions of pay-roll tax will have an effect on employment. They will go into the pockets of employers. Those are the facts and those are the statistics wherever they have been produced. However, there have been remissions in pay-roll tax in the State, and the Treasurer, in his Budget speech, has referred to further considerable remissions. It can be argued that pay-roll tax was regressive in relation to employment, and I think that that probably is a reasonable argument. It might be a good idea if we could abolish the tax, but no alternative revenue source has been submitted by the Opposition.

The only criticism of the unemployment relief scheme that I level is that the Federal Government is getting back about half of what we spend on it, from State funds, in the claw-back of taxes paid by the people on the scheme; in not having to pay unemployment benefits; and in all the other taxes and so on that are generated. That is done at the expense of South Australia and that is the real criticism of the unemployment relief scheme in this State. It is really handing to Mr. Fraser half of the money that is meant to be generating employment in this State.

The SPEAKER: Before the next honourable member speaks, I point out that I am sure he will receive the courtesy of the House.

Mr. GROOM (Morphett): I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to that high office. I am sure, knowing your past record, that you will enhance the dignity of that high office. Like the member for Ross Smith, I ordinarily would refer to my district in detail in this, my first speech in this Chamber. However, I intend to leave such remarks until the Address in Reply debate later. I support the Bill and, in doing so, want to refer to the item in the Treasurer's explanation, dealing with community welfare. He said:

The expenditure in community welfare is expected to increase from \$23 300 000 to \$26 400 000 for the 1977-78 year.

It is pleasing to note that the Government will maintain and continue to improve the level of community welfare services to this State. Had the Liberal Party been successful at the recent State election, undoubtedly the Community Welfare Department would have been the first victim of pruning (to use the language of honourable members opposite).

When the Labor Party came into office in 1965, we had probably the worst welfare services in Australia, yet today we provide the best level of welfare services in the country. In 1965, the Community Welfare Department was called the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department. In that year, the name was changed to the Social Welfare Department, bringing the department at least notionally out of the nineteenth century.

The gross cost of all the departments activities in 1964-

65, other than expenditure from Loan funds, which was \$625 386, was \$1 198 377. The department's receipts amounted to \$197 109. In 1965, the department was primarily housed in the old Cox Foys building in Rundle Street. The field branch was located in Hindmarsh Square. Entering the old Cox Foys building was like walking back into the nineteenth century, with officers working in comparatively primitive conditions. The interviewing conditions were depressing and the absence of air-conditioning made the summer months unbearable, not only for departmental officers but also for the public.

Privacy was another problem, as it was often easy to hear the conversation conducted in adjacent offices because of the primitive conditions applying. Generally, the department's operations were centralised, which is in stark contrast to the position in 1977, when facilities are mainly regionalised. When a Labor Government came into office in 1965 the department was inadequately staffed, and I think, from memory, that only six people were dealing with the enforcement of maintenance orders, despite the fact that new matrimonial and maintenance matters numbered 1 409 in 1965 alone. I intend to summarise some of the advances that have been made since 1965, although my list is not exhaustive.

In 1966, the Labor Government established the Social Welfare Advisory Council, as well as a system of in-service training. An organiser of youth welfare activities was appointed to the staff in 1967 to promote social welfare within the community, and district offices were expanded at Port Adelaide, Elizabeth, Port Augusta, and Mount Gambier.

The new McNally Training Centre at Magill was opened in 1967, and in 1970 the department was amalgamated with the Aboriginal Affairs Department. This, too, led to a new era and, without doubt, it benefited the Aboriginal community by having the functions of the old Aboriginal Affairs Department rationalised.

In 1971, there were major extensions of the department to country areas dealing primarily with matrimonial and maintenance matters. Departmental officers commenced to visit Mount Gambier, Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Lincoln, Yorke Peninsula and Murray River areas. This increased level of services in the department from 1965 was gradually reaching out into the community. No longer did people have to travel from Whyalla and Port Pirie at considerable personal expense to be interviewed by maintenance officers in Adelaide merely to obtain maintenance.

By 1971-72, seven more district offices were opened, some as far south as Christies Beach. In that year we also saw the proposal to appoint community welfare consultative councils in each departmental district. The proposal was to have the local member or his nominee on the council, as well as representatives of local government bodies, the department's district officer and members of the public interested in the furtherance of community welfare.

These councils which are now a reality, have benefited the community immensely. The positive result of these policies was adverted to in the annual report of the Director-General of Community Welfare for the year ended June 30, 1974. The Labor Government did not end its activities in respect of social welfare at that time. In 1976, we saw the introduction of the Crisis Care Centre. We had a community care project and a homemaker service, which was developed to help families that were not functioning adequately, and there was also the Youth Services Unit. A new Juvenile Courts Act was enacted with its related assessment panels so that juveniles are now being treated in a more humane fashion.

In addition, the department moved out of its old Rundle Street accommodation and is now housed in the new Grenfell Street building. This move to the new building has added dignity to the department and to its officers, as well as to members of the public, who are now able to come into proper surroundings to discuss their private problems and obtain the necessary relief.

These are only some of the measures introduced, and there are many more. The department makes a profit, but not in the monetary sense as understood by members opposite. The profit is to the community, and the profit of the Labor Government's record on social welfare services since 1965 has benefited the community immensely. Indeed, I commend the Government for its record of providing South Australia with the best welfare services in Australia.

It is only fair to tell honourable members opposite that I had four years with the Community Welfare Department from 1966 to 1970. I saw it grow from its primitive state in 1965 to its present position, where we have the best level of welfare services in Australia.

Finally, I refer to the level of unemployment. I commend the Government for allocating a further \$22 000 000 in 1977-78 to the State unemployment relief scheme. This takes the total sum provided by the Government to \$44 000 000. In May, 1977, the Glenelg branch of the Commonwealth Employment Service reported that 1 446 unemployed people had registered with it. The figures show that 50 per cent of those people registered were under the age of 21 years, which compares with the 863 persons registered in May, 1967. That branch covers the area from Adelaide Airport to Hallett Cove, going as far east as Morphett Road, and it encompasses a considerable proportion of the Morphett District. In July, 1977, the number of unemployed people registered with that branch was 1 661 and, without the State unemployment relief scheme, I shudder to think what would be the actual number of unemployed people registered with that branch.

For example, \$321 000 was spent in the Morphett District under that scheme, and \$36 000 was spent on extensions to the Glenelg Senior Citizens Club. I doubt that the Glenelg senior citizens would have considered that \$36 000 spent on their club a waste of money. Moreover, \$70 000 was spent on footpaths in that area. I commend the Government for its efforts to keep unemployment down in South Australia, despite the tragic direction of the Federal Government's economic policies.

It is significant in relation to unemployment, not only in South Australia but in other communities of the western world, that there is growing evidence of a real link between unemployment and the increase in crime. I am certain that the drop in the overall number of crimes by 0.79 per cent for the year ended June 30, 1976, is attributable to much of the Labor Government's work in social welfare, and its provision of the State unemployment relief scheme, and we must not forget the RED scheme, which was introduced by the Federal Labor Government.

A research paper published in 1973 tended to show that in the past 100 years, whenever the economy has turned down throwing people out of work, the rate of admission to mental hospitals rose in an exact ratio. Unemployment has profound psychological effects which are likely to increase the degree of mental disturbance in the community. I have already mentioned that the May figures at Glenelg showed that 50 per cent of those registered were under 21 years of age.

Prolonged unemployment among young people may in some cases lead them to turn to drugs as a way out and

eventually to more serious crime. I believe that the number of research papers currently being published add weight to what I have said. I believe it is far better to provide people with work through unemployment relief schemes than to make the unemployed rely solely on welfare benefits. Despite the refusal of the Federal Liberal Government to participate financially in the State unemployment relief scheme, the scheme has benefited South Australians immensely in the work force. I support the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill. I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of this House and to congratulate other members who have been elevated to different positions.

I congratulate my constituents for the very wise confidence they placed in me when I received my best ever majority in my electorate and, indeed, won every box there.

This last election, the election of convenience, saw the greatest of all false advertising in any election propaganda. If one looks at some of the propaganda put out by the Labor Party in the last election, the election of convenience, one sees that one piece of propaganda on State taxation states

The Dunstan Government has given us the lowest State taxes on the mainland.

Of course, it shows a graph which includes mining royalties, but if we analyse just what the figures are we see that, according to the official figures produced by each State Government, South Australians pay the highest per capita taxes of any of the smaller States. Indeed, at \$241.67 a head, South Australians pay more tax than do Tasmanians, Western Australians, and Queenslanders.

Had a private enterprise business produced an advertisement in this manner, there is no doubt that one of the members from the other side, probably the member for Semaphore who runs a regular service of reading out this type of material from the paper, would have approached the Attorney General to do something about it and to investigate this false advertising in the *Advertiser*.

Another propaganda advertisement of the Labour Party that the Attorney General did not see fit to investigate states

We are showing Australia how. Over the past two years South Australia has had the lowest level of unemployment in Australia because the Dunstan Government believes in the right to work.

Of course, the advertisement did not add, "If you join the trade union by compulsory membership" or "If you do not join the union you cannot get a job". The advertisement did not state that part of the union fees, with the sustentation allowance, would go to the Labour Party to help pay for pamphlets and advertising such as I have read out.

Let us see what is the situation regarding unemployment. There are many ways in which one can combat unemployment. The Treasurer and his colleague from Ross Smith, who has just spoken in this debate, mentioned the pay-roll tax scheme which was in the Liberal Party's policy. The Premier's colleague in New South Wales, Mr. Wran, and his labour Government announced that they would put aside \$10 000 000 to finance a full rebate of pay-roll tax on wages paid to young people during their first year of employment. This is a similar scheme to that put forward by the Liberal Party in South Australia in its recent election campaign. The raising of the exemption level from \$48 000 to \$60 000 on pay-roll tax, which this Government has done, goes nowhere near far enough towards the comprehensive employment programme that

is necessary in this State. The New South Wales Labor Government has calculated that this \$10 000 000 will generate 30 000 new jobs, and that completely undermines the arguments put forward by the Labor Party in South Australia.

Let us look at the unemployment figures. We have heard much from members on the other side about the great effort of the Dunstan Government in supplying money and creating employment. One shudders to think what would have happened had they not done this, because the unemployment figures in this State have risen 57 per cent, twice as much as in any other State in Australia. In the six months since April this year, unemployment in Australia has increased marginally from 5.2 per cent to 5.29 per cent, but in South Australia it has risen from 4.5 per cent to 5.21 per cent.

I have not heard or seen those figures put forward by members on the other side during this debate. A number of them mentioned it and showed concern, but they did not release the figures as they are. South Australia is the only State in which unemployment increased during September this year while every other State had a decrease in unemployment. What has happened to the great schemes? What has happened to the great Government's assistance? What has happened to the great unemployment relief scheme and the creation of jobs that this Government has put forward? I believe that it makes nonsense of the Treasurer's claim in his second reading explanation that for the first time in post-war history in an economic downturn South Australia has had a much lower than average unemployment. That is a direct untruth. I suggest that the Treasurer knows that it is an un-truth, and I suggest that the whole of his flock on the other side of the House knows as well.

We know that the last State election was a little different from the one before. We remember quite well when the Treasurer, to save his political skin after the Whitlam Government had got the country deeper and deeper into debt with a \$4 000 000 000 chain around the country's neck (and they were the ones who started the whole thing: the country was in great form until Whitlam and his friends took over), dissociated himself from his Federal colleague.

Unemployment, of course, really started when the Whitlam Government took over: there is no doubt about that. Indeed, it got so bad that Ministers in the Whitlam Government said they would resign. Mr. Cameron, a Minister, said he would resign if unemployment reached a certain level, but he was still there when 100 000 more people were unemployed than the figure he had given.

At the recent election the Treasurer said, "We'll blame the Federal Government for everything that's happened." He blamed the Federal Government for everything that went wrong, and he is still blaming it. In his second reading explanation, he spent a long time placing the blame on the Federal Government. He and some of his colleagues ought to be conscious of the fact that, in the last election, the propaganda was one of the worst forms of deceit I have ever seen in paid advertisements, and I have witnessed many different elections in different countries. The Premier's Department started with a mere handful of staff, whereas now there are about three floors of staff. One cannot keep up with their names: if they were given numbers, it would be much easier. In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer said:

Members will recall that last year the Government abolished succession duty between spouses with effect from July 1, 1976.

However, he did not add that that was Liberal Party policy or that he thought that it was such a good move that he should do something about it. All he did was adopt Liberal

Party policy, as he has done several times in different ways. Regarding industrial democracy, the Treasurer said:

During the current financial year the unit will expand its already extensive work within Public Service departments and statutory authorities.

Mr. Lyndon Prowse, who inaugurated the Industrial Democracy Unit, was encouraged to leave the pet-food industry. However, he obviously fell from favour, and is no longer with the Government. The Treasurer also said:

A representative of industry and a representative of the trade union movement will study developments in Europe and report to the International Conference on Industrial Democracy to be held in Adelaide from May 29 to June 2, 1978. A number of prominent speakers from overseas and interstate will also be addressing the conference.

Where in Europe will our people be sent? One would never dream, when talking about industrial democracy or democracy generally, that the Treasurer would choose Yugoslavia, which is certainly not a workers' paradise. If one gets off the beaten track in Yugoslavia, no resident of that country wants to talk, because the people there are frightened that they will disappear.

Mr. Slater: They might not speak the language.

Mr. MATHWIN: Much can be done without speaking the language. One's hands can be used expressively, as the honorable member probably knows. We have heard much about Ted Gnatenko, who is being sent to Yugoslavia to study worker participation, or industrial democracy, and the taxpayers are paying for his visit there. Anyone who knows anything knows that there is no such thing as industrial democracy in Yugoslavia: there, it is all worker control and worker co-operatives. Does this visit mean we are going to engage in worker co-operatives? Ted Gnatenko, who is going there to see how it all works, will bring back the good news to us, and we will put it into operation. I recall the Treasurer's saying that, if private industry would not co-operate in industrial democracy, he would legislate to compel it to do so. Of course, he had to climb down from that quickly.

Mr. Slater: Perhaps we should have sent you.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Government could have done a lot worse than that, because it would have heard the truth from me on my return.

Mr. Max Brown: We might never have got you back.

Mr. MATHWIN: I have friends who have just returned from Yugoslavia: they were so pleased when they crossed the border that they got down on their knees and thanked God. If the Government wants to know anything about Yugoslavia, I shall be pleased to tell it about that country. I cannot show slides, because one is not allowed to use a camera there.

I was disappointed to see that the upgrading of the Brighton High School was not on the list of work to be carried out. The school, which has a good parent body, has an excellent academic record. It is about 25 years old, and is built on land that was given to the Government. At least 31 temporary timber buildings are located on the site.

Mr. Gunn: It's nearly as bad as Ceduna.

Mr. MATHWIN: Perhaps, but I will not take my colleague up on that, because there are many bad things in Ceduna that I do not want at Brighton. No upgrading of the school buildings has taken place since the school was built. A resource centre has been built with Federal Government funds, together with a music centre, and the major portion of the hall has been provided by the parents' organisation. The greatest need at the school is for shelter sheds for the students, because it has no such shelters at present, nor does it have a matriculation centre. The unfortunate aspect is that there is little room on the site for the building of such a centre.

I hope that departmental officers with responsibility for educational facilities will go to the school and assist in developing an overall plan for the school. The parents have proved by their past record that they are willing and able to assist at every opportunity.

At page 250 of the Auditor-General's Report I note that the general builder's licence fee has been more than doubled from \$20 in 1976 to \$42 in 1977. There were 3 508 general builders' licences in 1976, and there are 4 081 in 1977. The provisional general builder's licence fee has also been increased from \$20 in 1976 to \$42 in 1977. Receipts collected under "Part I Taxation" on account of licence and permit fees were \$586 000, and they amounted to \$155 000 in 1975-76. So, there has been a huge increase of \$431 000, and it must be borne in mind that the building industry is far from buoyant at present.

I congratulate the member for Morphett on his contribution to the debate, but I was a little disappointed that he did not deal with the Morphettville bus depot. Expenditure on constructing this depot amounts to \$3 262 000.

Mr. Slater: That is money well spent.

Mr. MATHWIN: One can say it is well spent if one lives on the other side of the metropolitan area, but one takes a different view if one lives near the depot, as the member for Morphett would well know. The contribution of \$12 040 000 by the State Government on account of the Bus and Tram Division's deficit on operations was \$3 240 000 (or 37 per cent) higher than in 1975-76. After all the Minister's palaver over the past few years, the operations on bus and tram routes resulted in a slight decline of 207 000 in the number of passengers carried, although 1 324 000 more kilometres were run than in 1975-76. So, fewer and fewer people are being attracted on to public transport, although the Minister of Transport has been trying hard to get people to use it.

After all the palaver of the Minister of Transport about Volvo buses some years ago, we have only a few Volvo buses on the road. This does not encourage people to use public transport. The Minister of Transport hates private enterprise so much that at times it puts him off his food and drink. In 1973 the Minister said that there would be a high-speed double-decker train service operating at 70 km/h on the Christie Downs line by July, 1975.

I was surprised that the member for Mawson did not congratulate the Minister on the great service provided by the electric trains that were supposed to be provided on that line! When the Minister promised such a service, Mr. Charles Jones, the then Federal Minister for Transport, was going to give the State Minister all the finance in the world. The project was to be completed in 1975 but, when that year arrived, the Minister said that development of urban transport in the following five years would cost the Government \$130 000 000 and that the first electric trains would operate between Adelaide and Christies Beach in 1977. The Minister has broken promise after promise. We still have Red Hens operating on suburban lines.

What has the Minister provided? Certainly the Bee-line bus service is well patronised, but other public transport services are not nearly so well patronised. The Minister also promised that the Adelaide railway station, which I urge members to inspect, was to be redeveloped into a shopping mall with an international hotel and a restaurant. Certainly we have a restaurant on the lower level of the Adelaide railway station, but the Minister said that, when the promised restaurant was provided at the station, wedding receptions would be held there. Imagine a bride floating down the stairs in a white gown and a train!

Further, the Minister promised that at the station site there would be office accommodation and a stadium

seating 8 000 people. However, these things have not come to pass, in the same way as his promises have been broken in connection with a hovercraft for Kangaroo Island, a high-speed train to Christie Downs, and electrification of that railway line. The argument as to whether the electrified line would be AC or DC went on for months, and at one stage it was to be the overhead system, while at another stage it was to be the third-rail system. Of course, we have finished up with nothing. The only thing we know is that the boom gates go down at the right time. I support the Bill reluctantly, and I will speak in greater detail when the lines are debated.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) moved:

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

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to place on record how pleased I am, as one of the patrons of the South Australian branch of Amnesty International, to learn that the organisation has been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for 1977. I congratulate Amnesty International on this achievement. It is a very worthy organisation concerning itself with prisoners of conscience, regardless of political belief or of country, and I am sure that those of us in this Parliament who are members of it are very pleased at this international recognition.

Another item to which I should like to refer concerns the maiden speeches we have heard from members on the other side of the House. I congratulate them on the speeches they have made. They have been written and delivered extremely well. The content has lacked a certain amount of substance in many instances, and has departed from a reasonable and rational viewpoint on most occasions, but nevertheless they have done a good job so far.

I would particularly like to congratulate (and I am sorry he is not in the Chamber at the moment) the member for Ross Smith. I think he has given us today a very fair indication that, in spite of his lack of a balanced point of view and rejection of the proper side of politics, he undoubtedly is headed for a meteoric advancement to the front bench.

Mr. Allison: I think he's foreman material.

Mr. TONKIN: I think indeed he could well be foreman material. I could see that his colleagues were looking at him obviously with mixed feelings: some admiration for his undoubted ability to put the story across, and also a little concern that he might in fact live up to the prophecies made about his future.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We are very proud of him.

Mr. TONKIN: I am interested to hear on which side of the future faction fighting the Minister of Transport will be.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He's foreman material and that's more than you are.

MR. TONKIN: There is a clear division there, and it will become more and more obvious as time goes on. During the Budget debate, I said:

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.

Later, I said:

It is apparent that we must maintain a maximum level of works activity in the interests of employment and economic activity, and we must exercise restraint in the running costs of essential Government services. Good housekeeping and

strict economy are essential, and this is an area in which the present Government of this State is falling down badly. The Auditor-General's Report makes dismal reading, and there is obviously a tremendous amount of cost-cutting which can be achieved by more efficient accounting and inventory procedures.

There is a glaring need for this Government, in particular, to be kept honest in its spending and accounting.

Mr. Chapman: Do you think that is possible?

MR. TONKIN: I doubt very much whether this Government knows the real meaning of the words "cost benefit accounting". There is a glaring need for this Government to learn as quickly as possible. Waste and mismanagement could well have been the watchwords of the Labor Party during the past seven years, and lack of planning, in the broadest sense of the term, has been the basic cause of it. The subject I want to speak about particularly is the responsibility any Government has to manage the State's affairs responsibly and to get value for the taxpayer's dollar. There have been numerous examples of wasteful expenditure in South Australia. Monarto will go down in the history not only of South Australia but of Australia as one of the Labor Party's most wasteful debacles of all time. More than \$20 000 000 has been poured into the project since it was first conceived, and we still have a seven-figure interest bill each year. The only excuse the Labor Party could put forward for the waste was that more than half the money had come from the Commonwealth. That it is all taxpayers' money seems to have escaped it entirely.

Monarto was conceived at a time when population projections indicated the need for another city to relieve the potential pressure on Adelaide's population and to help stop the suburban sprawl. Even though population figures did not match the projections (and this was known by the Premier's Department and certainly by the planning authorities at the time), the project continued to be promoted and it was promoted right through late 1974, 1975, and 1976.

The money poured into Monarto, even the State's share, could have made a big contribution to inner-urban renewal. The metropolitan sprawl should never have occurred, anyway. Populations have fallen back in the inner suburbs, and the suburban sprawl has been exacerbated by this running down of inner-urban areas, the provision of essential services to outer metropolitan areas becoming inordinately expensive. It should never have happened. Monarto should never have proceeded. It was a total lack of continuing overall planning and control that resulted in the project's continuing when adequate routine monitoring of the situation could and should have called a halt before it had gone so far and so much money had been wasted. Even now, the Labor Party insists (and the Premier made the point in his policy speech) that the project is merely deferred and that it would go ahead immediately if funds were made available. One of the few things we can be grateful to the Whitlam Government for is that it pulled out the rug from under Monarto and stopped the wasteful spending by refusing finance. The appalling thing is that we cannot bring back the money we have wasted. It has gone for good.

Mr. Mathwin: It's only Federal money!

Mr. TONKIN: That was a funny sort of attitude. The Outer Harbor passenger terminal is another one of our State's white elephants. It was started during the life of a Liberal Government, and construction dragged on (and "dragged" is the word) past the time when passenger liners still called at Adelaide. I do not know when it was that a passenger liner called at Outer Harbor, although we have a passenger liner that takes sheep away now. There is

no question that it is easier for passenger ships to go directly to Melbourne and send Adelaide passengers on by rail or air travel. This development was obvious, it is a world-wide trend, and it was apparent five or six years ago, and yet that building still continued on in the same way and was completed, and it is rarely used for its intended purpose.

The container port is another white elephant. In the past few days we have heard that it has come into some prominence because it is being used as a result of the diversion of ships from Melbourne. Ships are being sent away from Melbourne because of the Victorian power strike, and the Outer Harbor container berth is able to cope with those ships. However, it still costs more to steam up the gulf and to steam out again, and it is not financially a viable proposition for the container port to continue to operate.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's good. Rocky would close it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister of Transport is making completely asinine remarks, but they are not worrying me in any way. There may be a time, and we can all hope for it, when both of these facilities (the container port and the Outer Harbor passenger terminal) will be needed again. In the meantime, we have about \$15 000 000 to \$18 000 000 tied up there waiting for something to happen. If the position had been regularly monitored and obviously changing conditions noted, we could have avoided spending all that money, which could better have been spent on other projects.

The frozen food factory, designed to provide pre-packed good meals for hospitals, was estimated initially to cost about \$1 000 000, but the cost has now escalated to be nearer \$5 000 000. Reports indicate that the cost of meals, which were supposed to be so much cheaper because of the frozen food factory, will not be much less, anyway. Again, it seems that we have had inadequate planning and investigation.

I am pleased that the Minister of Transport is in the Chamber, because I am able to say that the \$18 000 spent on potted plants in the new Motor Registration Division building is a total and absolute waste of money at a time when the whole country is suffering from extreme economic stringency. Even the annual maintenance, we are told, is to cost about \$7 000. The people of South Australia, who are already paying more to put the average family car on the road than people in other States are paying, will not feel pleased about having to pay \$18 000 initially and \$7 000 annually thereafter just to provide potted plants for the Motor Registration Division building. It is a scandalous situation.

There are other examples, some bigger, some smaller, all of which add up to a colossal potential saving that could be made if we could control spending, monitor the development of projects, and control waste. There are three ways that presently exist to control and check Government spending. They are, first, the Public Works Standing Committee; secondly, the Auditor-General; and, thirdly, the Public Accounts Committee. The Auditor-General is responsible directly to Parliament, and it is his duty each year to report on all Government accounts. Although he cannot take any action to correct a situation, he can comment on and ventilate various deficiencies in accounting, and draw attention to wasteful situations. Normally, his report comes in at the same time as the Budget is being considered.

Examining the Auditor-General's Reports from 1970, it is possible for one to form some idea of the officer's

continued concern for the general standard of accounting in all Government departments. In 1970, the then Auditor-General (Mr. G. H. P. Jeffery) said in his report:

In terms of the Audit Act, I am required *inter alia*, to report upon all matters relating to the public accounts. My review goes beyond that of a commercial audit, and is designed to ensure that Parliament's control of public money is maintained.

That is fairly much a standard form used in each report. The Auditor-General continued:

Generally, the accounting work in these organisations is well done.

This is in 1970. The Auditor-General pointed out the need then for a constant review to be carried out to up-date methods. He made some penetrating comments on general Government funding, too. These are things which all Governments should constantly keep in mind and which, it is obvious, the present Government has not kept in mind and about which it could not care less. The Auditor-General said:

Last year I commented that the problem facing Government is to keep the growth of public expenditure under control and at the same time discharge its responsibilities to the public. There is pressure from some sections of the community for greater expenditure on particular functions, but Governments must, with Parliamentary authorisation, apportion available revenues or borrowings to, in its judgment, the best overall advantage. In recent years there has been an increase in the cost levels of various projects, such as schools, hospital and other Government buildings. The cost of functions of Government has also increased because of *inter alia* improved wages and conditions for employees.

This is the important part:

In spending, the criterion should not be how much has been spent but the value that is received for that expenditure, to ensure the provision of projects of adequate standard at a minimum cost.

The then Auditor-General made the following pertinent point:

Too much emphasis is placed by some on the amount spent rather than the effectiveness for a given cost. It is obvious that, if costs are minimised, more projects can be undertaken.

That is a fundamental fact that all Governments should remember. It is a truism, yet Governments, particularly this Government choose to ignore it. In 1971, the Auditor-General's Report followed much the same lines. However, he also commented on the Public Works Committee, which has the task of examining proposals for major public works, as follows:

Last year, I commented on the high cost of some public works and emphasised the necessity for economy in design and execution to provide the maximum facilities at the minimum of costs. This is essential if the public is to get the greatest benefit from funds available. I again advocated a critical review of specifications and estimates of departmental works to ensure that essential requirements are provided for at the lowest possible outlay.

The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works does examine this aspect, but many projects do not come within its scrutiny. These include all works estimated to cost less than \$300 000, projects excluded by various Acts, and works, such as Institute of Technology and university buildings, where the State provides a part only of the moneys required. Further, the committee has no responsibility beyond its report to Parliament in terms of section 24 of its Act, which must be made before the works prescribed by the Act can be authorised. It has no jurisdiction over any variations which may be made subsequent to its report.

Variations are made in some cases subsequent to the report of the committee, and the Strathmont Hospital and Training Centre is an illustration of this. This project was recommended by the committee in 1965 at an estimated cost of \$5 702 000. This complex was officially opened in March, 1971, and the cost to June 30, 1971, excluding staff houses (estimate \$126 000), workshops and cost of land, etc., is \$6 534 000. Many construction details were varied from those submitted to the committee, and many features were in my opinion, of a standard in excess of essential requirements.

As an indication that design savings can be made, tenders were called during this financial year for a suburban technical college. The original tender price was in excess of \$2 000 000, but, after review of the specifications with the contractor and without reduction in requirements, a saving of \$336 000 was made. This has not been repeated with other projects.

Thus, the Public Works Committee has no power to control excessive variations from the estimated cost, even though savings can obviously be effected if an effort is made.

The position has not improved, and this is shown by the most recent report made by the Auditor-General, in which he refers to the Paringa Park Primary School. Although I do not intend to go through the report in detail, I say simply that, for some unaccountable reason which will be interesting to hear (I recognise that the member for Glenelg is concerned about the subject), and despite the Public Works Committee having twice recommended against the expenditure, the proposal has gone ahead. The Auditor-General said:

A proposal for the redevelopment of the school at an estimated cost of \$375 000 was then submitted to the committee in 1974.

This was after it had rejected the first proposal in 1972. The report continues:

Again the committee recommended against the proposal for the following reasons—

Except for the canteen, the facilities provided for both the infant and primary school at Bowker Street, Paringa Park, are reasonable.

The downward trend in student enrolments has been substantially more severe than was previously predicted.

The development of sporting facilities for both school and community use in conjunction with the Brighton council on a nearby site in Bowker Street, will provide additional recreation and sporting facilities for the students.

However, expenditure amounting to \$560 000 for stage 1 of the redevelopment of the school was approved, and to June 30 this year funds totalling \$683 000 have been spent on a project that the Public Works Committee said was not necessary or desirable. That simply points up the fact that the Public Works Committee is a useful committee to examine projects when they first come forward, but there is no power in the committee to control progress and expenditure on projects once they are passed. The Public Accounts Committee, which was established as a result of the initiative and persistence of the member for Mallee, now exists to examine accounts that appear to be inconsistent, and the Auditor-General's Report is a useful indicator to that committee, but the committee can investigate wasteful spending only after it has occurred, and often a long time afterwards, as we have heard this afternoon. Projects that are referred to by the Auditor-General may certainly be the subject of a report by the Public Accounts Committee, but, just as the Public Works Committee looks at projects before they are put in train, the Public Accounts Committee looks at spending and projects after they have been completed, after the accounts have been completed, and after the expenditure

has been incurred.

Obviously, this, again, is a very necessary committee, but it is no good having two committees if in the meantime, in the middle ground, the Government's wasteful expenditure can go on unchallenged, and that is exactly what has happened. The terms "unsatisfactory accounting procedures" and comments on the need for improved budgetary control appear in the Auditor-General's Reports with increasing frequency as the years progress. A suggestion to bring the Engineering and Water Supply Department workshops into one central location was first made in 1970. Two private consultants have more recently reported that savings of about \$1 000 000 a year could be made by doing just that, but still no action has been taken. In 1972, under "Hospitals Department", the Auditor-General stated:

For a number of years I have referred to the need for the department to renew procedures relating to inventories, and . . . little progress has been made.

The Auditor-General's Reports contain evidence of repeated frustration, of comments repeated year after year, and encompassing the activities of the various departments. Many departments have over the years taken up the challenge and improved their accounting procedures, but obviously some departments have not, if last year's report is consulted. We have already had ventilated this afternoon the matter of cost accounting, particularly on food costs at the Northfield wards. An investigation was made into the procedures and controls over foodstuffs, with particular reference to those wards. The examination disclosed that internal control was weak or non-existent, budgeting was poor, reporting was ineffective, the records were inadequate, and a reply has not been received to the report. This year, in his report, the Auditor-General states:

I reported last year that an investigation was made into the procedures and controls over foodstuffs with particular reference to the Northfield Wards of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The examination disclosed that internal control was weak or non-existent, budgeting poor, reporting ineffective and records inadequate. An examination of the matter of food costs in the Hospitals Department was commenced by the Public Accounts Committee on December 2, 1976.

The Public Accounts Committee, whilst it can investigate examples of wasteful spending (and we look forward to its report) actually is looking at things that have already happened, and expenditure that has already been incurred. Certainly, recommendations can and should be made by the committee to prevent any recurrence of wasteful spending. The effectiveness of the Public Accounts Committee depends entirely on the activities of the committee itself and, as the member for Alexandra has said this afternoon, there is a great deal to be said for the system which applies to committees in Parliaments of other countries, where the Leader of the Opposition or his nominee is Chairman of the committee.

However, the fact remains that the Public Works Committee and the Public Accounts Committee are both unable to influence or control current Government spending and the firm conclusion, judging from the Auditor-General's continued comments, is that he is basically powerless to do anything more than comment on Government mis-spending. He does it regularly, but the responsibility is on the Government itself to make certain that changes are made. Whether the Auditor-General, who is already an officer responsible to Parliament and independent of the Government, should or could be given more power to require government departments to adopt accounting procedures approved by him is something that should be considered seriously. It is the Government's

responsibility to make sure that taxpayers receive value for their tax dollars. The Corbett report states:

Much of the Public Service gave us the impression that it was not concerned with efficiency at all.

It also stated:

We have found too many examples of work being done where no form of efficiency or productivity control whatsoever was in existence.

It would be of great benefit to the community if a summary of the various items (in other words, a precis or summary of his Report in simple language) of special concern to the Auditor-General could be published separately each year and made freely available to the public. The report is a public document, but in its present form it might just as well be totally inaccessible to the public. Each such summary to which I have referred should contain the Auditor-General's progress reports, and comments on how far the Government had gone towards rectifying those problems outlined in previous years.

Parliament is the forum where the Budget lines can be examined in detail and we will do that if given the chance. Unfortunately, Parliament can also be controlled to a degree by the Government, and the facts do not always come out as they should. This was the case in that most unfortunate instance when the Government applied the guillotine during consideration of the State Budget some years ago. Ultimately, the responsibility for the management of Government departments rests with the government, and the public should be informed of the government's record in management. This Government is proud to say that it is an open Government, but I strongly disagree that it is. We have had more reports suppressed by the Labor Government in recent years than in the history of the Parliament, whereas the people have a right to know how its money is being used and how the Government is managing it. If the precis of the Auditor-General's Report was released, people could form their own opinions, guided by an independent Auditor-General and unmoved by the political weighting which often occurs. It does not matter how true those comments may be: that automatic reservation obviously comes forward, and it should not. Members of the public should be given the facts.

The Government should not need reminding of the responsibility that it has towards the electorate and the taxpayer but, as time goes on, this responsibility can be all too easily replaced by an attitude of arrogance and cynicism, and this is exactly what is happening with this Government. The Auditor-General's Report, in summary form and simple language, as well as the Public Acts Committee's reports in summary form, should be widely available to the public as one way of helping to keep this Government honest. It should not be necessary for this step to be taken but, in the light of the performance and the gross waste and mismanagement which has characterised this Government's performance, I believe that such a step is vitally necessary.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I wish to complain in this grievance debate about the activities of the brash, young Attorney-General. The member for Playford, who was passed over for the job, would have been far more competent and acceptable than the present Attorney-General. In their lack of wisdom, Labor Party members sought to elevate this brash young man to be the chief law officer of this State, but he has made a howling mess of the job ever since. I have time to recite briefly some of the highlights of the Attorney's career, but I want to deal with the manner in which he answers, or fails to answer, Questions on Notice and questions without notice in this

House. For the interest of members I refer to the Attorney's reason for not taking the oath of allegiance initially in this House. In explaining his position he stated outside the House:

I am an agnostic. I think religion is quite irrelevant to anything. I would prefer to swear my allegiance to Australia and not to the Queen. I do not hold any allegiance to the Queen, but you have just got to say that. There is no other choice.

Mr. Tonkin: A man of principle!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: True, yet I noticed that the Attorney was willing to accept the hospitality of Her Majesty on the Royal Yacht on the occasion of the Royal visit to South Australia, despite the fact that he owes her no allegiance, and he is not too proud to say so publicly.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We know that the Opposition was kept well in the background during the tour. Even the Republicans were well to the fore in enjoying the hospitality of Her Majesty. I need not remind the House again of the Attorney's Marxism. Members know of his activities as editor of *On Dit*, and I refer to his political philosophy—

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has just grievously misrepresented me.

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

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I refer to the following press report about the Attorney's philosophy:

Mr. Duncan's political philosophy is based in a study of Marxist thought, and relating it to Australian society.

I have no further time to pursue that. The next highlight in the Attorney's career was his public statement that he misled this House in relation to the homosexual Bill, just to ensure its passage. As soon as it was through, he said he would let the homos into the schools. That was another highlight in his career, and so it goes on.

Another point which comes to mind is his bemoaning the fact that left-wing students have suddenly gone silent, that there was a right-wing takeover. More recently, I refer to the Attorney's failure to answer satisfactorily questions in this House, especially in relation to his latest gaff, that is, the insult to the magistrates in South Australia. Last week I asked a question in this House and the Attorney started to answer but, simply because the member for Mitcham kept interjecting, he ceased to answer. I refer to the tail-end of the *Hansard* report of the reply, as follows:

Mr. Millhouse: There's nothing wrong with the *Advertiser*.

The Speaker: Order!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member quoted from the *Advertiser* editorial— that was I he was talking about, as I quoted that editorial—

and that is the point to which I was replying.

Mr. Millhouse: You said there was one law for the rich and one for the poor.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not getting the chance to reply because of the constant interjections of the honourable member.

He sat down without giving me an answer.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: That's right.

The Speaker: Order! The honourable Minister is out of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is typical of the lack of an adequate answer that we get on numerous occasions from the Attorney. At other times he makes up his own questions and then prefers not to answer them. I refer to one Question on Notice involving one of my constituents,

who came to my office after she had been involved in a divorce case. This matter had gone on for about 18 months, and she was a regular visitor to my office.

The divorce had been granted after much trauma and a property settlement had been given in the woman's favour. Her husband had shot off to Alice Springs with his secretary or the like. The property settlement of the former matrimonial home had been ordered to pass to the woman. On inquiry some time after the order had been given, it transpired that the judge in the Family Court had ordered that no stamp duty would be applicable to this transaction, but this was disputed by the Stamp and Succession Duties Division of the South Australian Government. The division believed that she would have to pay duty. This woman was in a quandary, as she wanted to get hold of the property. I then put the following Question on Notice to the Attorney to try to clarify the position for this distressed woman:

1. Is South Australian stamp duty applicable to property settlements ordered by the Family Court of Australia in divorce cases?

2. If the position is not clear when will it be clarified?

3. Is it a fact that property settlements are being made and exemption from stamp duty granted by the court?

The reply I received from the Attorney, after much delay, a matter of about six weeks, was as follows:

It is my policy not to answer questions involving purely legal matters or to give legal advice when replying to questions. My policy in this regard was clearly stated in the House on October 14, 1975.

On October 14, 1975, the Attorney answered a question on legal advice asked by Mr. Jennings, the former member for Ross Smith, who was apparently trying to guide the Attorney's footsteps in the right path, a case of the blind leading the blind.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's nasty.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I would not suggest that members opposite are the most charitable members who have ever set foot in this House. Mr. Jennings asked the following question:

Will the Attorney-General say whether it will be his policy, as it has been the policy of most Attorney's in the past, to refuse to answer questions asked in the House by members on purely legal matters? Some members seem to expect answers to such questions, and many of their constituents expect that they can get the advice free.

The Attorney's reply was as follows:

I am pleased that the honourable member has raised this matter, because I believe that it is one that can lead to some difficulties if the Attorney-General is called on to answer such questions in the House.

He went on to say that he would not answer such questions. Is it reasonable for my constituent, who was awarded a house in a property settlement in the Family Court in South Australia (I know it is a Federal jurisdiction) which excluded stamp duties, to be subject to the legal argument that arose between one Government department and another Government instrumentality? In effect, the Attorney is saying that she has to fight this matter in court. That was the import of his answer. He is saying that he will not give legal advice free to the House, so my constituent has to hire a lawyer to clarify the argument between one Government department in South Australia and a law court. That situation is ridiculous, and the Attorney should rightly address himself to it.

Heaven knows when the woman will come into possession of that house. The point at issue is that a question is asked in good faith in this House seeking clarification of a problem that has arisen because of the activities of a Government department, and I am fobbed

off by the Attorney-General, who says, "I refuse to answer legal questions." This is hardly a satisfactory state of affairs.

MR. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I was a little remiss last time I got to my feet in not offering you, Mr. Speaker, congratulations on your appointment as Speaker, and I take this opportunity to do that. I am sure that you will adjudicate fairly, although you did a pretty quick piece of stumping this afternoon.

During the recent election campaign I expressed much concern at the apparent failure of the Government's decentralisation policies in the South-East. I did say that I was pleased there was some decentralisation of tertiary institutions, both at the State and Federal levels, with the introduction of a number of Government departments into Mount Gambier.

One thing which is quite obvious, and which has been obvious for some time, is that the industrial base in the South-East, like the industrial base of South Australia, is declining. Among points that I made during the election campaign was the point that the Electricity Trust power plant in Mount Gambier was closed in October last year, with the loss of about 50 of the 66 jobs available with the Trust. Admittedly, the men were transferred into other industries, but the jobs they had are no longer available.

Then, there was the pre-election promise in March or April, 1975, of the Modulock industry coming to Mount Gambier. That never transpired and a reason has never satisfactorily been given. There was some indication that patents might not be granted, but then I was told in answer to a question that there was no real problem with the patents. Modulock is quietly waiting in New Zealand, where it is still in business. I asked why some South Australian industry such as ATCO Homes, which has recently made an attractive export deal, could not be attracted into partnership, if that were necessary, with the Woods and Forests Department in the South-East to manufacture some sort of transportable home, but apparently that was not considered.

In recent months, the Premier has announced the expansion of a number of industries, with millions of dollars being spent in the South-East, but what this has meant is that machinery has been replacing men. What we have is an apparent lip service to decentralisation but not much in the way of action. That is probably understandable because we are having a problem generally in attracting industry to South Australia, and to transfer industry from the metropolitan area to the country is a rather difficult problem.

Nevertheless, I point out that decentralisation policies have not succeeded in spite of the Premier's going to the South-East during the election campaign and saying there was yet one more survey being undertaken to see just how practicable it was to get the green triangle under way. I say "one more survey" because in 1971 the then Minister for Woods and Forests (Mr. Casey) said that the South-East would naturally expand when the population reached 25 000, and the Deputy Premier in 1972 reiterated that, saying that the South-East could support about 250 000 people. The Premier, in 1974, promulgated the green triangle idea. He then gave every local government leader in the South-East pre-election entertainment in Mount Gambier, which I think might have been contrary to the Electoral Act, but nevertheless there apparently was a loophole. At that time he told them another survey was under way.

The Liberal incentives which I brought to public notice in the South-East and which seem to have gone down well, since I am here today, specifically mentioned one aspect that has been ridiculed this evening by the member for

Ross Smith and the member for Morphett. They seem to think that they have a mortgage on concern for unemployed people. I do not really think they considered what they said. We are extremely concerned about the unemployed, particularly unemployed youth, and much of our pre-election campaign in the South-East was directed towards this. The young people in the South-East recognise our concern.

Regarding pay-roll tax, Dr. Barry Hughes mentioned in a speech he gave at the Wentworth Hotel in Sydney that the Federal Government did not appear to be interested in the youth job subsidies. There have been two youth job subsidies offered. One is the 20 000 young people who have been employed as a result of the apprenticeship incentive scheme of \$63 an apprentice, which has gone down well for employment. The other is the pay-roll tax incentive announced only last night by the Labor Premier in New South Wales, obviously a man of some repute and therefore one whose ideas are not to be taken lightly, even if he did happen to pinch them from the Liberal Party in South Australia.

Yet, this suggestion has been ridiculed by our Premier. To praise Mr. Wran in New South Wales would, indeed, be to praise the Liberal Party in South Australia. The *Australian*, in its editorial this morning, commented that the Premier of New South Wales had been "commendably inventive"; he had, he had pinched his idea straight from our policy. In being commendably inventive, what has he decided to do? He will give pay-roll tax incentives so that young people employed after a period of three months unemployment and taken on in their first job will have their pay-roll tax frozen for a whole year. This was ignored as an incentive for youth and yet that is precisely what pay-roll tax freezing is; it is an incentive for the lower salary scales, and if that is not an incentive for youth, what is?

We were further criticized in an unprincipled way when the Premier implied that we were completely against any unemployment relief scheme. My Leader, in his comments in the pre-election period, stated unequivocally that we would continue worthwhile relief schemes.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He said what we were doing—

Mr. ALLISON: No, you said that. The Premier had it on his conscience, probably because a public opinion poll taken here recognised our scheme, for what it was worth, as a good one and said that the unemployment relief scheme was the lesser of the two alternatives as far as acceptability was concerned.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You made your campaign—

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

Mr. ALLISON: The Liberal Party is willing to consider not just one single-minded scheme but two schemes to run concurrently. This is where the Government seems to be rather short-sighted. It has the idea that unemployment relief schemes that foster local government projects are the only way to salvation, yet the Premier admits that 8 000 people were employed for an average of 21 weeks each. Our scheme would, at the same time, encourage private enterprise to keep young people on for a longer term.

It is significant, I think, that Premier Wran says he will spend \$10 000 000 (that is far less than the Liberal Party said it would spend if it won the election) in anticipation of about 30 000 jobs for young people being created during the next 12 months. As I said, he is a Labor Premier and therefore a man of honour and reputation; his word is worth accepting. Surely honourable members opposite have to admit that. If they do admit that and do see the worth of a fellow Labor Premier's point of view, as they keep telling us they accept it, they must acknowledge that

there is some good in what was promulgated four or five weeks ago, and certainly over the past four or five months, as a solid Liberal incentive to get long-term industrial private enterprise development well and truly off the ground and, in particular, to get those kids back to work.

MR. GUNN (Eyre): I take this opportunity to correct some statements that the Attorney-General made about me, as the local member for the old seat of Eyre, during the election campaign, when he took it on himself to make untrue remarks about me. Knowing him as I do, that is not unusual, because he normally resorts to that kind of behaviour. On the occasion in question a person recorded the whole of his speech, and I am fortunate enough to possess a tape recording of what was said, and I have had my secretary take the trouble to type a transcript of it.

Mr. McRae: Was it a legal recording?

MR. GUNN: It was taped in public by a member of the Labor Party, I believe.

Mr. Chapman: That would make it all right.

MR. GUNN: Yes.

Mr. McRae: How many tapes are there?

MR. GUNN: Only one. I should be pleased to play it for the honourable member. I will quote only some of what the Attorney-General had to say, to the honourable member's benefit. He may well have been our Attorney-General, but we know that the left wing of the Australian Labor Party had its way and we now have a radical Attorney-General who has badly blotted his copy book.

Mr. Chapman: How will we get on with the up-and-coming Bannon, the member for Ross Smith?

MR. GUNN: I will leave him to my colleague, as he is in the industrial area.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The razor's coming out now.

MR. GUNN: You're commo friends will look after you all right. I will quote what the Attorney-General had to say.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You have to find quotes out of context to make it sound worse.

MR. GUNN: Give me time. The Attorney-General said:

I know full well of the problems in this particular area, for goodness sake, of course you're going to get better services and a better deal out of the situation than if your member of Parliament, as I suggested Graham Gunn does has nothing to do with the Government whatsoever, refuses to take people in to introduce them to the Government. Arthur Whyte does it, Claude Allen did it, but Graham Gunn is so much opposed to the Labor Government that he doesn't even speak to the Labor members in Parliament most of the time.

This is the learned Attorney-General. He went on to say:

If you have a member who is going to work hard for the district, is going to get around the place, is going to write to Ministers, is going to represent the interest of the constituents whether they be for group interests or the individual interests—

Mr. Allison: Which of the two candidates did he have in mind?

MR. GUNN: The one from the eastern section, I think. He also went on to say that I was so much opposed to the Government that I did not even write one letter to a Minister. I rang my secretary when this matter was brought to my attention, and she took a rough count on September 1. From February 1, 1977, I had written 120 letters to State Ministers, 22 letters to Federal Ministers, I had had 11 contacts with State Government departments, and 14 contacts with Federal departments; I had made 21 approaches to our Senators; and I had asked 41 questions in Parliament. That completely contradicts the untrue and deliberately misleading statements of the Attorney-General; they are complete lies.

THE SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member

knows that "lies" is unparliamentary; there are other words he can use.

MR. GUNN: The Attorney's statement was a complete fabrication, and he knew it to be so. He went up to Leigh Creek in a deliberate attempt personally to denigrate me, because he hoped that people in those areas had no knowledge of the manner in which I had represented my constituents. He was fully aware that Claude Allen was highly regarded there, and so was Arthur Whyte, so there would be no marks in attacking them. So, he thought I would not be known there and he would resort to untruths in an attempt to gain mileage for the Labor Party.

He went on to say that I had failed to take up on behalf of a constituent at Andamooka a case which that person had brought to my attention. I have no knowledge of any person at Andamooka approaching me on any occasion on which I had failed to take up a matter on his behalf. The Attorney indicated in the tape that, when he saw me, he was going to have a piece of me.

Since then, I have been trembling that he would suddenly rush up and accost me. We have exchanged words in the corridors, and on one occasion they were fairly sharp words. He has not approached me in relation to this matter, but he has accused me of deliberately saying to that person that I had taken up this matter, that I had deliberately done nothing about it, and that I went back to that person and said that the Government had done nothing about it for political purposes. That is untrue. In the case of every person who has approached me since I have been a member, no matter what his political views, I have done my utmost to attend to his problems. I object to the Attorney-General's gutter tactics. I am happy for him to visit my district, because it seems that wherever he goes it is sure that the Liberal Party will increase its vote. I ask him to stick to the truth and not resort to such gutter tactics, characteristic of him during his short time in office. It is obvious from what has taken place over the past few weeks in South Australia that he will not hold the office for long. My figures completely prove that what he has been saying is not only untrue but also unworthy of Her Majesty's first law officer.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Did Senator Jessop speak the truth at Coober Pedy?

MR. GUNN: Yes, and I was there with him.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Did he tip the can on the State Labor Government?

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

The Mr. GUNN: The Minister has never been in order, even in relation to the Stuart Highway. I had the pleasure of discussing those remarks with Senator Jessop before he delivered them. We agreed that they were fair and accurate and gave a true picture to the people of Coober Pedy. It would have been wrong of us to address a large gathering of people by giving information that was not factual. We wanted to explain clearly what the South Australian Government had done in relation to that matter. We did not enter into a character assassination of the Minister, because we would not want to do that. We were disappointed by the Minister's inaction. On another occasion, I will have something more to say about the Minister and the Stuart Highway.

I am waiting for the Attorney-General to tear a strip off me. I would like to know the name of the constituent and the matter in question. He has not approached me, although he has had over a month to do something about it. I believe that he was only engaging in political nonsense, as he normally does. His statements made at Leigh Creek and Andamooka were untrue and unworthy of him, and if he is an honourable person, I challenge him

to apologise to me for saying that I would not approach a Minister or talk to Government members because I had such a dislike for the Government. That is untrue. The Government knows that I have no argument for the Labor Party's philosophy, but I try not to take my dislike of its philosophy outside the Chamber. No-one can say that I have ever failed to represent a constituent who came to me for assistance. I believe the Attorney-General is not only the worst Attorney-General in Australia but also the most incompetent.

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

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I am disappointed that the Minister has left the Chamber, because I wish to deal with the West Beach Trust which, since the Government amended the Act, comes under the control of the Minister of Local Government. For some time I have been concerned about some aspects of the trust's operations. In September, 1974, the trust purchased Marineland and borrowed \$200 000. The Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1976, states that Marineland had an operating deficit of \$53 000, while the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1977, at page 512, states that Marineland had a deficit of \$14 000. Whilst it is pleasing that the deficit has been reduced, I am disappointed with some aspects of Marineland's operations. Last summer Marineland was unable to offer the public performances by the dolphins. Indeed, we were told at one stage that the dolphins had gone on strike! I have never heard anything so silly.

Marineland was virtually forced on the trust through industrial problems, but the venture has not been properly maintained, and there has been little care and concern for the whole operation. The Auditor-General's Report states that expenditure for 1976-77 included \$5 858 representing replacement of cash loss from the Marineland safe. The insurance brokers advised that no claim under the insurance policy would be admitted.

Much has been said about the value of the Auditor-General and the various matters that he brings to Parliament's attention; for example, his comments over the years concerning the accountability of some departments, accounting methods, and suggestions regarding internal auditing. However, one is disappointed that there are only a few lines stating simply that \$5 858 represented the replacement of cash loss from the Marineland safe; no further information has been given. The Auditor-General should have gone into greater detail, because inferences could be made from his brief statement that could reflect unnecessarily on the management of Marineland. If the Auditor-General gives information to this House, he should complete that information, instead of leaving it up in the air, as in this case relating to Marineland.

It is stated that the insurance brokers advised that no claim under the insurance policy would be admitted. Three questions arise. First, what kind of insurance policy was it? Secondly, how was the safe entered? And, thirdly, why would the insurance company not grant the claim? Because the Auditor-General is not restricted in respect of the size of his report, he should go further when he makes references of this kind.

A classic example in this connection relates to the pilfering of food from one of the State hospitals. If the Auditor-General had given full details, all the speculation and confusion would not have occurred. It is now up to a Parliamentary committee to investigate that matter fully.

Turning back to Marineland and the West Beach Trust, here is a wonderful opportunity for the Government, through the trust, to develop a large tract of land into a

people's playground and a first-class recreation and picnic area. However, I stress that we should not clutter up the rear portion of the last of the sand dunes in the metropolitan area.

I am pleased that over the past two years almost \$1 000 000 has been granted to the West Beach Trust in the form of unemployment relief grants, which have created much employment in the area. Regrettably, this allocation has not led to a large amount of permanent employment. If more resources had been used in developing the recreation area, more permanent jobs would be available in connection with maintaining the reserve. Money has been set aside for cycle tracks, and I point out that this area would be ideal for a cycle track and a mini-cycle area for young people. The pony club there needs extra ground, but it is not being made available at present.

If the Government made more funds available, people would be able to have recreation close to the city. As land becomes scarce with the development of the metropolitan area, we should foster the development of areas for all types of recreation. I hope the Government will carefully watch the management of the West Beach Trust to ensure that taxpayers' money is spent in a way that will benefit all those who wish to use the trust's facilities.

Mr. WOTTON (Murray): I wish to promote a few local issues in this debate. Many are matters to which I have referred in this House on previous occasions, and some I will continue to promote until action is taken by the Government. I shall be able to discuss matters of financing and costing when we deal with the lines, but the first matter I shall mention is one I have raised many times; indeed, it was raised many times by the former member for Heysen. I refer to the necessity for an adequate water supply for the areas from Callington through to Strathalbyn and the surrounding districts. The matter has been brought to the notice of the Government and has been put before the appropriate Minister on many occasions. A further deputation will meet the Minister soon to discuss the problem. It is a matter of great need.

It has been pointed out that it is unlikely that a water supply will be put through from Callington to Strathalbyn, but it would be appreciated if water could be supplied at least from Callington to the Woodchester and Hartley area. When the Minister announced recently that action would be taken to clean the Bremer River, the news was well received. Much of the surrounding area depends on the river and, whilst the progress of the work will be closely watched, I must bring to the attention of the Minister the need for a reticulated water supply in the area.

The cost of water has been mentioned many times by speakers on this side. I have referred previously to people who must pay for water whether or not they use it. It is most unfair that, particularly in rural areas, where water passes the property people are being charged for water whether or not it is being used. Inefficient services are provided in reticulated water schemes in many areas in my district, especially at Mount Barker and Mannum. I receive more letters of complaint about water pressures and engineering and water supply matters than about any other matter. One of the more recent, which came from a new constituent of mine at Mannum, states:

I am writing to you in the hope that you may be able to help with our water problem. To start at the beginning, we purchased a new Housing Trust built home in the north corner of Mannum two years ago. Since then, we have been fighting for enough water pressure to drive a sprinkler, but it has been useless.

The letter goes on in detail to explain the action taken

by these people, without success, and concludes as follows:

We are not satisfied, and feel we are entitled to receive what we pay for—a decent water supply.

These people have organised a petition which has gone before the Minister. I have raised the matter again because I believe, too, that the people deserve what they are paying for. Certainly, they are paying enough at present in water charges.

I have previously raised the matter of the need for an improved water supply for Murray River towns such as Murray Bridge and Mannum, and an improved filtration plant of some description, for those two towns particularly. The water at present available in Murray Bridge is useless for domestic purposes, and the area is in urgent need of an adequate domestic water supply. A great deal of propaganda is associated with the need for improved filtration works in the metropolitan area, but I remind the appropriate Minister of the need for an adequate domestic water supply, especially in Murray Bridge and Mannum. More formal approaches will be made to the Minister later.

I am pleased to see that the Minister of Education is in the House, as I wish to bring several matters to his attention. The first relates to the parent-child centre at Nairne. Approaches have been made to the Minister seeking support for the project. I shall quote from one letter that was sent by the school council to the Minister in reply to an earlier letter. The letter states:

We decided to line the lunch shed purely because we were sick and tired of the delays and excuses being presented by the department. Therefore, because of frustration and the will to do something about having a suitable place, we proceeded with the job on our own accord. It now appears that because of our initiative and response to the challenge our hopes of having a suitable parent-child centre building were and are being hampered. Furthermore, although the parent-child centre was granted \$2 000, this amount was for equipment, not for the lining of the shed!

The school council is not impressed with Nairne just being placed on the list of considerations of 1977-78 submissions and the erection depending upon the availability of funds in 1977-78. We demand a more definite decision as to whether Nairne is to receive a building and when.

I am concerned, on looking through the Budget figures, that I can see no reference to money being set aside for the project. This is a perfect example of a group of people within the community who are prepared to help themselves, and such people should be given financial incentive and encouragement by the Government. A letter has been sent to the Minister asking that the programme be re-examined and seeking priority and support. I commend the project to him.

I also bring to the attention of the Minister of Education the situation regarding the primary school at Mannum and the need for a new primary school at that centre. The matter has been on the books for many years, going back, I understand, to the days when the Hon. Joyce Steele was Minister of Education. The situation is most serious. Conditions in the existing primary school are cramped and most unsatisfactory. Deputations have waited on the Minister, the latest being only last month. Again, I commend this project to him. The site is available, and the need for the school is real.

Finally, I commend to the Government the need, put forward by the residents in Mount Barker, for a grant through the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department for a sporting complex in that district. There is a real need for the project to proceed, and I commend the submission that has been made to the Minister. I ask the Government,

when the time comes, to consider the matter, which I believe to be important.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I wish to bring to the attention of the House a most unsatisfactory state of affairs that has been drawn to my attention by constituents in the past few days. I raise the matter in the House so that it can be aired as widely as possible and also in the protection of those who have contacted me. I refer to a complicated situation relating to managers in the retail industry who are being prevented from receiving basic industrial justice. I wish to give a brief outline of these events.

Some time ago, retail store managers sought an award of the South Australian Industrial Commission to provide for the conditions of their employment. They did this because it is notorious in the retail industry that there are employers who engage managers or so-called managers on quite poor levels of wages and who, at the same time, demand a high work output and considerable work to be done outside the normal spread of hours. Perhaps "exploitation" is too strong a word to use in relation to the whole industry, although it is certainly applicable to some part of the industry.

An application was made, in addition to the reasons I have already given, to take into account changes in trading hours that might have resulted from the various controversies relating to trading hours that have been going on in South Australia for the past decade. As long ago as September 12, 1974, the application made on behalf of the managers by the S.D.A. came on for hearing before Commissioner Lean, the Commissioner to whom the retail industry was, and is, allocated in the South Australian Industrial Commission, and the same man who this year conducted the Royal Commission into shop trading hours. On that day in 1974 legal counsel for the employers, that is, the Retail Traders Association, said:

I give nothing away by saying that my clients are completely and utterly opposed to this application and will do all in their power to frustrate the applicants in promoting an application in this manner.

These were prophetic words in view of what subsequently happened. I suppose anyone would reasonably ask why such a strong statement would be made. Perhaps a reasonable answer would be that either the employers had much to hide or, alternatively, they simply would not accept an outside arbitration that could lead to more just conditions of pay and work in the industry.

Subsequent to September, 1974, the application had a checkered career and, at the time of the Royal Commission, still had not come on before Commissioner Lean for any hearing on the merits. However, Mr. John Raymond, a spokesman for his fellow managers, sought leave to tell Mr. Commissioner Lean at the Royal Commission of the exploitation within the industry by some employers, and to point out that in the event of extended shopping hours managers would not be protected against further exploitation unless an industrial tribunal intervened. The Commissioner said:

The matter of exploitation of managers is going to come before me in another place in September or October, and I think it would be improper to have it canvassed in this commission.

By that he meant that it would be wrong to admit the evidence before the Royal Commission when he had an application regarding conditions of employment pending in the Industrial Commission. He continued:

I if managers are being taken advantage of now, they'll still be taken advantage of, perhaps more so, if hours are extended. I think that's a fact. It will come to me again when I get back into the commission—

he meant the Industrial Commission—

and I hope before then—

he referred to December being the next date for hearing of the application—

I have fixed your organisation's problems up in an award. It is a genuine fear. I appreciate your point.

So, then the managers could not be heard and were not heard in the Royal Commission because of their application for an award in the Industrial Commission which Mr. Lean thought would solve the problem. However, neither the managers nor the Royal Commissioner reckoned on the lengths to which the retail traders would go. Members of this House who often correctly refer to bad industrial tactics and stand-over tactics by some trade unions may very well listen to the remainder of this disgraceful episode.

Because the Retail Traders Association feared the application, it went to Mr. Goldsworthy, Secretary of the S.D.A., and threatened him that, should he or his organisation proceed with the managers' award, the R.T.A. would cease withdrawal of union subscriptions from shop assistants' wages. That obviously put the union at great risk. To his credit, Mr. Goldsworthy rejected the threat.

Frustrated, the R.T.A. then started a campaign against their own managers of distorting the award application and attempted to force managers to write or indicate their objections and, with pressure from some senior management, in some cases this did occur. What I am saying is that managers were called into the office of their superiors and told that they would be in trouble if they did not sign a document repudiating the application that was before the Industrial Commission. Some were strong enough not to do so, but others succumbed to the threats.

However, even this was not enough, and on September 14, 1977, the R.T.A. sent a representative to Sydney and there threatened the Federal Shop Assistants Union that union deductions would cease Australia-wide if the South Australian Branch of the S.D.A. proceeded with the South Australian award. Quite obviously, the S.D.A. was alarmed and as a result I am sad to relate that the following day the Industrial Commission was told that the application would not be proceeded with. The application that had been made for the managers' award is now defunct.

Because the Royal Commissioner declined, quite properly, to hear the evidence which he thought he would later hear in the Industrial Commission and because through this industrial blackmail the R.T.A. stopped the Industrial Commission proceeding, the managers faced a total block from any reasonable avenue of justice. Many times in this House we are given examples of unions breaking rules of industrial justice but I have rarely heard such an example of the Gestapo jackboot as this. Mr. Raymond has now repeated all this to the Royal Commissioner, but unfortunately the Commissioner can no longer take the evidence. I repeat that there must be many things to hide, and bad things to hide, for the R.T.A. to go to these lengths. Why should the retailers fear an application which I have read and which simply asks for standard industrial commission provisions? Why the fuss, why the conspiracy, why the blackmail? We

might well ask that.

I now call for legislation which will protect this group of people who, unprotected, could be required to work unreasonable hours without adequate reward. Some managers have already been lined up by retailers and told that they will in fact be required to work on late shopping nights as well as every Saturday morning, and without award coverage these people could be required to work in the suburbs on Thursday night and in the city on Friday night and be required to front up again on Saturday morning.

Commissioner Lean, in his report, recommended that the working conditions of employees would not suffer from extended trading hours. I understand that to be the Government's position. I ask for the same protection for the managers. As member for Playford, I have promised two of my constituents who are in this group that I will expose in the Parliament any further attempts to attack, blackmail or harass them.

Bearing in mind the warning given by the R.T.A., by its legal counsel in 1974 and put into effect by the blackmail I have described, I am giving to the Minister of Labour and Industry and the Premier the names of my constituents and their fellow delegates, so that they may be protected in the event of any further disgraceful conduct.

Without such protection I truly believe that their jobs are much in peril. In my view that is one of the most disgraceful instances of industrial blackmail, from either an employer or employee organisation, that I have ever come across. I urge the Government strongly to take this into account in framing the legislation, to ensure justice for my constituents.

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

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I draw the attention of the House to page 32 of the *Advertiser* of October 3 relating to Government advertisements, listing a series of Government tenders, as follows:

2 p.m. Tuesday, October 11, 1977

SUPPLY OF THE FOLLOWING . . .

S.1791—Dem. and Rem. of Passenger Platform ex STA-Rail Div., Mindarie. Inspect with Station Master, Murray Bridge.

Further down in the same advertisement it states:

2 p.m. Monday, October 24, 1977

S.1898—Dem. and Rem. of Barracks ex STA-Rail Div., Alawoona. Inspect with Station Master, Wanbi.

This was on October 3, 1977, although the same advertisements had appeared previously. On the same day a constituent of mine presented himself to the Station Master at Murray Bridge, only to find that that officer, who had been cited in the advertisement, knew nothing about the tender.

He directed my constituent to go across the railway line to another officer who, in fact, had some knowledge of this matter. He gave my constituent a series of documents, and one of the documents to which I refer is as follows:

PETTY CONTRACT NO. R.48/77

S.A.R. 3260/77

ADDENDUM TO

Specification for demolition and removal of cottages and other structures from railway property for:

Mindarie—demolition of passenger platform.

Contract: The platform shall be demolished to ground level and all holes filled in. There shall be no earth mounds left in close proximity of track—it shall be spread away from track. The railway boundary fence shall remain and if damaged be reinstated to former condition. The platform is of timber and bitumen construction.

Site: The platform is located in the Mindarie station yard. The exact location and method of entry can be obtained from

the Station Master at Murray Bridge.

(signed) DIRECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT
OF SERVICES AND SUPPLY

Armed with that information my constituent then moved on to Mindarie to examine the structure to be demolished. Honourable members can imagine his surprise when he arrived at Mindarie to find that there was no platform or railway station. He found on inquiry from a local resident that it had been demolished five months earlier.

This fact was not known at Murray Bridge and nothing at all was known by the nominated officer at Murray Bridge about that event.

He moved on a little further to the Wanbi station in order to obtain from the Stationmaster there the necessary details before entering the Alawoona station yard, involving the further contract I have mentioned. However, he found that the Wanbi Stationmaster had left the area at least six weeks previously, even though he had been directed by this advertisement of October 3, to present himself to that officer.

The person in question is in the demolition game for a living and, although he may not be a large operator, he has put himself to the cost of moving, first, from Gawler to Murray Bridge, then from Murray Bridge to Mindarie, and then to Wanbi, only to find that no information is available to him and no demolition to be carried out.

To which Government Minister or Government department does he submit an account to meet his costs in answering what purported to be a legitimate advertisement in the newspaper? These are two items in the one advertisement of the same day, and there would be about 75 to 80 items in that advertisement, although I do not know the fate of persons interested in the other items.

This is a serious situation, involving the same problem that we saw earlier when the painters moved in to paint a school three months after it was closed. My colleague the member for Rocky River previously told the House how a completely new electrical system was installed in a school six weeks after it was closed (the old Stanley Flat school). Certainly, the Waterloo school in my own district got a new fence after it had been closed, a case of the right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing.

Under the heading "What's become of green belt?" a letter to the Editor in the local press, the *Bunyip*, states:

I wish to refer to the article "Big centre planned for Munno Para" reported in the *Advertiser* on Thursday, August 25, 1977. Councillor Kane through the medium of your paper has been slating certain residents for their desire to opt out of Munno Para and join Gawler. After reading the above quoted article the reasons for such appear more apparent.

That letter, signed "Concerned" and appearing on August 31 last, then goes on to indicate what is urgently required in that area. I believe that the member for Napier, who shares this area with me and who is the Mayor of the district involved in some of the development, wants to know whether there is going to be the promised green belt between the Elizabeth/Smithfield development and Gawler. I am heartened to know that the South Australian Housing Trust has made available for tree planting the area immediately north of the new Smithfield R.A.A.F. housing area, extending as far as Dalkeith Road.

However, beyond Dalkeith Road toward the township of Gawler is an area which is zoned rural and which boasts a number of small properties used for orchards, vineyards, vegetable growing and livestock, and I hope that there is no thought in the Government's mind to rezone that area so that it will not in due course be obtained for the purpose of making a positive and definite green belt zone between the Elizabeth-Smithfield development and between the area of Gawler and southward towards Evanston. I believe

that the member for Napier and I will be able to join forces in seeking to see this area maintained in that particular state. Certainly, one of the fellow councillors of the member for Napier has called for that consideration.

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

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): This evening, with the few minutes I have at my disposal I once again bring to the attention of the House my grave concern at the Liberal Party's continuing policies regarding industrial matters in Australia, and refer briefly to the power dispute in Victoria. I have said previously in the House and publicly elsewhere, and I say again this evening, that, unfortunately, disputes in industry have always been with us. I believe that, under the system in which we in Australia live, they will continue to be with us, but I do not believe that the Government any more than the Opposition really wants disputes in industry to occur. The only chance for any reasonable settlement of disputes in industry is, as I have said before, conciliation or the resolution of the dispute. It seems ironical to me that the Victorian dispute is now closer to being settled as a result of conciliation than it would be if the Federal Liberal Government and the Victorian Liberal Government had done what they threatened to do, namely, impose penalties, causing hardship and retrenchments.

I briefly criticise the Liberal Party opposite, particularly its shadow Minister of Labour and Industry, because it is a fact (whether we like it or not) that invariably when the shadow Minister, the member for Davenport, speaks in the House on industrial matters we get this kind of situation. He continually attacks the trade union movement, working conditions, and high wages, and he has a continuing phobia that manufacturing industries can survive only if the workers can produce more. That amazes me. I find it difficult, as a person who has been literally brought up in the trade union movement among the working class, to understand how retrenchments, unemployed workers, youths aged between 16 years and 18 years leaving school and not being able to obtain work, lack of apprenticeships, and lack of subsidies and incentives in manufacturing industry can all be accounted for by saying workers should produce more.

I speak now about the overall world situation regarding manufacturing industries. I find it difficult to line myself up with the Liberal Party's policies when we find that stockpiling exists in the shipbuilding industry, the motor vehicle industry, and in relation to oil rigs, and when a decline has taken place in world manufacturing markets. Yet, the philosophy of the member for Davenport is that we still must produce more.

The Liberal Party in this State, in Victoria, in Queensland, and in the Federal sphere has never suggested that perhaps we ought to have a 35-hour week, an additional week's annual leave, or a system more acceptable to all parties in the industrial movement, whereby production can be maintained, wage standards retained, and there can be a better deal for all parties.

The motor car industry has continued to produce more, retrench when necessary, stand down when convenient, and sack when helpful to over-production. An article in today's *Advertiser* is headed "Stand-down of 72 at plant 'wrong' ", but no Opposition member has said that this crime should never have occurred. Further, no Opposition member has asked what we ought to do about penalties for employers who wrongfully stand down employees.

Mr. Mathwin: How can they pay them?

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

Mr. MAX BROWN: If employees were on strike, would

members opposite agitate that there ought to be penalties for those employees? An article in the *Sunday Mail* of October 2, headed "Strike-free car plant to take on Big Three," by John Clydesdale states:

I have just visited three car-making factories in Japan that have never had a strike in 24 years. One of them has never had one at all.

Mr. Mathwin: That is like China.

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

Mr. MAX BROWN: The article continues:

And the workers are neither down-trodden, underpaid or under-privileged, but are enjoying wages comparable to Australians, plus a wide range of fringe benefits and a booming economy . . . Industrial attitudes by the Japanese are important for Australia since Nissan has just set up a multi-million dollar engine and car manufacturing plant in Victoria and will compete with the Australian "big three" car makers on their ground.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the production rate?

Mr. MAX BROWN: The Japanese car worker earns \$10 000 a year.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Glenelg will have an opportunity to speak. The honourable member for Whyalla.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The article states

Other Japanese companies pay for their employees' transport to and from work—

Chrysler and General Motors-Holden do not do that—

. . . each factory has its own family flats, bachelor quarters, swimming pool, gymnasium, and sports days.

If a man wants to buy a house outside he can get it at 6 per cent reducible interest, and a loan from the company. Rents are one-seventh of outside prices, and some 40 per cent of Japanese workers are buying their own homes. These are the down-trodden workers of Japan, the people with whom we have to compete. They are getting more benefits and more wages than we have ever looked at.

Mr. Mathwin: They produce more, too, don't they?

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I conclude on this note: I believe quite seriously that the motor car industry in Australia is a multi-national industry taking millions of dollars out of the country. I will give the B.H.P. one shred of credit: at least its money stays in the country.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.21 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 13, at 2 p.m.