

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

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

## PETITIONS: PETROL RESELLERS

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO presented a petition signed by 121 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would reject any legislation that could cause petrol resellers to trade seven days a week until 9.30 p.m.

The Hon. D.W. SIMMONS presented a similar petition signed by 214 residents of South Australia.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON presented a similar petition signed by 83 residents of South Australia.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE presented a similar petition signed by 167 residents of South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT presented a similar petition signed by 19 residents of South Australia.

Mr. GROOM presented a similar petition signed by 52 residents of South Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE presented a similar petition signed by 15 residents of South Australia.

Mr. BANNON presented a similar petition signed by 53 residents of South Australia.

Mr. HARRISON presented a similar petition signed by 39 residents of South Australia.

Mr. TONKIN presented a similar petition signed by 59 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

## PETITIONS: POLICE COMMISSIONER'S DISMISSAL

Mr. MATHWIN presented a petition signed by 70 residents of South Australia, praying that the House resolve that it lacked confidence in the Premier's handling of the dismissal of the former Commissioner of Police and that a full and proper inquiry of the matter be commissioned.

Mr. WILSON presented a similar petition signed by 220 residents of South Australia.

Mr. TONKIN presented a similar petition signed by 892 residents of South Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE presented a similar petition signed by 27 residents of South Australia, together with a petition signed by 15 residents of South Australia, praying that the House resolve that the Government appoint a Royal Commissioner to inquire into the circumstances of Mr. Salisbury's dismissal and matters of principle concerning the keeping by the police of secret files on individuals.

Petitions received.

## PETITIONS: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. HARRISON presented a petition signed by 21 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that the position of blood relations sharing a family property enjoy at least the same benefits as those available to other recognised relationships.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN presented a similar petition signed by 78 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

## MODBURY HEIGHTS COMMUNITY SCHOOL

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Modbury Heights Community School—Pedare Component.

Ordered that report be printed.

## QUESTIONS

## INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Premier explain to the House why, in reply to my question on industrial democracy yesterday, he said:

I can inform the honourable member that so impressed are his Federal colleagues with the industrial democracy policy of this State that I have had a request from the Federal Minister that . . . he should address a world conference on industrial democracy organised by this Government to be held at the end of May.

When it is quite clear that his statement was untrue and misleading? The facts are these. The Federal Minister (Mr. Macphee) does not support the concept of industrial democracy adopted by the South Australian Government as its policy. An approach inviting his participation in the forthcoming seminar was made to the Minister by Mr. Phillip Bentley, from the Unit of Industrial Democracy, at a job reform seminar held last year. The Minister's staff, having received no further communication from the South Australian Government, inquired whether or not the invitation to the Minister still stood. A formal invitation from the Premier to the Federal Minister inviting him to participate has since been received and is being considered. The Federal Minister has publicly expressed his support for the concept of employee involvement as outlined in the Liberal Party's policy and referred to in the Governor-General's Speech delivered in the Federal Parliament yesterday. The Premier has deliberately misled the House in an attempt to justify quite falsely his Government's policy on industrial democracy, particularly in the private sector.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The facts as stated by the Leader do not show in any way that I misled the House yesterday. The Minister has in fact sought to address the conference. He will be addressing the conference.

*Members interjecting:*

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Leader has asked his question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: An invitation was sought from us and the Leader has made that clear.

Mr. Dean Brown: The original invitation came—

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I intend to warn honourable members if they keep interjecting during Question Time, because far too many interjections are being made.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Stick to the truth.

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader knows perfectly well that an invitation was sought from us, and it was appropriately extended. The Minister will be addressing the conference. The Minister's support for the position which the Government outlined to the House yesterday in relation to legislation on industrial democracy I quoted to the House quite specifically. I used Mr. Macphee's own words, which were almost identical with the position I put to the seminar which I addressed at the Administrative Staff College on Monday.

## SEMAPHORE RAILWAY LINE

**Mr. OLSON:** Can the Minister of Transport tell the House what is the future of the Glanville-Semaphore railway line? No doubt the Minister will recall that on March 29, 1977, following a decision of the Minister's Transport Council, the department carried out a survey and proceeded with the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates in order that a discussion could be held with the corporation of Port Adelaide. Can the Minister give the House further information on this matter?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** Proposals have been worked on now over a considerable period to try to determine what is the best way of handling the problem involving the kilometre or so of railway line between Glanville and Semaphore. A large sum of money is required to be spent to rehabilitate the line. That cost has been coupled with the cost of operation to determine what is the best method of tackling this problem.

My officers have finally worked out a proposal which will be going before the Port Adelaide corporation at a meeting of I think, its works committee next Monday night and which provides for the removal of the line, the rehabilitation and resheathing of the road, the provision of interchange facilities at Glanville and a covered walkway and protection generally for people transferring from rail to bus and bus to rail, as well as a feeder bus operating between Glanville and Semaphore along Semaphore Road. This project has now reached the stage where serious consideration can be given to its implementation. The corporation will be involved in a considerable sum in resheathing Semaphore Road and, subject to its decision, the matter will then be taken further to determine precisely what will happen. I hope this decision can be reached soon.

## PUBLIC SERVICE APPOINTMENTS

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Does the Government intend to alter its policy in relation to outside appointments to the Public Service? There is widespread discontent in the Public Service about outside appointments, particularly in the top bracket. The Public Service Review, which has been highly critical of the Government's policy and practice of appointing people from outside, states in one of its issues:

1. The vacancy usually is published in the press up to a week before it appears in the Public Service Board notices.
2. Public servants who apply for the position can appeal against the nomination of another public servant, but not against anybody who is not a public servant.
3. Public servants or their association have no way of challenging the decision to advertise the vacancy outside the service.

The *Public Service Review* further states:

The association objection to outside appointments is not aimed at inbreeding or feather-bedding, but in opening up the decisions to challenge, to ensuring the protection of the right to the career service envisaged in the Public Service Act.

In a report in the *Financial Review* (Friday, December 16) reference was made to the appointment of Mr. Rob Dempsey to the job as Director-General of the Environment Department at a salary of \$36 000, and this appointment was described as "Free-loading on the gravy train." The report states that Mr. Dempsey came from Mr. Uren's staff in Canberra to the Premier as a private secretary in the first instance.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The honourable member

can quote inaccurate and quite scurrilous reports if he wishes.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** He does it with pleasure, too.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I am sure he does it with the kind of relish he evidences to the House. Mr. Dempsey did not come to my office as private secretary. My private secretary before and throughout the time Mr. Dempsey was with me, and since, was and is Mr. Wright, who is well known to the honourable member.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** He watches him very closely.

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

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The position as to appointments to the Public Service is a matter that I have discussed with the Public Service Association, not only with its council but also at a general meeting of the association that was called for an open exchange between members of the association and the Government, and at the meeting it was conceded by members of the association that, especially in relation to senior positions in the Public Service, it could not be expected that the necessary expertise, initiative, enterprise, or experience would always be available within the Public Service.

**Mr. Millhouse:** It usually is.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** No, it is not always available.

**Mr. Millhouse:** It usually is, I said.

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

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Let me say that most appointments to top Public Service jobs are from within the Public Service. It is necessarily the case that, where the Government is appointing to a job that has been in some measure redefined or where new initiatives are being undertaken or where a change of direction in policy is occurring, it may well be we have to look beyond the Public Service. What is more, no Government should be so inhibited in getting the best man for the job that it is confined in doing so to an area that may not be able to provide the best man.

**Mr. Millhouse:** What you want is a political appointee.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order. He heard what I have said earlier in Question Time. He will have the opportunity to ask a question.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Numbers of appointments that have been made from time to time to senior positions have been from outside the Public Service, and they have been very proper appointments. I instance the case of the appointment of the Director of Agriculture and Fisheries. He came from without the Public Service, but the Government's view was that a new initiative had to be taken in the area of agriculture, particularly in using the department more in the marketing area—

**Mr. Venning:** You want a new Minister.

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

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:**—and that the department had to be involved more in marketing and consultancy services than in its previous considerably heavy concentration in the research area. In those circumstances, a decision was made to appoint Mr. McColl, who is not a political appointee. He was appointed on the basis of his very considerable experience and ability. It is a good and proper appointment.

After I had discussed this matter at some length with members of the Public Service, who were being serious about this and not merely mischievous or nitpicking, it was conceded that the Government had a perfectly good case in relation to these matters. What was raised with me by

the Public Service Association was that people lower down the administrative service had, in its view, some ground for complaint when, in fact, there were qualified people in the Public Service but occasionally an appointment was made from outside the service and they could not appeal against the position's being advertised outside the service. We will deal with that matter in due season. I have had discussions with the Public Service Board as to how we may best deal with that matter. There may have been one or two cases in which there could have been some genuine complaint on the part of members of the Public Service, and I am having those matters particularly investigated. Overall, I do not believe that this Government should inhibit itself any more than has any previous Government in this area.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** What about Dempsey?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I turn to the matter of the honourable member's constant interjections. There can be no question that, in the examination of the applicants for the job of Director of the Environment Department, Mr. Dempsey had outstanding qualifications and experience.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** Brown would never accept that.

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

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** They were quite outstanding. In the normal way, a panel was set up to examine the applications, and a recommendation was made for Mr. Dempsey's appointment. It was a perfectly proper appointment, made in a perfectly normal way. I notice that the honourable member did not cite a complaint from the Public Service Association in relation to that appointment, but went off to some inaccurate report by a journalist from interstate.

#### PORT ADELAIDE GOVERNMENT BUILDING

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Can the Minister of Transport provide any information concerning the—

**Mr. Gunn:** Dear Dorothy!

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

**Mr. WHITTEN:** It certainly would not be Dear Graham.

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

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Can the Minister provide any information concerning the likely opening date of the new building to house the Motor Vehicle Registration Branch in Port Adelaide? It would appear that work on the new building, in Dale Street, Port Adelaide, is progressing rapidly, and that it should soon be available for occupancy, thereby providing a necessary service, in conjunction with the State Government Insurance Commission and the Community Welfare Department, both of which will also occupy space in the building.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** It just so happens that this morning the Registrar of Motor Vehicles had his regular fortnightly meeting with me, as happens with all heads of branches within my jurisdiction, and we discussed matters of current interest, what was happening, etc. Among the matters on which he reported to me was the progress being made in relation to the two next branches of the Motor Registration Division to be opened—one at Lockleys and one at Port Adelaide. Obviously, the member for Price is interested in the one at Port Adelaide, as I am sure that the member for Eyre was interested when we invited him to attend the opening of the Divisions office at Port Lincoln when he and the member for Flinders were at each

other's throats regarding who would get preselection at that stage.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The indication at this stage is that the building, which has been commissioned in Dale Street for the S.G.I.C., is expected to be handed over to the S.G.I.C. in about mid-March, when the Public Buildings Department will move in to do the necessary work of providing partitions, furniture, and the other facilities necessary for the Motor Registration Division. At the same time, services of the S.G.I.C. and the Community Welfare Department will also be housed in the building. It is still too early to give a positive opening date, but it is expected that the building should be operating no later than the end of May or, I hope even a little earlier.

#### WORKER PARTICIPATION

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Can the Premier say in what way it is intended to nominate, elect or direct workers within the Public Service on to the boards of statutory bodies, and what criteria will be used in choosing these representatives? In a recent announcement by the Premier in relation to his workers on the board policy, he said that he would introduce relevant legislation during the life of this Parliament. The method of appointment or election is important to the future of this State's industry. Of the European countries involved in this type of legislation, none, including Holland, has political appointments to boards.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I think I must be obtuse, because I am at a loss to follow the honourable member.

**Mr. Mathwin:** You can't get out of it like that.

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

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The election of workers' representatives to boards will be an election by the workers in the organisation concerned.

**Mr. Mathwin:** All the workers?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Apparently the honourable member is not aware that this has already happened on a number of occasions.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Only if they belong to trade unions.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Earlier in Question Time I mentioned—

**Mr. Mathwin:** I'm sorry for you, too.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member to order. I shall warn him on the next occasion. He heard my remarks earlier in Question Time in relation to interjections. Complaints about Question Time have been continuous from Opposition members.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The precise mode of election will depend on the adoption of an industrial democracy programme in the organisation concerned. The adoption of such an industrial democracy programme is in itself an exercise in industrial democracy. The programme is not imposed from outside; it is discussed with and adopted by the workers in consensus with the board of the organisation. I have had approaches, for instance, in relation to the State Bank and the State Government Insurance Commission for the appointment of a nominee of workers to the board. The answer of the Government to that has been that it is indeed quite counter-productive to appoint a worker elected or nominated a director on the board until such time as an industrial democracy programme is effectively working in joint consultation with shop committees and the like, so that there is

effective communication throughout the organisation, and that without that effective communication the work of a worker director on the board could be indeed less than helpful, because it would not return to the workers the kind of expectation they should normally derive from having a representative there.

**Mr. Mathwin:** It could be a situation of conflict.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I think the conflicts can be resolved, as they have been resolved in other countries. The provision will be made in relation to each of the statutory corporations in South Australia that an industrial democracy programme can be adopted by the workers and, as it is adopted and the processes set up through the workers, then the mode of election of a director to the board will derive from the adoption of that industrial democracy programme.

The Government's position on this matter is that all persons employed in the area should have a say in the election of the director. The honourable member will see that certain legislation will be coming before the House this session; for instance, I shall be introducing a Bill this evening which will allow for the provision of worker participation on the board, in due season, when an industrial democracy programme is adopted. We have already passed this session a provision for the establishment of the Government clothing factory. At the outset, one of the members of the board of that clothing factory will be the Secretary of the Clothing and Allied Trades Union, but in due season there will be (and there is provision within the organisation to allow this to occur) the election, as a director on the board of the Government clothing factory, of someone who is the representative of the workers employed in the organisation. That will, however, follow the establishment of an industrial democracy programme within those works.

#### BOAT-BUILDING LICENCE

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Will the Minister of Marine approach the Federal Government in support of a written submission which has been made by an officer of the Federal Transport Department in Whyalla, and which supports the granting of a small craft building licence to a small firm called Spencer Engineering Company in Whyalla? This firm, which has obtained contracts to build fishing vessels is now in a reasonable position to obtain contracts to build larger vessels that require a slipway or launching ramp. I am reasonably hopeful that Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited will sign an agreement with this firm some time next month that will allow Spencer Engineering to lease and use one of the slipways at the now inactive shipyards. This is not the first time that the Federal Government has been able to assist materially the grave unemployment problem in Whyalla. So far, on each previous occasion, the Federal Government has failed to come to the party. I would hope that, with the Minister's assistance, the Federal Government might see the light this time.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I shall be delighted to do anything I can to assist this firm to gain the necessary licence from the Federal Government. It would probably be more appropriate for the Economic Development Department to take up the matter rather than for me, as Minister of Marine, to do so. If the honourable member is willing to make available (if he has it in his possession) the document to which he has referred, I shall be only too pleased to see that, one way or the other, we support the application to which he has referred.

#### WINE-GRAPE SURPLUS

**Mr. ARNOLD:** Has the Premier received a detailed reply from the Minister of Agriculture to the question I asked two weeks ago about the wine-grape surplus in South Australia? The Premier would recall the question I asked two weeks ago, when he replied that he would seek a detailed reply from the Minister of Agriculture about the matter. The Premier would acknowledge the urgency of the situation with which the grapegrowing industry in South Australia is faced. I again ask whether the Premier has received a reply from the Minister because, within the grapegrowing industry, it is considered that the situation is so serious that it warrants representation in Canberra on this matter preferably by the Premier or, as second best, the Minister of Agriculture.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I have had some interim reports on the matter from the Minister of Agriculture. Several things have been happening. Although I do not have a detailed reply today, I will pursue the matter to see if I can bring the honourable member up to date tomorrow.

#### BOTTLE DEPOSIT

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL:** Has the Minister for the Environment any comment to make regarding recent suggestions that the Keep South Australia Beautiful organisation might be calling for a mandatory deposit on the new Echo beer bottle? Kesab, after a recent collection of litter, gave the impression that it may ask the Government to consider imposing a deposit on the Echo bottle. I gather that that organisation's real intention was to canvass the possibility that this matter might be considered by the Government. There have been reports that Kesab and others have been making litter counts that have revealed that there is generally less litter surrounding beaches and other parts of the State and that it is evident that more beer bottles than usual have been evident. I know that several country councils have claimed that the Echo beer bottle, which virtually replaced the beer can, is the most annoying component of general community litter. What information can the Minister provide about his department's attitude towards the problem?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The honourable member indicated to me his interest in this matter, and indeed I read with interest the report to which he has referred. On the face of it, there appears to be some broad evidence that bottles are now the more popular container for beer in South Australia. I think that this must be partly attributed to the marketing policy of the larger brewing company, which has deliberately changed to the use of the Echo bottle. I do not intend to respond in haste to suggestions that deposits either be withdrawn altogether or that deposits be extended to a wider range of container. Like the industry concerned, I am willing to wait to give the deposit system time to prove itself or perhaps demonstrate the need for some modification to be made to it. For the time being, I consider that the system needs to be in use longer before we can properly decide its real worth.

In the soft drink area the legislation is working very well indeed. There the manufacturers have not switched from cans, and, of course, the cans are no longer left lying around. Kesab is supposed to have completed some litter counts and to be conducting some more. I will be interested to see the results. I know there was considerable argument about litter counts when the deposit legislation was being considered in this Parliament.

Members might like to know that the Environment Department has completed five of its own litter counts and will be doing more. Its surveys have been conducted so far near Coonalpyn, Murray Bridge, Kimba and Loxton, on Aldinga Beach and on the Port Augusta to Whyalla road. Results are still being analysed but a few observations could be made at this stage. Deposit cans have almost disappeared from road-side litter. The bulk of cans found have been cans from interstate. There are more broken full-size beer bottles than broken Echo bottles. The larger bottle tends to break more easily and, of course, some bottles may have been there for years. There are still many old-style non-deposit cans left. For example, where only seven deposit cans were detected along a stretch of road from Port Augusta to Whyalla, there were also 763 non-deposit cans. On Aldinga Beach, on one occasion, there were five large beer bottles, eight Echo bottles and nine bottles from interstate as well as 55lb. of broken glass.

On this general question we have to wait and see. Drinkers should realise that although beer bottles, both the old Pickaxe and the new Echo, may not carry a deposit they do have a value. Large bottles usually return 15c a dozen for empties through the marine dealer system, and the Echos 12c. It is worth noting that 70 per cent of authorised collection depots are also marine dealers and the vast majority of them report to us that the return rate for Echo bottles is high, about as high as that of the standard beer bottle. Since so many depots serve that dual role, it is happening that children going out collecting cans for their deposit value also bring in Echo bottles for which they also get paid.

#### PORT LINCOLN WHARF

**Mr. BLACKER:** Can the Minister of Marine say what plans the Government has for the future of the wharf at Port Lincoln on which the old bulk loading facility was situated? The old bulk loading facility is currently being dismantled for use I believe at Wallaroo, and the remaining wharf could well be modified for use by the fishing industry or as a marina or boat haven for pleasure craft.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** There have been some preliminary discussions about this matter, I think brought about mainly by a request from the bulk handling authority, which is, as the honourable member is probably aware, contemplating additional silos. As a result of the discussions, we have looked, in a preliminary way, at the future of the wharf that the honourable member has mentioned. There are no firm plans as yet. I favour the retention of the wharf for pleasure or fishing craft, but at this stage we have not firmed on the matter. I shall be pleased to look at the matter for the honourable member to find out whether or not the department has advanced any further with the planning since I last discussed the matter with it and whether I can get a more advanced report for the honourable member.

#### NEW ST. AGNERS SCHOOL

**Mrs. BYRNE:** In the absence of the Minister of Education, will the Minister of Works obtain an up-to-date report from his colleague about the Education Department's planning for the provision of a future primary school on the four-hectare site reserved for this purpose on land which is now held by the South Australian Land Commission and which faces Smart Road, St. Agnes?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I shall be pleased to refer that matter to my colleague and obtain a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

#### SUNDAY FOOTBALL

**Mr. EVANS:** Will the Attorney-General urgently reconsider the application by the South Australian National Football League to play its programmed Sunday football matches on the Unley, Norwood and Woodville ovals? It appears from reports that the three ovals are controlled by local councils, which are the direct representatives of the local communities. The councils gave permission for their ovals to be used on Sundays knowing the likely effect such use would have on residents in the area. The Alberton, Glenelg and Prospect local governments, which have control over their ovals, did not wish to give permission for the playing of Sunday football on their ovals, so the league did not programme those ovals.

Great cost is involved in printing programmes, and it is urgent that those programmes be published in time. There is also a problem about advertising for the league and others associated with the promotion of football in the State, so I ask the Attorney whether he will urgently review the decision that has been made, thereby giving an opportunity for these matches to be played, because the local government authorities have given their sanction knowing full well the attitude that might be taken by their ratepayers living near the ovals.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The Government carefully considered this matter when it came to hand, which was only in the past couple of weeks or so. The first point I make is that, if a large sum of money is involved in having programmes and other matters prepared, one would have thought that the football league, knowing full well the law in relation to the Places of Public Entertainment Act and that it would have to obtain my permission before football could be played on Sundays, would immediately come to the Government and ask for specific permission instead of going to councils and various other people seeking their permission. That, after all, was ancillary to the permission I must give.

The football league, which controls, for example, West Lakes football stadium, could certainly have played Sunday football there provided I had approved of it. I heard about this matter because, when it was raised at a number of council meetings, some concern was expressed, as the honourable member has indicated, and because of the publicity which, apparently, was given in local areas to the matter through its being raised at council meetings and which led to a number of pieces of correspondence being forwarded to my office by concerned citizens requesting that I take the necessary steps to ensure that football was not played in their areas on Sundays. This, obviously, was a matter of some delicacy. I can tell the House that last year the football league tentatively contacted me when it was seeking permission to play a number of games last year, and I explained to it then that the Government was not opposed to Sunday football. I said, however, that we would approve Sunday football matches only in conditions in which we were satisfied that local residents would not be put out and that their quiet Sunday would not be unduly interrupted.

When the matter came before me there was a recommendation that football be permitted on a number of ovals, and I asked the Inspector of Places of Public Entertainment to review the situation at individual ovals in order to assess those ovals at which not a great

inconvenience would be caused to the public residing near them and also to assess those ovals at which such cause for concern would exist. As a result, the league was informed of the Government's view that football could be played on certain ovals on Sunday (I think there were four of five) and that at the other ovals such as Norwood, Unley, Prospect, Glenelg, and I think Alberton, where residential areas were close to the football stadiums, we would not permit football to be played on Sunday. I think that was a flexible and reasonable approach.

In direct answer to the honourable member's question, officers of my department are making arrangements for representatives of the South Australian National Football League to discuss the matter with me. I can say that the Government's view is that people's privacy on a Sunday should not be unduly interrupted by large sporting fixtures. Also, it has been our general policy since I have been Attorney-General to try to ensure that that happens. Accordingly, in other sports such as soccer we have tried to follow a similar policy, and apply it to all sports.

### FIRE BRIGADE FUNDS

**Mr. WELLS:** Can the Chief Secretary say whether it is correct that insurance companies contribute 75 per cent of the cost of the upkeep of South Australian fire brigades and that surplus funds of the brigades are paid into Treasury funds? I was interested to read a report published in the *Advertiser* on February 20 which claimed that insurance companies contributed 75 per cent of the cost of upkeep of South Australia's fire brigades. Mr. Laurie Hughes, South Australian Manager of Ansvr Insurance, asked why the 1975-76 fire brigades' surplus of \$1 900 000 had been paid into State Treasury funds and not returned to policy holders. As I am interested in the contents of this letter I should like an explanation from the Chief Secretary concerning this matter.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** First, it is not true that insurance companies contribute 75 per cent of the cost of operating fire brigades. They collect levies from policy holders to meet 75 per cent of this cost. The balance is shared between local government and the State Government. If it were desired to return the surplus on operations to contributors, it would be returned not to the insurance companies but to the contributors themselves. This would pose several problems, and would impose an extra burden on insurance companies, because they would have to be responsible for returning whatever proportion of that money would be due to individual policy holders. This would not be practical. However, I point out that the surplus is not paid into Treasury funds in the sense that it goes into general revenue; it is held by the Treasury in a trust account on behalf of the Fire Brigades Board, and remains the property of that board.

Finally, as to whether or not a surplus should be held in a trust account, the Fire Brigades Board urgently needs a new building to replace the present building in Wakefield Street, as that has been in use for a considerable time. The present building is restricted in access, is not large enough to handle the big appliances the Fire Brigade now has, and does not provide adequate training facilities. So, the board urgently needs a new building.

In the first week of this year, I was in Perth and went to see the new building there that was being established by the Perth Fire Brigade. It is a multi-million dollar building, as is warranted by the importance of this service. The available surplus in South Australia is going towards meeting part of the cost of the new building that is so urgently needed.

### TRADING HOURS

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Can the Premier say whether it is Government policy that used car yards be required to have around them fences 9ft. high or, indeed, any other height, to prevent trading out of hours? I was surprised (and if it were not so serious, rather amused) at part of a reply the Minister of Labour and Industry gave yesterday to a question asked by the member for Spence, during which the Minister said (I was listening downstairs to what he said, and I have since checked *Hansard*):

... the Government and I intend to stamp out unfair trading practices and prevent these people from breaking the law—

meaning used car yards—

... I am seriously considering bringing in legislation that will force car yard proprietors to erect a 9ft. wall around their properties. In those circumstances customers— that is, the general public—

would not be able to look in and the dealer would not be able to run back and put the chain on the gate every time an inspector appeared. I think, in many ways, this would certainly stop unlawful car dealing.

That is a verbatim report (knowing *Hansard*, I am sure that it is accurate) of what the Minister said in the House yesterday. It has been the subject of some comment outside, and I think lampooned by the *Advertiser* today in a cartoon. I point out (and I hope that I am not commenting in saying this) that we are not yet living in a gaol but, unless the Premier is prepared to make a considered statement on this matter (I hope to disavow his Minister with regard to this suggestion), I will certainly wonder how long it will be before we are living in a gaol. I know that this matter must have embarrassed other Ministers, and I give the Premier this first opportunity which I, anyway, have been able to give him to make a statement disavowing the proposal. If he beats around the bush and is not completely unequivocal about this—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is now commenting.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** —I will have to take it that he agrees with the proposal.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

**Mr. Millhouse:** This is a policy matter, and I hoped that the Premier would have the guts to answer.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order. He has asked his question. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Whether or not there is a cartoon on the front page of today's *Advertiser*—

**Mr. Millhouse:** It was not on the front page.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Well, there was a cartoon, and that paper treated the matter fairly, properly, and seriously. I have additional information I can give to the House today. It seems to me that my idea, after all, is not original. I have in my possession now several photographs that were taken at 12.30 p.m. today of car yards which were enclosing themselves in aluminium wire-mesh type walls.

**Mr. Venning:** That's different.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** It is not different; it is still a wall. There is nothing different about that situation. One proprietor (we have spoken to only one of these) informs me that he has saved the cost of the wire meshing or the walling in 12 months by reducing the effects of pilfering and people jumping over the fence, and so on.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Vandalism.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Vandalism, and so on. He has saved that cost within 12 months. Two different types

of fencing are being used at the moment. One type is a see-through mesh type wall, so that people can see through it but they cannot go into the car yard unless the fence is physically opened. I have said today on television that I do not want to deprive people of the right to see the cars there for sale. What I want to do—and the Government supports me in this view anyway, and I shall deal with the other part later—is to stop the law from being broken continually and flagrantly; I am sure the member for Mitcham would not want that to happen, either.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Judging from the wry smile on his face, however, he is probably supporting the breaking of the law, and that is probably what has prompted this question.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** He would be out of work if people didn't break the law.

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

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** He gets paid whether he wins or loses.

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

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** It could be that he has a pecuniary interest in this matter, because the more people who break the law the more times he can appear for them. I am not quite sure of his motives.

**Mr. Millhouse:** This Government—

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I shall get to that if the honourable member is patient. I did not say yesterday that this was Government policy. I said that I was considering it seriously.

**Mr. Millhouse:** You said—

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Be careful about what I said. I said that I was considering the matter seriously. It does not become Government policy until I submit it to Cabinet and Cabinet determines the Government's policy. At that stage it will become Government policy—

**Mr. Millhouse:** If it gets through—

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** The practicalities of the situation are that it is working for at least two car yards in Adelaide at the moment.

**Mr. Millhouse:** A lot of people like to walk around—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order. He had an opportunity to ask his question.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** With the present layout and the geographic situation of car yards, people step over the fence and do not break the law. That is the situation. Instead of opening up the chain outside hours, for which he breaks the law and can be prosecuted, the car dealer keeps the chain up. He will be flat out letting people in and having conversations, without opening this type of fence in some way, unless the people are pole vaulters who can jump over the fence. This law-breaking needs to be stamped out. I impress on each and every member of this House who has in his district such people who break the law that he should talk to them personally, and ask them not to break the law. We have extended hours quite liberally and consistent with what is happening in other parts of Australia and other parts of the world. If the legislation is not going to be honoured, something quite serious must be done about it. The other suggestion made to me quite strongly, not by the Government but by people in the industry, is that there should be a revocation of licences after a certain number of prosecutions. Those are different aspects of the matter that I am looking at and on which I shall make recommendations to the Government.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Well, I wish Dunstan had—

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

#### PORT PIRIE CENTRAL MISSION

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Can the Minister of Community Welfare indicate to the House whether his department has been able to assist the Port Pirie Central Mission in the establishing of an emergency night shelter in that city? The Central Mission has been anxious for some time to establish such a facility, and I understand that a suitable building might be available at Port Pirie but that it is the property of the Community Welfare Department. Has there been any agreement between the department and the Central Mission on the future of this facility?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The honourable member was kind enough to indicate to me his interest in this matter, so I am able to give an immediate answer to his question. I can inform the honourable member that a few days ago I received a request from the Port Pirie Central Mission to use an old dwelling at 77 Gertrude Street which the mission wishes to use as an emergency night shelter. This dwelling is one of two dwellings on land to be used for the construction of a Port Pirie community welfare centre. The other building is now being used by the Job Hunters Club. The land will not be required for construction purposes until 1979, so I have agreed to allow the Central Mission to use the house for a minimum period of 12 months.

The mission and my department's district officer at Port Pirie believe that there is an immediate need for an emergency night shelter at Port Pirie, but there has been a lack of the hard statistics required to obtain funding under the Commonwealth Homeless Persons Act. The establishment of a temporary night shelter in the house in Gertrude Street will enable the mission to establish a sound case for the funding of a permanent emergency shelter at another location in the city. The board of the Central Mission has agreed to be completely responsible for any renovation and maintenance required before the temporary shelter can begin to operate.

#### AUDITOR-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** Can the Premier say whether members of the Opposition are to assume that the seeking of information which might reasonably be regarded as ordinary information of public interest direct from officers of the Auditor-General's Department is a practice no longer acceptable to the Government? On Monday morning of this week I telephoned the Auditor-General's Department and asked to speak to the Auditor-General or a senior officer of his department with a view to gaining answers to three specific questions. I was connected to a senior officer who, for the time being, shall be unnamed. My questions were: (1) why was the practice of the Auditor-General's annual reporting of South Australia's 29 statutory authorities and their respective financial commitments and details ceased in 1975; (2) what steps should one take to gain an assurance that this important authority borrowing detail be reintroduced in future Auditor-General's annual reports; and (3) what Parliamentary Papers are available to members of the Parliament, if any, that give the source, the amount of borrowings, capital repayments, and interest rate details of each and all of South Australia's 29 statutory authorities, that is, those that have been given specific

power to borrow with the protection of Treasury guarantee.

I requested the information to allow me to prepare myself to speak on the State Transport Authority Bill, on which I hold the adjournment. In response to my questions, the senior officer indicated that the replies could be expected the same afternoon. However, on return to my office in Parliament House on Monday evening I received the following message:

I have referred your request for information regarding guarantees by the Treasurer to the Auditor-General. The Auditor-General requests that the questions be submitted in writing through the responsible Minister.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has not sought leave of the House.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** Yes I did, Sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member may continue.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** Without being repetitive, I ask the Premier whether he will, if not at present, as soon as possible, give the House an indication of the Government's policy regarding this type of basic public information and its availability to members of the public and, in this instance, to members of the Opposition, who are required to be somewhat abreast of public funding and the public scrutiny of that funding in the ordinary process of carrying out their job.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The Auditor-General's statutory duty is to make a report to this Parliament. He is also obliged by various Statutes to carry out auditing duties in relation to Government and statutory authorities. When the honourable member has questions that relate to the policy of the Auditor-General, including matters that come within his report, those queries should normally be directed through the Minister. If the honourable member has queries of any other Government department in relation to policy matters of any kind, those queries should be directed through the Minister. The honourable member is not in a position, nor is anyone else, to go to a public servant and say, "I want you to answer these questions".

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** I think the Deputy Auditor-General will remember what he did to him before.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Yes. I am not surprised that the Auditor-General may have seen fit to exercise a certain amount of caution and to require the matters to be on record and on paper from the honourable member before they were answered, in view of the honourable member's previous activities.

### SLAUGHTER-HOUSES

**Mr. VENNING:** Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the Government has any plans immediately or soon to introduce legislation affecting country slaughter-houses and, if it does, what are those plans? For some time there has been a rumour that the Government plans to introduce legislation affecting country slaughter-houses to the point of even regionalising them. Country slaughter-house people are far from satisfied with this type of suggestion, but they ask whether the Government has any plans in this regard.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I shall be pleased to make that inquiry of my colleague, ask him for a report on it, and let the honourable member know.

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

### INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

**Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport):** I move:

That this House expresses grave concern at the attempts by the State Government to introduce industrial democracy to further the cause of socialist politics rather than to improve job consultation and participation to achieve better human relations within industry.

Expressions such as "The bloody boss wouldn't know what goes on in this factory" or "If the boss would only come and ask us we could tell him what is wrong with the place" are common expressions in any organisation with a large number of employees and demonstrate the breakdown in communications and the lack of sufficient consultation that invariably occur in any large work place. Overcoming these problems would increase the efficiency of industry and dramatically improve human relations within industry.

Although most older workers are prepared simply to complain but keep on working in circumstances of inadequate consultation and uninteresting repetitive work, younger workers who have just left an education system where they have been taught to question and comment openly to their elders are not. As a result industry throughout the western world has been reassessing its methods and modes of management. Rapid and significant changes are occurring.

Unfortunately, socialist governments and radical trade unions are attempting to use this era of change for their own cheap political advantage. Rather than tackling the root causes of poor consultation and participation in industry, these socialists and communists are using the situation to attempt to destroy the free enterprise nature of industry and replace it with a system of trade union control. In so doing, they have ignored the objectives of improved job consultation and participation, which are necessary to improve human relations within industry. They are simply attempting to replace the existing managers and owners of industry, most of whom already are humane and have a national outlook in managing their companies, with a group of political anarchists and power manipulators.

Members need not take my judgment of my own political opponents; instead they should look at the evidence from the Labor Party policy and also independent assessment of it. The working environment policy recommendations of the A.L.P. which were adopted at the 1975 annual State convention contain the following quotations as the preamble to the industrial democracy policy:

Any attempt to develop industrial relations in Australia must begin with a realistic assessment of the role and importance of trade unions.

The preamble continues:

Without watertight guarantees to the rights and responsibilities of trade unions, workers will continue to be adversely affected by uncontrolled managerial prerogatives and by technological, economic and other changes. Without the introduction of provisions to strengthen and develop trade union organisations, workers will be unable to control or even influence major changes in their working and social environment.

Later, under the heading "Industrial democracy", the A.L.P. policy states:

In fact, industrial democracy must be an additional instrument for trade unions through which they can play a direct part in workers' self-determination.

I urge members to note the expectations contained within this policy statement to control industry and for workers'

*At 3.8 p.m., the bells having been rung:*



self-determination. This policy statement leaves no doubt that the Labor Party and elements of the trade union movement simply want to become the dictators of industry with little or no apparent concern for the working environment of the workers. In general, trade unions have shown no greater ability, and often less, than management to communicate with and understand the workers on the shop floor or in the office. Trade union policies on the Medibank strike, the development of uranium, the issue of compulsory unionism and other such issues have revealed the gap that exists between trade union leaders and their worker members. Last year, through one of its committees the State Government published papers entitled "Industrial Democracy: Philosophy, Nature and Scope". The document states several general platitudes with which no-one could disagree. It also emphasises the general philosophy of the Government in introducing industrial democracy. It makes the following emphasis:

Industrial democracy is concerned with an extension and implementation of employee rights. No matter how rudimentary or simplistic some industrial democracy schemes may be in their embryonic form, an extension of employee rights should be the goal.

Again, there is an emphasis on expanding the rights and control of workers, rather than improving industrial relations. After discussing the various schemes to improve consultation and participation, the report concludes:

It is our view that only those strategies which involve changes to structures of influence and power should properly be considered as a part of industrial democracy.

It is significant that our Premier promotes industrial democracy to achieve a change in the structure of influence and power within industry. I want to stress the point that the Premier has consistently emphasised that industrial democracy is not there to improve industrial relations; it is there to influence the power and change the structure of industry. That came through in the speech the Premier made in Victoria on Monday, as reported in the *Advertiser* on Tuesday.

The purpose behind industrial democracy is further highlighted when the preliminary programme for the International Industrial Democracy Conference is examined. This conference is being held in Adelaide in June under the sponsorship of the South Australian Government. The Premier is both opening and closing the conference (one could almost describe it as a Premier's conference). With the exception of speakers from Australia, every speaker comes from countries with either social democrat Governments or communist Governments, such as Yugoslavia and other European countries.

The most famous institution in the world on worker motivation and management techniques, the Harvard Business School, has been completely snubbed, along with the remainder of all such institutions in the U.S.A. and Canada. Likewise, the Japanese, with their unique system of managers who work on the shop floor for several hours a day, have been ignored. Instead the Premier only listens to the socialist countries. This curious bias of the Premier is revealed further when his fascination with communist Yugoslavia is considered. The Premier recently visited the country to examine worker control. Mr. Ted Gnatenko was sent there at State Government expense to study worker control. And now we have invited guest speakers from that country to talk on worker control, or what is called "Industrial Democracy in Yugoslavia". I sometimes wonder what a communist Government knows about democracy, at least as we understand it.

**Mr. Allison:** They envy it.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I think they certainly should. I sometimes wonder, though, whether they really under-

stand what the system is all about. The Australian Institute of Management recently commissioned a study into "Worker Participation in Australia". This study is probably the most comprehensive summary of current attitudes within Australia. The study states:

Representative systems . . . operate in the interests of those concerned with the maintenance and enhancement of the present influence of the union movement . . . this is the form of participation specified in the policies of the South Australian, New South Wales, Victorian and Queensland branches of the A.L.P.

The study examines the motives of some who promote worker participation. It concludes, on page 24, as follows:

It is clear that those who view worker participation only from the narrow perspective of improved quality of work life, without being aware of other sectional interests, are dangerously blind to the realities of the situation. Although morally justified they are nevertheless fearfully vulnerable to the actions and manipulations of others seeking different objectives.

The study also draws attention to the fact that the 1975 A.L.P. Industrial Democracy policy makes no mention of improving individual job satisfaction. It implies that that policy is only directed towards influencing the power and changing the structure of industry. The State Government has been unsuccessful in getting even one company to adopt its industrial democracy structure. Its continued failure to do so shows the contempt held for the industrial democracy policy by private industry. Many inquiries have been made to the Unit for Industrial Democracy, but this is out of curiosity and/or fear.

There is a growing fear through industry that the State Government will use the adoption of its industrial democracy policy as an unofficial condition for the granting of Government contracts, in much the same way as industry was blackmailed into adopting compulsory unionism. The January, 1978, edition of the *Metal Industries Association Review* reflects this fear in industry when it reports that:

Association officers detected [amongst its members] a note of apprehension concerning whether the Government would note the absence of a particular company's participation in the proposed [International Industrial Democracy] conference.

This fear was heightened last year when the South Australian Government produced a secret list of companies which could be targets for the adoption of the Government's full industrial democracy policy. Initially, the Premier denied to the news media the existence of such a list. Two hours later he admitted to the media its existence. (In the meantime he had apparently done some checking.) Then he claimed the companies had approached the Unit for Industrial Democracy, and that was why they were on the list. The list actually marked those companies (a clear minority of them) that had contacted the unit. One notable feature about the list was that some of the companies were large contractors of Government works and others held Government financial loans and Guarantees. It is interesting to assess the impact of the Labor industrial democracy policy on companies in South Australia. After consulting with a number of the larger companies in Adelaide, it appears that a majority of companies have recently modified their management techniques to improve job consultation and job involvement. This has been done in spite of the Government's involvement rather than because of it. The Government's use of industrial democracy for political purposes seems simply to have increased the fear and suspicion of any changes. I think that also comes through when one speaks to managers in this State. It is noteworthy that there

appears to have been a more positive response to increased worker involvement in Victoria and other States (where no Government pressure has been applied) than in South Australia.

In speaking on a subject such as this, one needs to be careful to put forward a positive alternative. I will briefly outline the Liberal Party's attitude towards employee involvement. The working environment can best be improved by ensuring that workers are treated with the respect and dignity that all humans deserve. The Liberal Party supports and encourages the adoption of greater worker consultation and employee involvement within industrial organisations. Improved communication and a redesign of work tasks can give workers greater involvement, satisfaction and interest in their work and relief from monotony in repetitive tasks. Greatly improved co-operation and understanding will also develop. Management benefits from becoming more aware of the views and feelings of its employees and becoming better informed on all subjects in which its employees are involved. However, management must retain its responsibility for making management decisions. The skill, education and experience required for sound management decisions at the top must not be discouraged or ignored.

Because of Australia's unique system of conciliation and arbitration, it is essential that Australia develops its own methods of consultation and employee involvement. Also, the exact corporate methods and procedures to be adopted will vary with the characteristics of the people within a particular company. The Liberal Party does not believe in, and therefore will not impose, any particular methods or procedures upon any corporation.

The adoption of any worker participation schemes must be voluntary, as the fundamental principle is mutual co-operation. Compulsion will damage the co-operation that already exists and further divide management and employees. The Liberal Party opposes the introduction of legislation to force private companies to adopt any form of industrial democracy. Such legislation requires rigidity, rules and compulsion. I particularly stress that point in the light of the Premier's statement on Monday that his Government intends to legislate for industrial democracy in the private sector into the 1980's.

A Liberal Government will actively encourage the introduction of worker consultation and involvement in all companies on a voluntary basis in the form of joint consultative committees and the redesign of work tasks, and it will advise and assist employees and management to initiate such schemes. When encouraging the establishment of joint consultative committees and the redesign of jobs, certain principles will be promoted. I will briefly run through these principles. First, the employees will be expected to accept responsibility for the decisions they make and the work they do and to develop with management an atmosphere of co-operation. Secondly, any employees representation must be open to all employees. Employee representatives should be elected by secret ballot.

Thirdly, management should inform all employees of the performance of the enterprise and the short-term and long-term objectives and problems. I am pleased to see how many companies in South Australia (in fact, throughout Australia) are now adopting the principle that they will send to all employees a special employee report before issuing annual statements to the Stock Exchange, or doing so at the same time as they issue those statements.

Fourthly, employees should be given the opportunity and encouragement to share in some of the benefits of

increased productivity and efficiency. Schemes to allow employees to participate readily in the equity capital of the enterprise will be promoted. Fifthly, Shareholders will retain the fundamental right to control the use of their capital input, as capital is one major risk commodity in any enterprise.

The redesign of jobs will include schemes of job enrichment, job enlargement, job rotation, and the use of semi-autonomous work groups. Such schemes can provide a means for the employee to participate at the job level and so improve job satisfaction. They can create room for individual development and experimentation. They can increase the use of the workers' capacities by encouraging decision-making and responsibility for their own work. A fundamental part of worker consultation and the redesign of jobs will be a new emphasis on industrial education, especially in the sphere of industrial relations.

I would like briefly to comment on the policy proposed by the Labor Party in this State. The policy that stipulates that one-third of the number of board directors must be elected by employees and another one-third appointed by the Government to report to State Treasury is an attempt to nationalise companies through the board-room. The requirement in that Labor Party policy that managerial decisions must be made by a joint management council with half of its members elected employees will remove from management the responsibility to manage that organisation. The policy requires that employee representatives must be members of the appropriate trade union. This restricts participation and is not in the best interests of all employees. Worker participation is a scheme for the benefit of all rather than the gains of a select few. The policy threatens to introduce "legislation of general application" and, despite the statements made by the Premier yesterday, I believe that statement still stands. Such legislation will demand rigidity, rules and compulsion and destroy the necessary mutual co-operation that should exist to improve industrial relations.

The Premier is charged with manipulating industrial democracy to benefit the cause of socialist politics rather than to improve job consultation and employee involvement to achieve better human relations within industry. The evidence presented from the Australian Labor Party policy statement and independent assessment of that policy clearly indicates that the Premier is guilty of such manipulation. The industrial democracy policy, with its provision that one-third of company board positions should go to employees or their trade union representatives and another third to government-appointed directors, is a move to nationalise companies through the board-room.

The most recent threat of the Premier to legislate for industrial democracy in the private sector after the 1980's will threaten future industrial development in South Australia. That, of course, will mean further increases in our unemployment level. During the past year this State has suffered the greatest increase in unemployment of any State in Australia. During the last year for which figures are available, this State had the second greatest decline in employment in the manufacturing sector of any of the States of Australia. The only State to have a greater decline was New South Wales. Both States have Labor Governments.

**Mr. Bannon:** Our Opposition was so much more favourable in the other States.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** The honourable member says "more favourable", but I am talking about the decline—

**Mr. Bannon:** You're an economic lag—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I am referring to the decline in the

manufacturing work force. Certainly, the decline in this State has been exceptionally high at 5 per cent for the last year when figures were available. "Democracy" is often a misused word. The term "industrial democracy" is misused by the Premier to foster unrealistic dreams with workers and to undermine industry in our State.

**Mr. BANNON (Ross Smith):** When the member for Davenport began his speech, I was encouraged by the way in which he began tackling this important topic. First, his speech was written, and that indicated that he had put much thought and care into preparing it and secondly, he made comments with which I would agree about the changing nature of the work force and the attitude of people in it. It can be seen that there are different attitudes, especially among the young workers who are emerging from a better developed and equipped education system and who have been taught to question and be creative and productive in any job they are in, and who enter the work force believing that they have a positive contribution to make as individuals and that they are not there simply as pawns or ciphers to be pushed around and told what to do.

We should welcome this in our society, but it presents a challenge to the community generally and especially to traditional management in the work place. The honourable member began by dealing squarely with the problem and acknowledging it, and I believed that he was getting off on the right foot in discussing industrial democracy. Unfortunately, for the rest of the 20 minutes he completely abandoned that good start and constructive approach. It did not take him more than a few minutes before he was using words such as socialist, communist, destruction of free enterprise, seeking to replace management, political anarchism, and so on.

In a few minutes more he was into one of his favourite themes, not the role and importance of trade unions in our society but the almost paranoid fear of what he believes the trade union movement is about and what it could do to the things that he supports and represents. He worked at that theme rather un-productively for some time. To pick it up from that point, the role and importance of trade unions cannot be ignored or underrated when we are considering reorganisation of the work force and job enrichment. This has been acknowledged clearly by the group to which the member for Davenport referred when quoting from the policy paper entitled *Industrial Democracy: Philosophy, Nature and Scope*, prepared by a tripartite industrial democracy committee that comprised not just members of Government and unions but also leading managers and people actively involved in management of the private and public sectors.

This is the committee that has as members some eminent people in our community, and the names of three private employers are Mr. W. J. Menz, Deputy General Manager, Arnott, Motteram and Menz Proprietary Limited; Mr. David Pank, Managing Director, Laubman and Pank Proprietary Limited; and Mr. Bob Ling, Chairman and Managing Director, Hills Industries Limited. They are three leading manufacturing industrialists in this State, respected not only in South Australia but also throughout Australia. They have served on Federal Government committees and have a high standing in the community, and they put their names to this report, which therefore requires that considerable assessment and attention should be paid to what it states.

Let us consider what this group stated about the role of trade unions. They are talking about the fundamental background factors with which we must view industrial democracy. They did not launch into an ideological discussion of socialism and communism, as did the

member for Davenport. They dealt with trade unions and their role in this way: that "there must be recognition and agreement that our industrial relations system is founded upon the trade unions as the legal representatives of employees and that, in our system, individual employees, except in limited circumstances, cannot put claims before the arbitral tribunals. The arbitration system is based on the encouragement of trade unionism and the recognition of trade unions as the legal representatives of employees." Also, they say that "it is obvious that, in terms of employee rights and conditions, trade unions play a more pervasive role than union membership figures might suggest. For this reason, and because it is difficult or perhaps impossible to distinguish industrial from non-industrial matters, it is essential that industrial democracy programmes integrate with rather than conflict with contemporary trade union functions and aspirations."

That is putting the trade unions fairly and squarely in their place as a central group in any form of industrial democracy development and programme. That is not only the view of the tripartite committee, some of whose members I named: it is also the view of the Federal Minister for Productivity in the Fraser Government, Mr. Ian Macphee, who was a former head of the Victorian Chamber of Manufactures and a leading employers advocate and representative in Australia for some years, but is now the Federal Minister in charge of productivity in which is involved the question of industrial democracy.

Mr. Macphee said that management had to recognise that unions and employees would not allow the introduction of programmes which did not confer real benefits but were tools of management. I am afraid that the policy that the member for Davenport and his Party advocate in the area of industrial democracy and the things that they pick out as being important for programmes and the way in which they should be tackled are very much linked to the question of industrial democracy being perceived as a tool of management, not as a collective exercise and as a recognition of the changing nature of the work force and the desire of people in it to be actively involved and to feel themselves usefully employed in any enterprise.

It is based on the old-fashioned concept which the honourable member began by implying that he recognised had gone out of the window, namely, that the workers are ciphers who do not have to think about the job and that they switch off their minds as they come to work and switch them on again when they leave at the end of the day. That is just not on any more. Any programme which seeks to change what happens at the work place from a management point of view only and which, in the words of Mr. Macphee, does not confer real benefits but makes the programme a tool of management, will not be acceptable and will not work.

The evidence is overwhelming from both sides of the industrial fence and those actively involved in management and unions that any change in the work place involving industrial democracy must take place by co-operation and consultation and with a common respect for each other's importance in that field. That is, management must recognise the central role to be played by trade unions and their representatives, and any programme that they seek to introduce and negotiate on must involve trade unions and their representatives in it. That is taken for granted in the work place where these things happen, but it does not suit the doctrinaire, ideological approach by the member for Davenport, who chooses to ignore the practical experience of managers he is supposed to speak for.

**Mr. Mathwin:** That would be the right of the workers, and not just trade unions.

**Mr. BANNON:** That is true but, as has been pointed out by this document, especially in manufacturing industries, most workers are members of trade unions and those that are not are direct beneficiaries of what the trade unions have done for them. Let us consider the major point made that the Government has an ideological approach rather than a practical approach to this question of reform on the job and of industrial democracy. The evidence does not bear that out.

From the beginning the Government has stressed a gradualist approach with an education campaign and for any programme showing the need for change to be derived from the people in industry and not for it to be imposed on them from outside. That attitude is present in almost every document produced on the subject. It goes as far back as the two committees set up by the Government to consider worker participation in industry on which the member for Davenport now comments favourably. At the time I am not sure what his reaction was to those committee reports and their approach. Now, he is suggesting that it was an important stage, and I do not think that the Government would disagree with that at all.

It was only a starting point, and we, in South Australia, whatever else has happened in Australia, have long since left that basic starting point: we have moved on and have more sophisticated and more fundamental reforms and programmes already being experimented with in industry today in South Australia. To use the Premier's own words in one of the first editions of the Industrial Democracy Newsletter:

Whilst keeping these fundamental ideas clearly in view we must be flexible in our approach to the systems and schemes which we develop.

That attitude and approach have dominated the way in which industrial democracy has been promoted in South Australia, and it has achieved remarkable success. It is no accident that we are having a major international conference in South Australia or that South Australia is seen as the most appropriate place for such a conference to be held. It will be the most important conference of its kind to be held in the Southern Hemisphere. People from all over Australia are to attend, because they see South Australia as the place where there has been a practical, consensus, flexible and experimental approach in the whole area of industrial democracy. Of course it has been promoted and pushed by the Government. That is one of the Government's jobs, particularly the job of a reforming Government that believes in democratic socialism. The Government has to take the lead and the initiative in the community and to educate the members of the community, and this Government has been doing that for five years. Those ideas have taken root and are being accepted by management, trade unions, and workers on the job, and useful changes in developments in job reform are taking place as a result.

Unfortunately the honourable member referred to fear in industry in relation to such programmes, but I put it to him that such fear is being promoted in some employer organisations by people who are out of touch with what is actually happening on the shop and on the factory floor and in board-rooms. They are the people who are spreading fear and trying to warn employers off because they see that in some way these industrial democracy programmes will take away their traditional work and control of industry in relation to industrial conditions, and so on, that somehow the system will get out of hand, and they cannot cope with it. Some of these people in groups such as the Chamber of Manufacturers ought to look closely at their motives when they feed information to people such as the member for Davenport and get him to

stir up panic, scares or thoughts of socialist control in industry to try to prevent it from experimenting in this flexible way.

I have already quoted the Federal Minister for Productivity (Mr. Macphee), whose remarks are extremely important in relation to the question of legislation. I will not continue to speak much longer, because I realise that other members want to speak on other matters. However, I make the point, particularly in relation to the question of voluntarism *versus* legislation, of which the honourable member made much. It is totally untrue to say that the alternative to legislative prescription of industrial democracy is to allow it to grow generically, without any kind of legislation, because, unfortunately, current legislation prevents experimentation in industrial democracy in many areas. Much of the existing company law and legislative prescriptions make it impossible for the sort of experiments and schemes to take place that people on the work floor and in trade unions and in management themselves want. In other words, without legislation industrial democracy cannot prosper, flower or develop. That is the point the Premier was making in his speech at Mount Eliza, and he has held it consistently for some time now. The kind of legislation the Government envisages at this stage of our development is legislation which will allow industrial democracy initiatives to take place, without being prevented or blocked by existing prescriptive legislation.

The classic example is those Acts which make it legally impossible for employees to be members of a board of a company where problems of fiduciary relationship, and so on, make it impossible, if those companies wished to operate, to put worker directors on the board. To remove that legislative barrier is not to force worker directors on to any particular company; it is simply to enable those companies to do it if they so wish. In the case of statutory corporations, the same applies. There is no essential contradiction between legislation and allowing industrial democracy to develop naturally on the job. That is what it is all about.

I conclude by quoting Mr. Macphee, who has recognised it as well, as follows:

The Federal Government will not legislate to impose any particular form of industrial democracy on employers or workers. Real changes cannot be imposed but will evolve. But as a Government we are committed to removing legislation which inhibits the adoption or worker participation schemes, job restructuring or job enrichment.

That is what the Federal Government is proposing. It is what we have done in many cases in South Australia, but we are a long way ahead of others in terms of our thinking, and we are moving ahead with the consent and support of large sections of industry. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## BALTIC NATIONS

**Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg):** I move:

That this House applauds the action of the Fraser Liberal Government in rescinding the Whitlam decision to recognise the Baltic nations as States of Soviet Russia and in asserting support for the integrity of these captive nations.

In moving my motion, I remind members of the Premier's thoughts. On August 3, 1974, the Whitlam Government recognised the incorporation of the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania) into Soviet Russia. This announcement came not as an announcement from Canberra from

the Prime Minister or the Minister for Foreign Affairs but through a news agency cable from Moscow. The announcement was later confirmed by the Foreign Affairs Department. There is no doubt that this decision had a great bearing on the New Zealand announcement made by the late Prime Minister Kirk. Both decisions caused surprise throughout the world, because no other country has taken similar action during the past three decades. There was no need for this move to be made. There was no advantage to Australia, or to the present or past residents of those States. The announcement caused protests from Baltic people throughout the world, and those protests were supported by many people in different countries.

The then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Fraser, committed himself and his Party to revoking this decision as soon as he regained office, and he did that within a week. He honoured the commitment he had made to Australia. Briefly, the history of the whole matter goes back to 1940, when the Soviet Union occupied the three Baltic States and incorporated them within the Soviet Union. Those States were independent republics, members of the League of Nations. In one brief statement, not from the Minister or from the Prime Minister of the day, but through a press agency from Moscow, they lost their independence.

It later became known throughout the free world that a secret protocol had been signed on August 23, 1939, by Nazi Germany (the National Socialists) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (Soviet Russia). The signatories were Von Ribbentrop and Molotov, who signed this secret document in 1939. That document was never accepted by the three Baltic States, or by people generally throughout the free world. It was a fraud forced on those nations. Certainly, it was not accepted by several of the great powers of the world, particularly the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada, because they realised that it was a *de facto* and not a *de jure* situation. That also applied in New Zealand until August, 1974, when the then Labour Socialist Government changed its tune on the situation and agreed with what Soviet Russia had done to the three Baltic States. The New Zealand Government endorsed a situation which is morally wrong and which is against all principles of the self-determination of nations.

Page 3 of the document produced by the Latvian Federation of Australia in relation to the New Zealand episode states:

The Baltic communities in Australia and New Zealand, as indeed throughout the world, realise that such a *de jure* recognition does not change the realities or the position of their countries of origin, and that nothing short of brute force would compel the Soviet Union to abandon its illegal occupation. They do not seek to involve any government in any wars or use of force, nor do they seek any assistance towards such activities. To them the question is a matter of principle and international morality. They believe that the principles embodied in the Atlantic and the United Nations Charters should apply to all nations, big and small, and that Soviet colonies should have equal right to self-determination with the so-called newly emerging nations arising from former Western colonies and dominions. The small Latvian, Estonian and Lithuanian nations have preserved their national identities and cultures through many centuries despite long occupation by bigger powers, and they have a proven record of self-government and independence and as members of the League of Nations. They only seek moral support for their long-term hopes and aspirations for the re-establishment of their independence.

That was not recognised in any way by the then Whitlam Government and by the then Government of New Zealand. The reasons for the decision of the Whitlam

Government are obvious. Before Mr. Whitlam's trip to Moscow, he wanted the support of the U.S.S.R. for the then Senator Willesee in his nomination for President of the United Nations General Assembly, even at the expense of the Baltic States. That failed.

A number of attitudes have been stated in the book from which I have read extracts to the House. At page 10 of the same document, the following comment appears:

Other countries whose attitudes may be of interest to consider are the United Kingdom, Canada, the United States and the People's Republic of China. The attitude of the British Government, irrespective of which Party has governed, has never changed. The legations of the three Baltic States in London are still recognised by the Government and Latvian, Estonian and Lithuanian passports are still accepted as valid documents of identity and travel. Nor has the attitude of the Canadian or the U.S.A. Government changed and diplomatic and consular representatives of the three Baltic States are still recognised despite *détente* (a word which President Ford has recently excluded from official terminology).

And so the document goes on to remind people of what the situation has been and how wrong it was that the Whitlam Government should recognise the oppression of the Baltic States by the communist regime of Soviet Russia.

The conditions under which these people live are well known to people who read about events in countries with communist or far-left governments. No newspapers are allowed in the Baltic States, and no magazines and books are permitted. Even a Bible is not allowed by the oppressors of the Soviet Union.

**Mr. Whitten:** Are you sure of that?

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Those are the facts as given to me in the document from the Baltic States. I understand that travel restrictions are strict and that it is difficult for travellers to get outside of the capital cities.

**Dr. Eastick:** If their relatives go to visit them, they bring the people into the hotels where the relatives are staying instead of letting the relatives go to the people.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** That is so. I understand that the restrictions make travel extremely difficult. Hotels are allocated to travellers. This happened to me recently when I tried to get into Hungary. I was asked where I was going, what accommodation I would be having, how much money I was taking, who I was going to see while I was there, and various other questions before my application for a visa could be considered.

**Mr. Max Brown:** How did you get into this country?

**Mr. MATHWIN:** It is all very well for the honourable member who is shortly going to South America. We shall see how he gets on down there. Tourist guides are always present with visitors, and no-one dares to criticise the true conditions in these countries, as that is regarded as a crime against the State. The decision of the State is final, and people face the possibility of imprisonment in a concentration camp or confinement in a lunatic asylum.

**Mr. Whitten:** Fair go!

**Mr. MATHWIN:** It is all very well for the member for Price. Half of the family of friends of mine disappeared overnight, along with 50 000 other people. Their only crime was that they were intellectuals. Those people have never been seen since then. I have tried through the Red Cross and by every other means to get information about them, because the person concerned wants to know whether her mother is dead. No information has been available to that person for years. I have been trying hard to get such information, but I have got nowhere. I will not keep the House too long on this matter—

**Mr. Millhouse:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MATHWIN:** —because other matters have to be dealt with. I hope the member for Mitcham will support this motion.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I didn't say that I would not support you, but time is running out.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Even the Latvian Communist Party is protesting against this situation. To help members, particularly those opposite, make a decision on this matter, I refer briefly to the thoughts of the Hon. D. A. Dunstan. In a letter sent to the Vice-President for South Australia of the Latvian Federation of Australia and New Zealand, the following comments appeared:

Thank you for your inquiry about the Premier's attitude to Australia's recognition of the Baltic States as States of the Soviet Union. Mr. Dunstan told the press and repeated in the House of Assembly in reply to questions in November, that he did not agree with this decision. The Premier has asked me to pass on to you this formal statement of his attitude:

I do not question the right of the Australian Government to make this decision. However, my personal view is that it is one I would not have made. I disagree with it. I recognise the distress it has caused to Australians of Baltic descent and believe it brings no benefit to Australia.

With those words of the Premier, I ask the House to support the motion.

**Mr. DRURY** secured that adjournment of the debate.

#### ADELAIDE AIRPORT

**Mr. GROOM (Morphett):** I move:

That this House commends the State Government for continually refusing to permit extensions of the Adelaide Airport beyond its present boundaries and for its insistence that the present flying times curfew be retained and obeyed.

In moving this motion I am mindful that there has been quite a bit of discussion locally in areas abutting the Adelaide Airport. The concern has been whether the airport will be extended to take permanent international flights. In some respects the State Government's policy has been misrepresented. I refer to a news release of January 23, 1974, in which the Minister of Transport stated that the Adelaide Airport runways would not be extended west of Tapley Hill Road. That announcement quashed rumours that houses at West Beach would either be acquired for the extension of airport runways or the construction of an entirely new highway to replace Tapley Hill Road. The Minister stated:

The State Government has always rejected proposals to extend the runways beyond the existing boundaries of the airport.

In a press release of August 3, 1976, the Minister of Transport stated that he had sought permission from Mr. Nixon to widen Tapley Hill Road between Burbridge Road and Sturt Creek on the western side of the present airport boundary. In his reply to Mr. Virgo, Mr. Nixon, the Federal Minister for Transport, refused permission until the investigation of an advisory committee studying airport facilities had been completed. The State Minister of Transport said that he would hazard a guess that runway extensions were under very active Commonwealth consideration. He said that this was despite the fact that the State Government has repeatedly told Canberra that airport facilities would not be permitted to extend beyond present boundaries. The Minister was concerned that the Federal Cabinet was not prepared to accept the State Government's policy. Further concern was expressed about the Federal Government's wanting to expand Adelaide Airport to take supersonic and subsonic international aircraft.

Adelaide Airport's being Commonwealth property, the greater say rests with the Commonwealth Government in relation to it. The State Government's policy on the matter has been quite clear, at least since the press release of January 23, 1974, to which I have referred. It has been clear that the State Government has continually refused to permit extensions of the Adelaide Airport beyond its present boundaries. Additionally, the State Government has insisted that the present flying curfews for Adelaide Airport be retained and obeyed from 11 p.m. until 6 a.m.

In a press release on March 1, 1973, it was stated that an advisory committee had been set up to examine Adelaide's future airport needs. I believe that that advisory committee has almost finished its report. Three working groups are involved, the first of which is concerned with international operations and facilities required in Adelaide; the second working group was concerned with constraints on the development of existing and alternative airport sites; and the third group was concerned with the alternative combinations to serve the Adelaide region. I understand that report will soon be made available.

Ultimately, it will come to pass that Adelaide will need an international airport: it would be disadvantaged by not having such an airport. However, it is clear that the airport should not be at West Beach. The State Government's policy is clear on that. It would cost about \$16 000 000 to develop international facilities at West Beach. If those facilities were permanently established there that would be to the considerable disadvantage of local residents, and noise pollution would be impossible to bear. This is a difficult problem now. Living in the area, I am mindful of the problems that arise in relation to jet aircraft.

In my view, the expenditure of \$16 000 000 at the West Beach site would be a complete waste of money. If the Adelaide region needs an international airport, it should be provided in the Virginia and Two Wells area. Unless the existing runways were extended it would be impossible to have permanent international flights from Adelaide to Hong Kong. The existing runway is about 8 000 ft. and would need to be extended to 10 450 ft. and would need to cross Tapley Hill Road to enable these international flights to occur.

It is clear, because of the State Government's policy in refusing to extend the present boundaries of Adelaide Airport and in refusing to allow a runway to cross Tapley Hill Road, that Adelaide Airport will not be the site of permanent international airline flights.

I consider this to be an important issue, not only locally but also for the State. I am concerned that the member for Hanson has had a motion before the House that touches on international flights, and that it has never been put to a vote. The State Government is to be commended for not allowing extensions of Adelaide Airport beyond its present boundaries. That policy has the effect of prohibiting permanent international flights between, say, Adelaide and Hong Kong. If such flights were allowed the runway would have to be extended over Tapley Hill Road. The State Government's policy is quite clear that the curfew on present flying times be retained and obeyed between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m. The State Government has followed a policy of protecting local residents and will continue to do so.

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** The motion needs further consideration. I have supported the belief that wide-bodied international aircraft could land at Adelaide Airport without causing much inconvenience. I believe they would not make any more noise than do the planes currently using the airport on interstate routes, particularly if they complied with the curfew. I will say more

about that at a later stage. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### UNLEY TRAFFIC

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That the regulations under the Road Traffic Act relating to traffic prohibition (Unley), made on October 27, 1977, and laid on the table of this House on November 1, 1977, be disallowed.

(Continued from February 15. Page 1556.)

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** As I understand it, because I was out of the House when this matter was debated previously, the member for Mitcham was considerably embarrassed in speaking to the motion. I have no such embarrassment, and I want to make clear that, although the honourable member seems to have been uncomfortable about the whole business, I am not uncomfortable about it. I have taken the step of seconding the motion for him because he is without any other support in this House, and I believe it is a proper step to take.

The whole question of road closures has been one which has raised temperatures and tempers in various areas, including a large part of my own district, particularly in Rose Park and Toorak Gardens. It is a subject with which I am familiar. The whole duty of a member of Parliament in representing such a district in a matter which concerns the local government authority, the Road Traffic Board and the Minister is to keep the matter open and before the council so that the residents of the area can at all times, together with the council, resolve the problem to their mutual satisfaction. That is the long and the short of the exercise, and I believe that is what the member for Mitcham is doing in this instance.

The situation in Rose Park and Toorak Gardens is extremely interesting and may well translate itself to the situation in Unley. Following the apparent resolution of the difficulties after the road closures were erected in Rose Park and Toorak Gardens, an alternative scheme has been put forward by the council. I emphasise that the matter was resolved by the council in consultation with the ratepayers. What does concern me is that, although an alternative scheme has been put forward, no action appears to have been taken. I have been told that is because of the intervention of the Minister, through the Road Traffic Board, who has delayed any action being taken on the alternative scheme. I believe strongly in the autonomy of local government bodies on matters that relate directly to their jurisdiction, and matters such as road closures, whether they be in Unley, Rose Park or Toorak Gardens, or anywhere else, should be left to the local government authority concerned to decide as the ratepayers of those areas wish it to decide. I do not believe that the Minister of Transport should in any way interfere with what has been the clearly expressed wishes of the people whenever those wishes have been recorded.

At present, the wishes of the people of Unley, as I understand it, are not yet defined and resolved, and this is a matter for the Unley council to decide for itself. In those circumstances, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion which I am quite certain the member for Mitcham has put forward simply to keep the matter open so that it can be resolved by the council, as is proper, in consultation with the ratepayers.

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL** secured the adjournment of debate.

### CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from November 30. Page 1121.)

**Mr. DRURY (Mawson):** I oppose the Bill. I would like to express my attitude towards child pornography, about which great play has been made recently. As a family man and a father of four children my personal feeling towards it is one of repugnance. The exploitation of children and adults for sexual purposes has been with us for thousands of years; even Cleopatra, a fine woman, traded her virtues for power, and this is one of the hallmarks of history. Our attitudes towards sex have been formed over centuries. I think we take a rather puritanical attitude towards the matter; I would prefer to see a much more sensible attitude adopted.

The church has generally had a significant effect on society. In 312 A.D., the Roman Emperor Constantine recognised the Christian church as the only legitimate religion of the Roman Empire. Since then, the church has had an influence that has virtually amounted to a monopoly. There was the growth of what was termed by scholars Caesaro-papism whereby the church and State combined to establish norms for society. With the collapse of the Roman Empire it was left to the church to establish some form of order for society; otherwise there would have been a degeneration back to barbarism. All sorts of restrictions and sanctions were placed on society from then on.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** What's this got to do with the Bill?

**Mr. DRURY:** These are my thoughts on the basis of the Bill. Over the centuries, this rigid attitude to all forms of sexuality and expressions thereof has developed. A person expresses his or her sexuality in various ways, simply by physical posture, looks, dress and speech. It is a part of the human process that we do this, but in the process of doing it I think we have to distinguish between what is licence and what is freedom.

On consulting the Concise Oxford Dictionary, I found that the definition of "licence" is "Liberty of action, especially when excessive; disregard of law or propriety", whereas "freedom" is defined as, "Personal liberty, civil liberty, right to do". I think the difference is obvious. The question of child pornography involves the threat of censorship. As I said earlier, I find child pornography rather repugnant. Nevertheless, one has to take a balanced view of the matter, because one does not want the situation tipped into reverse, so that a state of censorship will develop.

The Classification of Publications Tribunal has guidelines laid down in the Act that provide that adult persons are entitled to read and view what they wish and that members of the community are entitled to protection, extending both to themselves and to those in their care, from exposure to unsolicited material that they find offensive. The Act then refers to the Commonwealth Censorship Board, due regard to the nature of publications, etc.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Don't you think it would be better to outlaw the production of it?

**Mr. DRURY:** I am coming to that now. The following report appeared in the *Advertiser* of March 30, 1977:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) has asked the Classification of Publications Board to refuse classification to "hard-core" pornography depicting children. In a letter to the board on March 16, Mr. Dunstan says it is evident that community standards are such that material depicting "hard-core

pedophilia" should be refused classification. In the letter Mr. Dunstan says he has been aware "for some time" of the tendency for pornography depicting children to become less of a rarity in Australia . . .

Mr. Dunstan said yesterday the board had previously refused classification to publications involving children in indecent acts . . . This policy was that the board should refuse classification to any publication containing such material.

Adult persons, as I said earlier, ought to be able to read and see what they want. The limitation on this is that, if what they do see and hear is produced outside the State of South Australia, and would constitute a breach of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act if such material was produced in South Australia, the board must refuse it classification. In doing that, the board imposes a sanction immediately on the sale and distribution of such material for profit. This means that material depicting child pornography is not available for those purposes; in fact, this applies not only to offering material for sale but also to its dissemination, whether for profit or not.

The problem then arises, if it is not for sale but is still distributed, of catching the offender. I note that, if the act of simulated intercourse between children contravenes the Criminal Law Consolidation Act or a similar Act interstate or overseas, literature depicting such simulation would not be classified and, hence, a sanction would be applied: the board would refuse classification, and it would not become available. In that case we have to deal with the penalties for distributing this material illegally. This Bill provides for a penalty of three years gaol, a \$2 000 fine, or both. The Government maintains that the existing penalty of \$1 000 is a sufficient penalty. When the Bill was introduced in another place, it did not extend the law in any way. This Bill, in providing for this penalty, could be subject to argument.

There is no disagreement with the principle that both sides of the House dislike child pornography. I do not think that any of my colleagues enjoy looking at it any more than I believe members opposite would enjoy looking at it. When it comes to fixing penalties I think a quote from W. S. Gilbert is applicable, as follows:

My object all sublime  
I shall achieve in time,  
To let the punishment fit the crime  
The punishment fit the crime.

To mete out punishments in such a case one has to decide what crime is being committed. Is it the crime of distributing child pornography? Then one must consider the bad effect of such publications on children, and the effect on family stability. Will the publications be distributed for a profit? We must then consider whether a penalty of \$1 000 is fair. Should it be more severe? In the current situation, the Government believes that it should not be increased.

**Mr. Wilson:** What sort of penalty do you think should fit the crime?

**Mr. DRURY:** I have not yet been able to work out the actual effect of the crime; that is what I am saying. I am trying to work out what it leads to.

I refer to a crime that occurred on April 13, 1977, at Flagstaff Hill when offences were committed against children. The defendant was given a sentence of 4½ years imprisonment.

If this Bill became law, resulting in a maximum penalty of three years imprisonment or a fine of \$2 000, in fact he would have received a lesser sentence. There have been two other cases of distribution of such material in the past couple of years. It is fair enough that they should be brought before the courts. In another place it was pointed

out that under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, if such pictures were taken of children in a sexual situation, it would be a case of gross indecency, dealt with already by section 58.

**Mr. Wilson:** Don't you think it should be a specific offence?

**Mr. DRURY:** The problem has been raised of children swimming in the nude in a backyard swimming pool. What should be the penalty if someone takes a photograph of them and distributes it? Is it done with malicious intent, or is it done innocently? How many parents have taken photographs of pre-school children with no clothes on and given the photographs to relatives or friends?

**Mr. Allison:** But this Bill defines an act of indecency.

**Mr. DRURY:** Yes, but in addition to the penalty of \$1 000 already laid down, we also have section 33 of the Police Offences Act, which is to be amended shortly. I believe that that amendment will provide for a substantial increase in the fines. According to the debate in another place, this Bill does not take the matter any further at law, except in respect of penalties. So, our argument revolves around the question as to what degree we should impose penalties in connection with this matter. Whilst members on both sides would not approve of child pornography, the imposition of a three-year gaol sentence or a fine of \$2 000 or both is a bit steep, because if a person commits the offences, even without a monetary motive, he really needs medical treatment rather than a gaol sentence. Such an offence is rare. The courts are severe on pornography offences nowadays. For the offence of distributing pornographic literature a fine of \$1 000 is sufficient.

During a radio programme this morning, I heard of a person in a position of trust over young children who had committed sexual offences against them. I realise that that does not involve child pornography; nevertheless, that person was committed to an institution. That person needs treatment. In his case, imprisonment would have done him no good. He is better off in an institution. The penalties provided in this Bill are excessive, and I continue to support the Government's policies in this matter. I therefore oppose the Bill.

**Mr. WOTTON (Murray):** I support the Bill. I am extremely disappointed that the member for Mawson and other Government members have opposed it. The member for Mawson said that the Opposition had made great play out of this issue, and he said that he was speaking as the father of four children. I support the Bill because I am the father of three children, and I want to see their future protected. This Bill has nothing to do with Roman emperors or history lessons, as we heard from the member for Mawson. It is a matter of protecting our children and future generations.

I have been concerned that the Government has been reluctant to support this Bill which, after all, simply prevents the taking, distributing, and selling of photographs of minors in pornographic positions. If it is not too late, I urge the Government to rethink its attitude. I am sure every member would appreciate how easily young children are coaxed into doing what they would not do normally. People with warped minds would do anything to encourage such activity. The Government has tried to hide behind the suggestion that the portion of the Bill dealing with the taking of pornographic photographs of children is already covered in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. The Government has used that argument consistently, but the argument is not valid.

It is incredible that the Government has not gone above politics in this matter. I believe that the purpose of this Bill is not covered in that legislation but, whether or not it is covered, surely the Government would lose nothing



politically or for any other reason by supporting this Bill to clear any doubt. Government members have insisted that examples or details should be cited where people have been found to be engaged in this activity. There has been proof that people have been engaged in this activity, but surely we do not have to reach the stage of proving that it is happening in South Australia. Let us ensure that it does not happen in the future. It is sickening that it should happen at all.

The member for Mawson has said that adults should be free to read what they will, but that says nothing in regard to the protection of children. He said that he doubts whether any member would disagree with the principle that this Bill brings forward. Yet the Government is not willing to take any action. As the member for Light pointed out, all the Government is willing to do is give lip service, but we need more than that. The present law and its penalties are useless in preventing children from being abused. The situation can be improved by preventing the sale of pornography in the first place.

The sum of \$200 has been mentioned, but that is chicken-feed. Let us bear in mind the money that offenders would get from people perverted enough to look for such material on the open market. We should be proud of our society. We know what happens in other countries, and we must ensure that the same things do not happen here. Let us not kid ourselves. If action is not taken, such incidents will occur here. We have enough problems at present in bringing up children.

We need to take action while we can. As I said earlier, the Government should be willing to forget its pride and politics in relation to this matter. It has nothing to lose, because it is almost three years before the next election will be held.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** Two people have gone to gaol already on this.

**Mr. WOTTON:** I know, but there is nothing to stop further action being taken through representations on this Bill. Nothing wrong can happen as a result of our supporting this Bill. However, we could protect one child's future. It could be my child, or the child or grandchild of any member in this place, and I believe that a child, as a citizen of tomorrow, has the right to be protected.

Nothing is to be gained politically from this Bill. Indeed, I am led to believe that polls organised by the Labor Party in this State have indicated that 85 per cent of the people in South Australia want this legislation to pass. I urge the Government to do more than give lip service to this matter, to take action and to support this Bill, which has come from another place, so that we can protect children in future.

**Mr. SLATER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### GRAPEGROWING INDUSTRY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Arnold:

That this House calls on the Federal and involved State Governments to—

1. limit vineyard plantings to existing areas,
2. increase duty on imported wines and brandies,
3. reduce excise payable on Australian produced brandy,
4. provide funds to convert surplus wine grapes into juice concentrate and use the product to promote and establish overseas markets,

in an urgent endeavour to resolve the massive wine grape surplus.

This House further recognises the appropriate action of the Federal Government in relation to the citrus industry and

seeks similar consideration for the grapegrowing and wine and brandy producing industries of Australia.  
(Continued from February 15. Page 1558.)

**Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier):** At the outset, I state that in principle I support the motion. The member for Chaffey and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said last week that this was an urgent matter. All Government members agree that it is and, indeed, that it should be resolved as soon as possible. However, there are some points in the motion with which I do not agree and some which I believe are irresponsible. Later, I intend to move an amendment that I hope will get members' support.

**Mr. Wotton:** You'll just make it into a political issue, won't you?

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** In his closing remarks, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that this matter should not be political. Judging by the interjection, the member for Murray does not agree with his Deputy Leader, because he is trying to accuse the Government of being political. Grapegrowers and the wine industry are in trouble today as a direct result of political decisions taken by past and present Federal Governments. This is the whole point of the matter, as my amendment will show. The present Federal Government was perfectly aware of the problems being experienced as a result of the Whitlam Government's decision to increase the excise and to repeal section 31a. An uproar occurred when those decisions, which were in line with the Coombs report, were made. Since 1975, the problem has become compounded, but the present Federal Government has done nothing to alleviate the situation. My remarks this afternoon and the amendment I intend to move relate to the Federal Government's decision to do nothing to alleviate the position in which grapegrowers and the wine industry find themselves today.

If my amendment is carried, and the Federal Government agrees with all the points embraced by it, it will be too late to help grapegrowers in South Australia with the 1978 vintage. It will be like shutting the stable door after the horse has bolted. These decisions should have been made in 1976, or even as early as 1975. I am not trying to be uncharitable to the member for Chaffey, but it seemed to be rather bad timing for him to move the motion last week, as he did, when everyone was aware of the problems that existed and when grapegrowers were telling their respective members about those problems.

The member for Chaffey moved the motion, suggesting that we should do this and that, when growers were on the point of picking their crops. We are told that this is a matter of urgency, that we should forget politics, and that we should immediately send a telegram to the Minister for Primary Industry and ask whether he can do something. Any realistic person would admit that, even if we sent that telegram two weeks ago, nothing could be done to help growers with the 1978 vintage. I am sure that the member for Chaffey would agree with me in that respect.

**Mr. Arnold:** No way—nor would the growers.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** I remind the House of the actions taken by the South Australian Labor Government to try to solve the problem. Every time that the Minister has got Cabinet to agree to release money to help grapegrowers in this State, he has warned the industry and the Federal Government of the problems facing grapegrowers here. But what response have we had? We have had no reply or reaction from the Federal Minister. I am sorry if I am being uncharitable, but this motion was moved by an Opposition member only last week, and it says that we should be giving some form of assistance to South Australian grapegrowers. The member for Chaffey was

kind when he said that Government members were always accusing Opposition members of not going to their Federal counterparts and trying to get them to do something. He said, "We are doing it this time. Therefore, you should not be political but should help us; we should send a telegram to Mr. Sinclair tonight."

**Mr. Mathwin:** You don't think it is an emergency, do you?

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** I do. However, this motion should have been moved in 1975. That is the whole point. If Opposition members were truthful, they would agree with me. The Angle Vale and Virginia Grapegrowers Committee in my district comprises 28 growers who are completely incensed with the treatment they are receiving. Their problems are worse than those in other areas, because this is a new area and because their crop has to be picked two or three weeks earlier than crops are picked in other areas. They are facing a situation in where large wineries are saying to them, "We cannot give you any commitment to take your grapes, because we do not know what the situation is at present." These grapegrowers are in a worse situation than are those in the Barossa Valley and Riverland.

This growers committee asked me to arrange a deputation to the Minister. I did, and the Minister tried to help as much as he could by trying to arrange for them to join a co-operative by using finance from the State Bank. While the committee thought that this suggestion was reasonable, they made the point that it might contend with the 1979 vintage, but what about the present vintage? If the present motion and my proposed amendment were passed today, there would be no way that we can do anything for the 1978 vintage. These grapegrowers were so incensed at the inactivity of the Federal Government that they sent the following telegram to the Federal Minister:

We the undersigned grapegrowers of the Angle Vale and Virginia area of South Australia wish to register the strongest protest at your Government's lack of action to alleviate the problems caused by the surplus of red wine grapes. We urgently request information concerning any proposals you have to assist us.

Although the telegram was sent about eight days ago, no acknowledgment or reply has been received, typifying the attitude of the Federal Government, especially to the 1978 vintage.

All indications have shown that the wine industry failed to heed the warning signs. When there was a boom in the consumption of red wine, there were extensive plantings. Then large United Kingdom multi-national companies (and especially tobacco companies) in trying to diversify their activities considered the Australian scene, and began to purchase old family Australian wineries. They immediately began extensive plantings, basically to reduce their income tax and to offset the cost of the take-over. I refer to the involvement of the South Australian Government and why I consider that, in this instance, it is impossible for the Government to give now any financial assistance to grapegrowers. I refer to press releases from the Minister of Agriculture: that of March 16, 1976, states, in part:

"Reports received in the last week from the Wine Grapegrowers Council and the United Farmers and Graziers organisation indicate there could be a surplus of about 1 500 tonnes of wine grapes this season," the Minister said. "A loan of \$150 000 should be sufficient to cover a surplus of 2 000 tonnes."

The Minister also sounded a warning to the industry that, if a similar surplus problem was anticipated next season, the industry should take action to provide its own solution well before next harvest. That was in 1976. A further loan

of \$193 500 was allocated in July, 1977, and this brought the loan from the original \$150 000 to \$323 500 to process, cart, and store the surplus crop of 4 925 tonnes. To convert that surplus into spirit cost the State Government \$323 500.

Today, the surplus is between 40 000 and 50 000 tonnes, and it would be impossible for the State Government with its financial resources to process that quantity. The 4 925 tonnes in 1977 was processed into 500 000 litres of spirit, and the greater part of that is still unsold. The State Government's hands are tied in relation to giving financial assistance, so we must turn to the Federal Government. That is why I believe that this motion is wrong and that my proposed amendment to it is correct.

I am sure that if the wine industry had considered the situation in the late 1960's, and the Federal Government had used its anti-dumping regulations, things would have been much better. French brandy is coming into this country at a price well below that which the French distilleries are receiving, because the French Government is dumping it in Australia. At the same time there has been an over-production of Scotch whisky, and that is being dumped in Australia and in other parts of the world at a price below the cost of production. However, the Federal Government will not use its anti-dumping regulations, because it is frightened of retaliation and wants to protect other sections of our rural industry. It is prepared to see the Australian wine industry (and especially the industry in South Australia which is suffering most) go to the wall. I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out all words after "House" and insert the following words:

"Condemns the Federal Government for its irresponsibility towards the Australian wine and brandy industry in refusing to take steps to establish favourable differentials for Australian wine and spirit which would have lifted demand for wine grapes and thus avoided the present critical surplus situation.

The House further calls on the Federal Government to take immediate steps to implement taxation measures to discourage imports of wine, brandy, and whisky, and to encourage domestic consumption of Australian products.

Further, this House calls on the Federal Government to co-operate with involved State Governments to:

- (1) Institute limitations on further wine grape production;
- (2) Develop and encourage domestic and export markets for grape juice;
- (3) Provide some form of compensation to small grape-growers severely distressed by the surplus situation largely created by the Federal Government's refusal to take the necessary steps to stimulate sales of the domestic product."

The reason I have moved my amendment is that I do not believe that the motion really covers the situation, or it is too vaguely worded. The motion seeks to limit vineyard plantings to existing areas. The mover said that this would be easy to do, because it had been done on a quota basis in the sugar, rice, dairying and egg industries. My amendment would place a limit on further wine grape production. In addition to the problems involved in merely limiting the extra planting of vines, there are problems associated with replanting. The mover is aware that extensive planting is taking place in the Riverland. If we were to limit the area of planting, how could we police the activities of a person who uprooted low-yield vines and replaced them with high-yield vines and who, in effect, could halve his area of plantings and still produce more? In the long term, I agree that we must institute limitations, but it must be done nationally; it is no use South

Australia's doing it alone. If we moved alone and if there were a need for grapes in the future, there could be a flood of grapes coming in from New South Wales and Victoria. The fourth part of the motion is the irresponsible part, in that it seeks to "provide funds to convert surplus wine grapes into juice concentrate and use the product to promote and establish overseas markets". The member for Chaffey stated:

The Overseas Trade Department has people available overseas to promote new markets. Here is an opportunity for the Federal Government, in co-operation with the State Governments, to process the surplus 40 000 or 50 000 tonnes of wine grapes in Australia and to convert them into juice concentrate.

That is a good idea, but it is irresponsible. First, we must develop the market and ascertain the cost of putting the product on the market. The honourable member says that we should process it all into grape juice, telephone our people in the United States of America, Japan and elsewhere, and say, "We have so many thousand litres of grape juice concentrate. Will you please find a market for it?" I assure the House that the Economics and Marketing Branch of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department is working with members of the wine industry and with overseas trade organisations on creating a market for grape juice. Surely that is the correct and responsible way of going about it. The mover is merely saying that we should give them the money (although I sympathise with the grapegrowers), produce grape juice and all our troubles will be over. We need to ensure a long-term market for grape juice and to promote this product.

Finally, I point out that it is the small grapegrower who is suffering as a result of the problems caused by over-production and to whom immediate compensation should be paid, even if it is only in the form of leaving his crop on the vine. I believe that the Opposition would support such a move. Regarding the differentials between imported and Australian brandy, as well as reducing the excessive excise payable, I have no argument with the motion, but I urge members to support my amendment.

**The SPEAKER:** Is the amendment seconded?

**Mr. DRURY:** Yes, Sir.

**Dr. EASTICK (Light):** That commentary by the member for Napier represents a complete hypocrisy regarding the people he claims to represent, and his amendment makes a mockery of this whole important issue. Price fixing, which was instituted by this Government, has been a great boon to the wine industry, and no-one can deny that. However, by giving a guaranteed price, there has been an unlimited increase in production resulting in over-production in the prevailing economic climate. We cannot guarantee a price without considering the volume of production. That simple fact of life, together with the failure to look at the importance of supply and demand, completely contradicts the statements we have just heard. There has long been a need to give better consideration to the wine industry.

It was the Whitlam Government's activities that created the major havoc which is still influencing the activities of the wine industry in Australia today. The action of the present Government in not resolving that situation completely has been re-presented to it and requires further re-presentation. As the mover so rightly said, we must advance the cause of the industry. However, the mischief contained in the amendment would do nothing for the people the member for Napier represents, and the 29 people concerned in the Virginia and Angle Vale area to whom he has referred will see the folly of his remarks. It is necessary in the long-term and best interests of the industry to reduce production in the present climate.

There is an urgent need for the replanting of large areas of Australia's vineyards in order to move away from many of the varieties which can now only be turned into spirit and which are contributing to the disastrous effects being experienced by our brandy industry.

There is a useful article to which I refer members. It appears in volume 6 (No. 2) of *Scope*, in February, 1978. That is a monthly magazine which is a supplement to the *Eyre Peninsula and Northern Papers* of this State. Under the heading "Industry joins in new vine project", we see:

While life begins at 40 for man, this is the age when the grapevine goes into decline.

The article continues:

Significantly over half of South Australia's 31 000 hectares of vineyards are more than 40 years old and will need to be replanted over the next 10 years.

That is a significant comment. Add to that the fact that the new types of vine being grown are producing more than the ones they are replacing. Unless there is a rationalised approach to this whole industry, we shall continue to get further and further into the mire. I believe that this motion has full regard for that matter and would allow the Federal Government to look at this matter objectively and positively.

In France at present, unless the people responsible for planting and replanting vines follow the direction of the industry and plant the varieties that will benefit the industry, they are refused opportunities to replant more than 50 per cent of the area that they take out of production. In France, 70 000 hectares is being taken out of production purely and simply because it is based on the reality that new varieties are producing better and there is not the need for a continual over-supply of the product. Much more could be said on the matter but I know that others wish to speak and it is desirable that a vote be taken on this matter. The intention of the original motion was of value to the people in the wine industry in this State. Support of the hypocritical amendment which has been moved for purely political purposes will do nothing at all to advance the cause of the industry, which is suffering now because of the activities of and the measures introduced by the present State Government.

**Mr. DRURY (Mawson):** I second the amendment. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that not so long ago a constituent of mine came to see me about a request for free school books because, in addition to working for the Engineering and Water Supply Department, he owned a 4-hectare allotment, and he had received a letter from the local winery that it would not accept his grape crop. That request led me on to other things, and I came across the report of the Senate Standing Committee on Tax and the Wine and Grape Industries, which at page 11 states:

The rate of income growth will be a very important determinant of future wine sales.

It should be obvious that the production of anything, whether it be cars, wines, or any commodity, is done for sale and, if we cannot sell those things, obviously we shall end up with a surplus. The Senate Standing Committee on Trade and Commerce clearly states that the rate of income growth will be a very important determinant of future wine sales.

In effect, what we have seen in the last two years is a reduction in people's expectations. This has been deliberately caused by the actions of the Fraser Government; there can be no dispute about that. That Government set about deliberately to reduce considerably Federal and State spending, and with that we have the corresponding spin-off of loss of contracts and jobs and the deliberate creation of unemployment. After all, we were told in the December, 1975, election that that would be

the case—a reduction in Government spending. That has had the effect of reducing the number of jobs; fewer contracts are let—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! We are concerned with the wine industry.

**Mr. DRURY:** This is the background of the statement here, that the rate of income growth will be a very important determinant of future wine sales. If people do not have enough money, obviously they will resort to the more staple necessities of life, such as food, clothing and shelter; and the tastes they have developed over the decade from 1965-66 to 1975-76 will obviously be cast aside in order to survive. In the case of a group I associate with locally in the area in which I live, the consumption of wine became something that we developed only in the early 1970's, and I even developed a taste for it myself, considerably watered down, but a few of them over the past few years have given it away because their incomes, reduced in real terms, are needed for housing, clothing, food and children's education. Consequently, there will be a lessening of sales of wine and, therefore, the wineries say they do not need as much of the wine grape crop: they say to the growers, "Keep your grapes; we do not need them." Considering that the wineries themselves have only 30 per cent of the grape crop, the other 70 per cent comes from growers, who are expendable in the eyes of the large wineries which, as my colleague pointed out, are almost all overseas-owned.

In addition to the lessening of expectations due to a fall in incomes, we have a change in consumer tastes. The red wines are no longer selected by consumers. There has been a switch to white wines. I myself, using again a personal example, know that the local group with which I am associated no longer bottles red wine for sale to raise funds; it has switched over to whites. Fortunately for that winery, there are some white grapes for sale locally. In addition to that, the South Australian Government has again stepped into the breach. I quote from the Premier's policy speech at the last State election:

The Labor Government has recognised the particular problems of horticultural industries in the Riverland. Funds have been provided for emergency pools in wine grapes and citrus juice. The loans to the Riverland cannery have been converted to grants. We recognise the need for long-term solutions to the problems of this region.

The long-term solution for the wine industry is, first of all, to find a market and develop it and then use the surplus we now have and, in the meantime, produce more grapes with the expansion of those markets. Also, the South Australian Government has assisted the wine industry with loans. I believe the member for Napier mentioned a \$500 000 loan in this regard, and the South Australian Government's submission to the Industries Assistance Commission on the wine industry was made with the intention of protecting the State wine industry.

Mention was made by the member for Light that the Whitlam Government erred. In fact, the Dunstan Government at that time publicly stated that it did not agree with the actions of the Federal Government of that day.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** The Premier said, "I have been dishonoured."

**Mr. DRURY:** I believe that is so. I shall rely on the Minister's memory.

**Dr. Eastick:** I wouldn't if I were you.

**Mr. DRURY:** It is a good memory, and I shall rely on it. I support the amendment.

**Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** This is a sad and sorry day for the wine industry, for the grapegrowing industry, and for

politics in South Australia. I do not know what has been the involvement of the member for Napier and the member for Mawson in the wine industry; obviously, from their contributions this afternoon, it has been extremely limited. I have been actively involved in the wine and grapegrowing industries all my life, and I am one of the wine grape producers who has a surplus at this stage.

It is unrealistic for the member for Napier merely to say that I gave notice of this motion only some two or three weeks ago. I gave notice of it on the second day of the sitting this year. If I had been given an earlier opportunity to introduce such a motion I should have done so. Apparently, such an important motion before the House does not even warrant a reply from the Government, which delegates two of its backbenchers to reply. Even though hundreds of growers and their families are facing economic ruin, no Government member is willing even to support the motion. There is no politics in this motion. It would have been easy for me to condemn the previous Whitlam Labor Government for an hour or two for its actions from 1973 in completely destroying the wine and brandy-producing industry, but my intention was to try to get some action for South Australian grapegrowers and to save them from economic ruin.

The Government has seen fit not even to reply, and has relied on two of its backbenchers to state its case. What a sorry state of affairs for the industry! We have a precise motion before the House, and the amendment does not even offer a suggestion as to what could be done with the 40 000 tonnes or 50 000 tonnes of surplus grapes. The member for Napier said perhaps that will be sorted out next year. Obviously, Government members have never been in the sort of situation in which the grape producers now find themselves. Dozens of them will be forced off their properties and out of their homes.

**Mr. Chapman:** Because this Government won't support them.

**Mr. ARNOLD:** There is no doubt about that whatever. This is an incredible situation. The Government had a glorious opportunity to show a bit of statesmanship in supporting the motion and going to the Federal Government. The Minister of Agriculture, in the press in the past two weeks, has been condemning the Federal Government, but what approach has he made to it? I have seen nothing in print as yet to say that he has been to Canberra or that he has made an approach to the Federal Government. He condemns the Federal Government in the press, but in not one instance has he gone to Canberra and made personal representations to the Prime Minister or the Minister for Primary Industry.

**Mr. Groom:** Have you done that?

**Mr. ARNOLD:** As a State member of Parliament I am endeavouring to do it through the State House, through the Government of South Australia, but this Government will not even speak to the motion. That is the incredible part of it.

**Mr. Groom:** You've got to do more than speak. Why don't you go to Canberra?

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** What about O'Halloran Giles?

**Mr. ARNOLD:** He is the Federal member, making representations to the Federal Government in Canberra. I am a State member, making representations in the House of Assembly to the State Government. I am making representations on behalf of South Australia, which is and always has been the predominant wine-producing State of Australia. It is a major industry in South Australia. Three weeks after notice of motion was given, the Government will not even reply. It is a sorry day. Undoubtedly, the

Government's amendment will be carried.

**Dr. Eastick:** More's the shame.

**Mr. ARNOLD:** Yes, because it does not even suggest to the Federal Government what is going to happen or what should be done to try to assist the growers and their families.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Mr. ARNOLD:** Members opposite might laugh and joke about this, but if they had ever been in this situation, having enormous debts, they would not laugh. The member for Morphett has undertaken a certain amount of business in the Riverland and he would understand my reference to the indebtedness of many of the growers. The member for Price knows what the industries are like up there, and he knows the plight many of the growers are facing and the enormous indebtedness of many growers involved in horticulture. It is not a laughing matter. Many growers will be forced off their properties as a result of this year's calamity. Along with their families, they will be forced out of their homes, and yet the member for Napier asked why I did not bring this to the notice of the House earlier.

When the House adjourned last year, there was no precise indication of what quantities of grapes the wineries would accept. I have before me letters from a major South Australian winery written to its grape suppliers as recently as February 10, cancelling the quotas it had issued in December. There was no way on earth that a motion of any substance or basis of surplus could be put before this House before Parliament resumed on February 7. Notice was given on February 8, and the Government could have replied a week ago, but it saw fit to take the adjournment and defer the matter for a further week. Now, the Government has delegated the job of speaking to the motion of two of its backbenchers who have little knowledge of the wine and grapegrowing industry. This is a sorry day for the wine grape producers, for the wine industry, and for politics in South Australia.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

#### CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from February 15. Page 1568.)

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare):** The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in introducing the Bill, relied heavily on reports of the Mallen committee and, to some extent, on a report that he called the Nicolson report. Since he spoke, the Minister of Health and I have been able to inquire of the Mallen committee direct. That committee held a meeting recently. As a result of those inquiries, I propose to prepare some amendments to the Bill.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** Amendments, or one amendment?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** At this stage, that is not quite clear, and for that reason I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from February 15. Page 1563.)

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** Last week, I was making the point

that, merely because we allow b.y.o. licences, licences restricted to that area, to be available, that may not increase wine sales in the first 12 months of operation of those licences, of slightly longer. Some people have large stocks of wine stored at home, and I do not object to their taking it to a restaurant and consuming it there. I think that those who argue that automatically there will be an increase in wine sales are being misled. That will not be the case. There could be a decrease in the amount of wine sold in the first year or two of operation of these licences. Moreover, I am disappointed that the Bill does not include a provision that a restaurant owner who wished to do so could have a dual licence: in other words, customers would have the opportunity to buy liquor from the restaurant or to bring their own. That provision is not included. If we are to give restaurants a licence to operate in a more complete way, they should be allowed to have a dual licence. I cannot see why that should not be the case. If a person fights to get a licence against neighbouring operators who may say that there is no need for a further licence in the area, and the court grants a restricted licence that takes away some of the business that the holder of a full licence could share. Whether that applies in other States does not matter. We could have made the law much better if we had broadened the issue so that there could be a dual licence. I cannot see anything wrong with the dual licence.

I have dined in restaurants in other States where people bring their own liquor. At one restaurant, in Bourke Street, Melbourne, I was told by the proprietor that it was a b.y.o. restaurant. I had not realised this. There were two members of Parliament from Queensland with me, and the proprietor said, "Don't worry, we will buy it for you." The hotel must have been nearby, because he was back in about two minutes with a list of what was available. Therefore in some of these places stocks can be made available, limited though they may be.

Doubtless, that sort of thing will happen here to some extent, and I hope that those who do it will lose their licence. I have no complaint about the principle and have supported the idea of b.y.o., but I believe that we should allow a considerable period before such restaurants come into operation. I consider that the restaurant industry in South Australia is over-capitalised. There are too many restaurants, and they are struggling to survive. Some restaurants may just convert from one licence to the other, but if we allow other restaurants to start and if the Licensing Court is not cautious about how many licences it grants, the burden on an industry that is already suffering will be more severe.

I have reservations about implementing the measure so quickly and not allowing a phase-in period. I know that people will have to apply for a licence and I know that the court will have to hear the applications. I also know that a period will be allowed for appeals and that evidence will be given against granting some applications. Those matters will slow down the process, but I should have hoped we could have a period of, say, one year before we allowed the licences to operate. I do not think that would have affected society seriously and it would have given those operators in the industry time to solve their problems and consolidate their interests so that they will not be in jeopardy. I support the Bill with reservations, because I do not believe that, when the industry is suffering, it is wise to make the obtaining of a licence too easy. I hope that the Licensing Court will consider that aspect, and that the Government will consider the matter of the dual licence for those who wish to have it.

**Mr. BECKER (Hanson):** I thank members who have

spoken in the debate. It is clear from the remarks made by the member for Stuart that he and I are concerned to ensure that consumers receive the best possible deal. I wish to clarify a statement made by the member for Fisher. Under present licensing laws, a restaurant with a full licence can accept customers who bring their own liquor.

**Mr. Evans:** But they are taxed.

**Mr. BECKER:** Yes, they may be charged corkage or they may have to pay a fee, but the provision is there now to bring your own to restaurants that have a full licence.

**Mr. Whitten:** That would be like taking bottled beer to a hotel.

**Mr. BECKER:** I agree. It would not be a sound tactic. The Bill creates a different level of licence and will give those who wish to visit a restaurant that has good cuisine or other facilities the opportunity to bring their own. For that reason, I am sure that all members will support the Bill wholeheartedly.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Nature of licences."

**Mr. EVANS:** A restaurant owner who has a full restaurant licence now and who allows people to bring their own liquor must pay the 8 per cent tax that he would pay wholesale on that wine. The position is not exactly as the member for Hanson has suggested. I believe that there should be a dual licence, but I will not try to have the Bill amended, because I believe that what I suggest will come about through pressure in the industry.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (3 to 8) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## LAND VALUATIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Dr. Eastick:

That this House is of the opinion that land valuation used for rating or taxing purposes should reflect a value which relates more directly to actual land usage.

(Continued from February 8. Page 1439.)

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I do not wish to debate this matter further. Much more could be said about the difficulties of valuing property on its potential use. The member for Light has clearly shown where he sees the problems in this area. I support the motion.

**Dr. EASTICK (Light):** I regret that the programming of this session of Parliament, with the impending closure of private members' time, has not allowed and will not allow a greater measure of consideration of this urgent and important matter. Regrettably, we have had the opportunity of hearing only one contribution from a member opposite. I thank the member for Mawson for inserting into the record the history of the art of valuation. I say not uncharitably, that what he said really did nothing to resolve the problem that exists for people in the community. His speech indicated that the valuer must make a valuation of the property on the basis of its highest and best permitted use. That is stipulated by case law, and there is no argument about that. In fact, I made that point when I moved the motion.

I also indicated then that notwithstanding that, in other States, Governments had seen fit to insert into legislation an alternative arrangement that gave due consideration to the land use of the property concerned. The Government or the instrumentality involved was able in the long term to benefit as soon as the land use factor ceased to be static.

As soon as a person changed the land use to benefit from its greater value that situation arose, whether the change was caused by urbanisation or production with a higher return than simple grazing, such as intensive industries involving pigs and poultry. One could also think of the situation in the South-East where, in the Coonawarra district, every parcel of land within cooee of Coonawarra that contains red-brown earth now attracts, by the measure to which the Government subscribes, a value for red grape growing. Land is still being used for grazing in that area. There is no demand at this juncture for an increase in red grape growing.

*Mr. Allison interjecting:*

**Dr. EASTICK:** True, as the honourable member says, by its contribution on another matter this afternoon, the Government has discouraged the further growing of grapes. This is where buying is involved. It is a real problem and relates not only to rural areas but also to city areas. One has the situation whereby a person who is saddled with high-value land can not produce from that land anything that will in any way service the cost that the Government and instrumentalities extract from him. I have reported that fact previously; it is constantly before us.

The members for Napier and Elizabeth would know about that. In fact, every member who has land in the hills face zone in his district would know of the situation where land is being valued and all the service charges are being rated on the basis of subdivision, yet that land cannot be subdivided and the person involved is required to graze the land. That person cannot obtain from grazing a return that would amount to the value of the rates and taxes for that area in the hills face zone.

It is possible to subdivide land in areas adjacent to the hills face zone and in the past people have sought, on that land, to incorporate large areas of natural vegetation for its aesthetic value and for shelter for stock. However, because of the valuation scheme they have been forced into denuding the country of that vegetation to bring the land into production in order to come somewhere near meeting the costs of servicing the rate debt on the property.

To some degree I am heartened by the attitude that was expressed by the member for Mawson in addressing himself to this problem. He conceded that he could, as a valuer, see the difficulties to which I have referred. When a measure of this nature was before the last session of Parliament, the Minister for Planning also conceded that he could see the problem to which I was drawing attention. I would not be too far wrong in suggesting that Mr. Hart is undertaking his major survey of planning difficulties because of this type of problem that the Government is constantly facing. Certainly, the creation of high costs and high valuation in the Hahndorf area is close to causing the elimination of the features of that area which give it its character.

That was basic in the move taken by the member for Murray in moving the motion that historical buildings should be afforded some State protection. Later this evening the Premier will introduce a Bill relating to a constitutional museum in South Australia. The Premier has stated publicly that before long there will be historic buildings legislation to assist in solving problems such as those encountered in Hahndorf and similar areas, problems which have resulted from the lack of a valuation that truly reflects the actual land use.

The member for Mawson was required by the Government to speak in opposition to the motion; he did not offer an amendment, but merely denied, on behalf of the Government, the passage of my motion. The

Government will have to consider this matter seriously in the life of this Parliament and, if it fails to accept the opportunity offered to it in this motion, I can say, categorically, that it will have to face up to this real problem soon, and the sooner the better for the benefit of the people of this State. I seek the support of every honourable member for my motion, which benefits people throughout South Australia.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (16)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury (teller), Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Nankivell and Rodda. Noes—Messrs. Hopgood and McRae.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

### CADET CORPS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Mathwin:

That this House congratulates the Federal Fraser Government for re-establishing the Army Cadet Corps and in particular for the formation of the first open unit in Australia, viz., the Warradale 27th Cadet Unit, giving great benefits to those young people who feel inclined to take this advantage.

(Continued from December 7. Page 1278.)

**Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla):** For each of the past eight years the member for Glenelg has moved this motion, and I wonder whether or not we will be dealing with it again in 1979, when we can compare it with radio serials such as *When a Girl Marries* or *Blue Hills*, because this matter goes on and on. Each year the member for Glenelg has the uncanny knack of playing boy scouts with this matter. I have much to say on this matter. I know that members opposite, as well as my colleagues, are waiting with baited breath to hear what I have to say. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

### CONSTITUTIONAL MUSEUM OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish a Constitutional Museum of South Australia; to constitute a trust for the administration thereof and for matters incidental thereto. Read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

The purpose of the Bill is to establish a museum of South

Australian constitutional history in the old Legislative Council building, and to set up a trust for its management. The Constitutional Museum has been designed to provide the best possible presentation of the story outlining the development of democracy and the Parliamentary system in South Australia, from before settlement to the present time. Under the plan, the old Legislative Council building will be transformed into one of the world's most exciting and revolutionary display complexes. The State's constitutional history will be told by words, pictures, illustrations and exhibits and will culminate in an extensive and dynamic *son et lumiere* and audio-visual presentation in the restored Legislative Council chamber. In general, the displays will be bold and striking, featuring large reproductions of documents, photographs and the written word.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Are you going to have our photographs there?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I imagine the honourable member will feature. I have suggested to some honourable members opposite how they might feature; I do not know whether the honourable member wants to feature in that way. Subjects to be covered include the turmoil of the years from the *Buffalo's* arrival in 1836 to the first democratic election in 1857; the development of the party system in politics; major political figures; religious freedoms; women's rights; civil liberties; enfranchisement; electoral boundaries and federation. There will be specialised display areas featuring current legislation; a section called "Your Government Today", where electorates and the sitting members will be shown, together with an explanation of the operation of the two Houses, their traditions, offices and procedures, and the role of Government and Opposition.

The museum will be unique in Australia as it will be totally automated. Visitors will be conducted through the building by an "invisible guide" system, which together with lighting and special effects, fire evacuation and security by television monitors, will be controlled by a computer. The museum will be a distinctive tourist and educational attraction. It will enhance the whole North Terrace precinct and will be an ideal way to teach school groups. Most of the existing building will be restored to a baseline of 1875 and will be used for display purposes. However, provision has been made for office accommodation for the controlling authority. The original Parliamentary refreshment room will be converted into a coffee-shop/sales area, for booklets, pamphlets, posters and Parliamentary publications.

Restoration work will start as soon as possible and it is hoped the museum will open in 1979. Furnishings of the period will be included in selected areas. The Public will have a chance to become directly involved with the museum and Parliament, by "local member question forms", available on entry to the museum. At the end of the display area these forms can be deposited for later delivery to members in Parliament House. In this way, members will become closer to their electors. The museum's primary objective is the efficient communication of information and the function of the visual material will be to support the narrative. Because of the extensive use of special effects, the museum cannot be perceived as a museum in the traditional sense. It will be an "experience"—to entertain, to stimulate and, most importantly, to inform. The remainder of the second reading explanation deals with the clauses of the Bill in detail and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

### Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal, and clause 4 sets out definitions of terms used in the Bill. Clause 5 establishes the Constitutional Museum. Clause 6 provides for the establishment and basic powers of the trust as a body corporate, and clause 7 sets out the terms and conditions upon which members of the trust hold office. Clause 8 is concerned with the validity of acts of the trust and the liability of trust members. Clause 9 sets out the trust's powers of delegation to its members and officers, while clause 10 deals with the remuneration of members.

Clause 11 provides for the appointment of a Chairman of the trust and clause 12 sets out various procedural measures relating to the conduct of trust business. Clause 13 requires members of the trust to have any interest in a contract contemplated by the trust to disclose such interest and thereafter refrain from any deliberation on the contract. Subsection (3) provides that trust members who are also trust employees are deemed not to have any interest in a matter relating to employment by reason of their being a trust employee. Clause 14 sets out the functions and powers of the trust and clause 15 provides that the trust shall be subject to the general control and direction of the Minister in the exercise of such functions and powers.

Clause 16 and 17 are concerned with employees of the trust, including the trust Secretary. Clauses 18 and 19 set out the trust's borrowing and investment powers, and in addition, provide for banking procedures. Clause 20 requires the trust to present to the Minister for approval an annual budget of estimated receipts and payments for the financial year immediately following. Clause 21 provides that proper accounts of its financial dealings shall be kept by the trust, that these shall be audited at least once a year by the Auditor-General, and submitted to both Houses of Parliament.

Clause 22 authorises the trust to accept gifts of real and personal property on behalf of the Constitutional Museum, and provides that such gifts shall not be subject to stamp, succession or gift duty. Clause 23 imposes criminal liability on any person who unlawfully damages property of the trust or the Constitutional Museum, and in addition, provides for the payment of compensation in consequence of such damage. Clause 24 requires the trust to deliver an annual report of its operations to the Minister, who is in turn required to place that report before each House of Parliament. Clause 25 provides that proceedings for offences against the proposed Act may be disposed of summarily and clause 25 empowers the Governor to make appropriate regulations.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

### PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Service Act, 1967-1977. Read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

This short Bill makes two amendments to the Public Service Act. The first corrects an inconsistency which has occurred between the principal Act and the Racial Discrimination Act, 1976. Briefly, the Racial Discrimination Act provides that a person shall not be discriminated against on the ground of his race in the field of employment. The Public Service Act, which forbids the employment of persons as officers unless they are British subjects, is clearly inconsistent and this Bill will resolve the inconsistency by removing that condition from the Public

Service Act. In fact, the Government's legal advisers are of the opinion that as a matter of law the "discrimination" provision of the Public Service Act has been ineffective since the commencement of the Racial Discrimination Act.

The second amendment is the correction of an error in the Public Service Act Amendment Act, 1977. In amending section 91 of the principal Act, a provision was inserted dealing with the long service leave payment, which was to apply where a person resigned after five years service for the purpose of caring for an adopted child. The amendment incorrectly referred to a child of or over the age of two years whereas it was intended that that section should apply to a child of or under the age of two years. This Bill has been expressed to come into operation on January 1, 1978, to be in line with the "long service leave" amendment to the principal Act which commenced on that date. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

### Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on the first day of January, 1978. Clause 3 amends section 39 of the principal Act to remove the requirement that a person must be a British subject to be appointed to the Public Service. Clause 4 amends section 91 of the principal Act to refer to a child of or under the age of two years.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

### CLASSIFICATION OF THEATRICAL PERFORMANCES BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the classification of theatrical performances; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

This Bill is designed to deal with the classification of theatrical performances on the basis of principles that have been applied to the classification of films and publications. Issues of censorship create a great amount of contention within the community. However, the Government believes that much of the heat has been taken out of the controversy by the Film Classification Act and the Classification of Publications Act. These Acts do not, of course, satisfy everybody. There are influential groups within the community that would argue for a return of strict censorship; on the other hand, there are many who would argue that there should be no restriction at all on the dissemination of any form of material throughout the community. But, generally, the system of classification does seem to strike a reasonable balance which seems to have been generally accepted by the community.

The present Bill extends this system of classification to "live" theatrical performances. The task of assigning classifications to "live" performances will be carried out by a board consisting of the same members as the Classification of Publications Board. The board will be able to classify performances as "restricted" or "unrestricted" theatrical performances. In the case of a "restricted" theatrical performance the same conditions prohibiting attendance by children between the ages of two years and 18 years as are presently applicable to "R-



classification" films will operate. Where the performance is so offensive that it ought to be the subject of proceedings under the criminal law, then the board will, of course, refrain from assigning any classification to the performance. In that case the promoters have their opportunity to put it on and take their chance at law, if they choose to do so.

**Mr. Millhouse:** That seems a bit of a paradox, doesn't it? If it is so bad it won't be touched by this legislation.

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

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Then it will be touched by criminal legislation.

**Mr. Millhouse:** As long as we don't fall—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham will have a chance to speak to the Bill.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I am quite sure that we do not. I point out that that is exactly the system that occurs in the Classification of Publications Act; that is, people may choose not to submit publications for classification and to take their chance, publish, and if necessary be damned. The remainder of the second reading explanation refers to the formal clauses of the Bill and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of the new Act. Clause 5 establishes the board and provides that it is to be constituted of the members for the time being of the Classification of Publications Board. Clause 6 deals with the procedure of the board. Clause 7 grants the members of the board immunity for anything done in their official capacity. Clause 8 provides for the payment of allowances and expenses to members of the board.

Clause 9 provides for the appointment of a Registrar of the board. Clause 10 provides for an application for classification of a theatrical production. The board is required to consider a theatrical performance if the Minister requests it to do so. Clause 11 sets out the criteria to be applied by the board in assigning classifications. These criteria are similar to those applicable to the Classification of Publications Board. Clause 12 deals with the classifications that may actually be assigned by the board.

Clause 13 enables the board to impose conditions in respect of a classified performance. Where a theatrical performance receives a "restricted" classification conditions restricting advertisement may be imposed. Clause 14 sets out a number of necessary powers of a procedural nature. Clause 15 provides for publication of a notice of classification in the *Gazette* and provides for service of the notice on the promoter of the performance. Clause 16 makes it an offence to fail to observe a condition imposed in respect of a classified performance. Clause 17 restricts the theatres in which restricted theatrical performances may take place.

Clause 18 restricts the admission of children between the ages of two years and eighteen years to "restricted" theatrical performances. Clause 19 protects those persons who take part in classified theatrical performances from prosecution for offences relating to blasphemy, obscenity or indecency. Of course, the conditions stipulated by the board must be observed if this protection is to operate. Clause 20 is an evidentiary provision. Clause 21 enables members of the board, the Registrar and other authorised persons to enter theatres for the purpose of viewing

performances. Clause 22 provides for the summary disposal of offences. Clause 23 is a regulation-making power.

**Mr. ALLISON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### WATERWORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Waterworks Act, 1932-1975. Read a first time.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

The sole purpose of this Bill is to amend those sections of the Waterworks Act, 1932-1975, which contain monetary penalties. In most cases, these penalties are absurdly low, not having been amended since the 1932 consolidation of the principal Act, and it is appropriate to increase the amounts to reflect more accurately current money values. The increases, with some exceptions, are about 500 per cent.

To consider the Bill in detail, clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 18 of the principal Act, which provides for compensation in the nature of a penalty to be paid by the Minister for delay in reinstating roads and streets. The amount is increased from \$10 to \$50 a day.

Clause 3 amends section 38 of the principal Act which prohibits the laying of gas pipes and tramlines that interfere with water mains. The penalty is increased to \$50. Clause 4 increases the penalty in section 43 of the principal Act which deals with interfering with a water meter. The penalty is increased from £20 to \$200. Clause 5 amends section 45 of the principal Act which prohibits the unauthorised alteration of pipes or fittings. The penalty is increased from £5 to \$50.

Clause 6 amends section 46 of the principal Act, dealing with the improper use of fittings. The penalty is raised from £5 to \$50. Clause 7 increases the penalty in section 49 of the principal Act which deals with the connection and use of unauthorised fittings. The new penalty will be \$100. Clause 8 amends section 50 of the principal Act which provides a penalty for breaking valves etc. by increasing the penalty from £10 to \$100.

Clause 9 amends section 52 of the principal Act by increasing the maximum penalty for a contravention of the Act from £5 to \$200. This increase, of more than 500 per cent, is necessary as this section provides the maximum penalty available under the Act for a contravention of the provisions of the Act which may lead to the waste, misuse or contamination of water. Clause 10 increases the penalty provided in section 53 of the principal Act for wasting water or not repairing fittings etc. from £5 to \$50. Clause 11 increases the penalty for unlawfully taking water in section 55 of the principal Act from £5 to \$50.

Clause 12 amends section 59 of the principal Act, which provides a penalty for permitting substances produced in gasmaking to flow into any water works, by increasing the penalty from £20 a day to \$100 a day. Clause 13 amends section 60 of the principal Act by increasing the penalties provided for the fouling of water in certain circumstances from £20 to \$100 and with an additional daily penalty of \$50. Clause 14 increases the penalty provided in section 62 of the principal Act for obstructing the construction of

works from £5 to \$100.

Clause 15 increases the penalty for illegally diverting water provided in section 63 of the principal act from £20 to \$200. Clause 16 amends section 65 of the principal Act which deals with trespassing by increasing the penalty from £5 to \$50.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### INDUSTRIAL SAFETY, HEALTH AND WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972-1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

This Bill amends the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act in two areas. First, it includes in this Act provisions normally contained in other Acts to enable the permanent head to delegate authority for dealing with matters associated with notifications and registrations and by removing specific references to the permanent head in connection with the receipt and recovery of fees. The main problem for the permanent head at present lies in section 26, which provides that fees are to be paid to him and that he must take action to recover unpaid fees. By removing the specific references to the permanent head, the section is brought into line with current practice and, although the effect of the section is not changed, it will be, in practice, easier to administer.

Section 37 of the principal Act is also amended to provide that an allegation in a complaint that a notice has not been given or the prescribed fee has not been paid shall, unless evidence to the contrary is given, be deemed to have been proved. This again will improve the administration of the Act.

Secondly, the penalty for breaches of the regulations is increased from a maximum of \$200 to a maximum of \$500. This is to correct an oversight in 1976, when all other penalties of \$200 contained in this Act were increased to \$500. The provisions of the Bill are as follows: clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 provides a power of delegation for the permanent head by enacting section 7a of the principal Act.

Clause 4 amends section 24 of the principal Act by removing most of the references to the permanent head in that section. It is not necessary to specify that fees be paid to the permanent head nor that they be recovered by the permanent head in a court of competent jurisdiction. The removal of the references to the permanent head does not change the effect of the section.

Clause 5 amends section 37 of the principal Act to include in the list of allegations of which proof need not be given those that a notice has not been given or that the prescribed fee under section 26 has not been paid. It is suggested that these amendments are reasonable since it is within the knowledge and capacity of the defendant that he gave the notice or paid the fee, but it is a matter of some complexity to prove that the defendant did not

perform these acts. Clause 6 increases the penalty provided for breach of regulations from \$200 to \$500.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SHOP TRADING HOURS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Shop Trading Hours Act, 1977. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Members will recall that when Commissioner W. C. Lean presented his first report into Shop Trading Hours in August, 1977, he indicated that the issue of extended trading hours for service stations had proved to be a special and complex matter. He indicated that he could not report on that aspect in the time then at his disposal to report on the trading hours for shops generally. Accordingly, as an interim measure, in the Shop Trading Hours Act passed by Parliament last November, the provisions contained in the Industrial Code with respect to trading hours for service stations were simply repeated.

Pursuant to his extended terms of reference, the Commissioner invited evidence from interested parties as to whether the needs of the public were being fully met by the existing trading hours arrangements. This inquiry included a detailed examination of the situation existing in other States and, in particular, was directed towards a consideration of whether service stations should be permitted to trade on Sundays, and whether the types of goods which can be sold from service stations should be restricted after the normal closing times specified in the Act for shops in general.

On February 1, 1978, the Commissioner presented his second report in respect of the law relating to the sale by retail of petroleum products in the metropolitan area. The Government had previously committed itself to legislate to give effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission, and this Bill gives effect to that promise.

The significant effect of the Bill is to introduce an element of uniformity into trading hours for service stations throughout the metropolitan area. It specifies that service stations will be permitted, but not required, to open until 9.30 p.m. on Mondays to Saturdays, between 7 a.m. and 9.30 p.m. on Sundays and until 1 p.m. on all public holidays, except Christmas Day and Good Friday, on which days trading will be prohibited.

Until now it has been the practice for the Minister to issue, pursuant to section 17 of the Act (and previously under the equivalent section of the Industrial Code), a licence to all service station proprietors in the outer metropolitan area for unrestricted trading hours. The current licences will not expire until December 31, 1978, and, in order to give the owners and lessees of the service stations concerned a reasonable notice of the change to the new hours, those licences will continue to operate until the end of the year. This does not involve any legislative amendment.

The Commissioner concluded in his report that it would be desirable and appropriate for a limited number of 24-hour sites to be located throughout the whole of the metropolitan area rather than being mainly concentrated on certain arterial roads in the outer metropolitan area as at present. The selection of strategically placed 24-hour sites will be undertaken as soon as possible so that the new arrangements can be fully operational from January 1, 1979.

In his report the Commissioner recommended that service stations be permitted to sell, after normal closing

times, motor fuel, oil and spare parts, and such goods related to a motor vehicle or necessary to effect the repair of a motor vehicle or which are required by a traveller for the purposes of a journey in a motor vehicle, as may be prescribed.

The effect would be that service station proprietors would not be able to sell other than prescribed goods after 6 p.m. on weekdays, other than the late trading night, for half an hour after 9 p.m. on that late night, and between 12.30 p.m. and 9.30 p.m. on Saturdays, with no trading in non-prescribed goods on a Sunday or public holiday. This would re-introduce the requirement that was abolished by the Shop Trading Hours Act, of requiring certain goods to be locked away after normal trading hours. The Government is not prepared to re-introduce such a provision.

Accordingly, in line with the approach taken with respect to other shops, the trading hours provisions will apply to service stations while they mainly sell motor spirit. If a service station sells a preponderance of goods other than motor spirit, then it will be required to observe trading hours of normal shops, that is, close at 6 p.m. on weekdays, 9 p.m. on the late shopping night, and 12.30 p.m. on Saturdays, and remain closed on Sundays and public holidays.

In order to protect petrol resellers from the external pressures which might be associated with extended hours of operation, the Commissioner proposed in his report that no oil company should be permitted to force a service station lessee to trade for more than 65 hours a week. A provision along those lines is contained within clause 13a.

The Commissioner's terms of reference, and therefore his recommendations, applied only to the metropolitan area. At present, service stations in country areas have unrestricted trading hours. Those within proclaimed shopping districts are granted a licence to trade at any time, pursuant to section 17 of the Act. To obviate the need to issue such licences to service stations in country areas in future, the Bill exempts from the closing hours provisions all service stations situated outside the metropolitan area.

The opportunity is being taken to also make a minor amendment to section 13 (5) of the Act, which provides that the Governor may, by proclamation, alter or suspend the closing times prescribed in the Act in respect of shopping districts and in respect of such shops or class or kind of shops as may be specified. All butcher shops throughout the State are covered by the Act. In the past, through a temporary suspension of the Industrial Code, butcher shops in holiday resorts that are not in a shopping district have been permitted to open for a limited period during times of successive public holidays, for example, on Easter Saturday. The authority to permit such a practice was omitted from the Act, and the Bill includes an amendment to rectify the situation.

Members will be aware that since the Commissioner presented his report there has been some demonstrated opposition to the recommended revised trading hours. In fact, in the past few days some members have presented petitions from their constituents to this House. The suggestion has also been made from several quarters that some form of roster system for service stations in the metropolitan area could be appropriate.

Commissioner Lean, by personal visit, examined thoroughly roster systems in operation in Western Australia and Tasmania. However, at the Commission hearings only three oil companies and in a minor way the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce indicated support for such a system in the Adelaide metropolitan area. Taking this into account and in view of

the effect the introduction of rostering would have on the highly capitalised service stations licensed to trade 24 hours a day on the fringe of the metropolitan area, the Commissioner rejected a roster system in favour of the recommended uniform trading hours for service stations throughout the metropolitan area.

I point out that there is nothing in the Bill to prevent service station proprietors in the metropolitan area arranging between themselves (or in groups) or through the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce to have uniform hours that are more restricted than in the Bill, and to adopt a roster system at other times. However, being a consensus Government we have decided that interested parties should have further opportunity to put forward their views on the issue. Accordingly, I indicate to members that I will move at the appropriate time that this measure be referred to a Select Committee. I seek leave to include in *Hansard* the Parliamentary Counsel's report on the clauses of the Bill.

Leave granted.

### Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act by including in the definition of "exempt shop" service stations situated outside the metropolitan area. The effect of this amendment is to place no restriction at all on the trading hours of such establishments and also to make certain other consequential amendments. Clause 4 amends section 13 of the principal Act and is consequential on clause 5, the principal operative clause of the Bill.

Clause 5 inserts a new section 13a of the principal Act and is commended to members' particular attention. This new clause enacts into law the recommendations of the Royal Commission. It will be noted that the application of the section is limited to service stations situated in the metropolitan area. The closing times for these service stations will be 9.30 p.m. on every day of the week and 1 p.m. on public holidays. In addition, such service stations will not be able to trade on Good Friday and Christmas Day and before 7 on Sunday mornings.

Finally, it gives effect to a recommendation of the Royal Commission that owners of service stations should not be compelled in the terms of any lease or agreement to keep open for business for more than 65 hours in any week. However, necessarily this last provision cannot apply to service stations which are the subject of a "24-hour licence" issued under section 17 of the principal Act, since such a limitation would defeat the purpose of a licence of that kind.

Clause 6 amends section 14 of the principal Act to make it clear that that section does not apply to shops within the meaning of section 13a, since the relevant material contained in section 14 has been re-enacted in section 13a. Clause 7 inserts a new clause 14a in the principal Act and is intended to make clear that temporary variations of times at which shops can be open can be made in respect of days on which shops would otherwise be required to be closed, for example, Sundays and public holidays. This power was contained in the Industrial Code to allow trading in areas frequented by holiday-makers over the Christmas and Easter periods where a succession of public holidays occurs. Clause 8, which amends section 16 of the principal Act, is consequential on clause 5 and also makes a drafting amendment. Clause 9 repeals subsection (6) of section 17 of the principal Act which is now no longer needed.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and**

**Industry**) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the second reading debate to be continued forthwith and the Bill to be referred to a Select Committee.

**Mr. BECKER (Hanson):** As there is wide public disquiet over this matter, I support the Bill at this stage for the purpose of its being referred to a Select Committee.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport):** I thank the Government for the opportunity of ensuring that the Bill will be referred to a Select Committee, because that is extremely important. Since the report of the Royal Commissioner was introduced, several service station proprietors have contacted me and have expressed grave concern at the final recommendations of the Royal Commissioner. I believe that there is a great deal of merit in a roster system, and I therefore urge the Select Committee to look at three particular aspects. I hope that its members will look at these three aspects in depth. The first is the possibility of establishing a roster system, which would be controlled by the industry. Secondly, the committee should examine the list of goods, perhaps goods outside normal market accessories, that can be sold by service stations outside normal trading hours. The Bill places severe restrictions on the sale of items such as fishing and camping gear, etc., which may be purchased, say, on a Sunday morning as people leave the outer metropolitan area. The third aspect is the effect of any such legislation on existing coin-operated self-service petrol pumps, and whether some consideration should be given to fitting a roster system in with the use of such pumps. I certainly support the legislation through the second reading stage so that it may be referred to a Select Committee.

**Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg):** Mr. Speaker, where is the Bill and where is a copy of it, if we are to debate it? The Bill has been introduced only within the past few minutes and it appears that we have to debate it now, or we will not have an opportunity to debate it at all. This occurred last evening—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will get a chance to debate the Bill when the report is noted.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** On a point of order, last evening when we were debating the report of the Select Committee on the Residential Tenancies Bill, I began by referring to the Bill, and was taken to a point of order by the Attorney-General, who was unheld by the Chair. I was not allowed to debate the Bill, but had to confine my remarks to the report as it came from the Select Committee. What is the position of members if they wish to debate the Bill?

**The SPEAKER:** If the honourable member wishes to debate it now, he is entitled to do so.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Do I take it that we are not allowed to debate the Bill when the Select Committee's report is brought down? Will we be allowed to debate any part of the Bill at that time?

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member may debate the Bill as it comes out of the Select Committee. The committee's report will cover the whole of the Bill, and he will have an opportunity to debate it.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Do I take it that, if the Select Committee's report does not cover the whole of the Bill, we cannot debate the Bill?

**The SPEAKER:** I have just answered the honourable member.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I am afraid that I did not hear your explanation, Mr. Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** When the report is brought down, the honourable member will be able to debate the whole of

the Bill. Does he wish to continue?

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Apparently, we must debate the Bill now. Last evening, when I tried to debate a Bill reported on by a Select Committee, I was called to order by the Attorney-General and was ruled out of order by the Chair. The position has now been clarified to me by the Whip.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have clarified it for the honourable member. Does he wish to continue?

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I will not continue. The Whip has given me your message, which I did not hear. I understood you to say that we could debate the Bill when—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member asked me to repeat it, I repeated it, and he had no complaint. Does he wish to continue? He must not continue in that vein.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** I think I owe the member for Glenelg a slight apology.

**Mr. Mathwin:** A big one.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I had not misled him. I do not blame him, frankly, after what happened yesterday, and I think there would be other Liberal Party members who would complain about what happened yesterday.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member must get on with what is before the Chair.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Before he rose to speak, he asked me whether the Bill was in our places. I am afraid that I had not seen it. I said that it was not, whereas it was in our places. It had been put on a glider clip with all the other Bills that had been introduced, and perhaps they are in order. To that extent, I misled him. I sympathise with him, after the experience we had yesterday. However, I do not want to debate the Bill because I have just seen it, although I will make two points. I am pleased that the Bill is to be referred to a Select Committee; that is sensible and the Minister was kind enough earlier in the day to tell me that that was likely to happen.

I hope that it will not be necessary for members of the Select Committee, whoever they may be (and I suppose that they have been teed up between the major Parties already), to traipse off interstate. As the Minister said, Commissioner Lean, the Royal Commissioner into this matter, made close inquiry into this matter and went interstate to study the roster system. There has been a vague suggestion to me that it may be necessary for members of the Select Committee to do that; personally, I think that that would be a sheer and utter waste of money, and I hope that it will not happen. Secondly (and this is addressed to members of the Liberal Party), I hope that they will not be taken in by the Government, by the device of a Select Committee, as they were taken in on the two Bills we had before us yesterday. I have always been enthusiastic about Select Committees, because I have always believed that it was a good way with a complex Bill to get to the truth, and perhaps improve the measure. However, it was perfectly obvious yesterday (and I hope that it does not happen again on this Bill) that the Select Committees were simply used by the Government as a device to lead the Liberal Party by the nose.

It was done because the members of the Select Committee in that case from this side of the House simply did not have the experience or the ability to stand up to the Government members, particularly the Minister who—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will have an opportunity at the right time to refer to that matter. The Government makes the decision.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Well, with the utmost deference to you, Mr. Speaker, the Government does not make the decision; this House makes the decision. The Government may have the numbers but I suggest you are the Presiding

Officer in this House and not merely an instrument of the Government.

**The SPEAKER:** I want the honourable member to come back to the motion before the Chair.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** The matter before the Chair that I was canvassing when I was interrupted is this: I hope that those members of the Liberal Party who go on the Select Committee will be strong and independent enough to make their own decisions and not simply be overridden by the Government members on the committee. I know the Minister of Labour and Industry; he is a pretty strong personality, and I have no doubt that he will be doing his best—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is digressing again. He should be debating the second reading. He will have an opportunity, as he has at all times, to voice his opinion; the Chair will not stop him doing that, but I want him to get back to the clauses of the Bill.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I was saying that I know the Minister of Labour and Industry pretty well. He is a powerful personality; he knows his subject, he knows what he wants, and there is every chance of the same thing happening on this Bill as happened on the Contracts Review Bill.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is getting back to the same argument, and I will not allow it any longer. The member for Mitcham.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I am giving a friendly warning after what happened yesterday; that is all I am doing. You, Mr. Speaker, have asked me several times to get back to the Bill. Of course, it is entirely impossible for me to debate it because I have had it in my hands for only five minutes, and for three of them I did not know it was there. I support the Bill at this stage. I hope the Select Committee will get on with the job. I do not know whether the Minister said that it should report before the House rises in four weeks time or not. I hope the Bill will be through this House by then and through another place because, the sooner we can get this jolly question fixed up, the better. If the Select Committee went to other States it would be a waste of time and money.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! As the honourable member knows, a motion on that matter will be moved, but it has not been moved yet and it is not before the House.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Yes; I just made a few remarks to make my own position clear on the matter. I support the second reading.

Motion carried.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Mr. Abbott, Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Becker, Groth, and Wright; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to sit during the recess and to report on the first day of the next session.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** You promised me, Mr. Speaker, I would have a chance to speak at this stage, and I take you up on it. I am disappointed that the Select Committee is not going to report in this session. I think the Minister said a moment ago "the first day of the next session". We do not even know when that will be. Perhaps he will be kind enough, when he replies to me, to indicate when it is likely that the next session of Parliament will begin and when this Select Committee's report will be known. That is at least something that is owed to the House before we vote on this matter. It strengthens my fears, though, not only that there will be a delay in fixing this up but this Select Committee will be on a bit of junket around Australia.

**Mr. Becker:** Not while I am on it—no way.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I have known some words to come

from the member for Hanson before and not really ever to be carried out; I am not sure that I can accept what he says, but I should like from the Minister (a) an indication as to when we are likely to get the report—that is, when Parliament will meet again; and (b) an assurance (and, of course, the Minister is only one member but he is the dominating member of the Select Committee, naturally, now we know who the others members are) that it is not proposed that the committee leave the State.

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** The member for Mitcham has been in this Chamber a long time—many people would say far too long—to engage in the sort of exercise he is engaging in now. I support the motion. What I cannot understand is why the impression is being given by the member for Mitcham (and quite nakedly, although he protests otherwise) that, if anyone was to make this Select Committee come up with some other finding, he would. I believe that rather suggests that he is able to prejudge the issue and he has no confidence in members of the Liberal Party or Labor Party as members of this Chamber, because they will be meeting as members of this Chamber. I think he is carping and making pettifogging objections. It does him no credit at all. I support the motion.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry):** I was disappointed with the comments made by the member for Mitcham in his condemnation of those people on the committee. The Liberal Party has chosen two of the people who really led the debate on shopping hours. Certainly, the member for Hanson played a major part in that debate, and there is no doubt why his Party has chosen him. I have been associated with the member for Coles in conferences between the two Houses; she has performed very well on those occasions, so there was little room to start condemning those members on the committee. Any committee that serves or has served under me always gets a fair go and always has its point of view listened to. I do not think it can be said that I have led a junket, which is the accusation by the member for Mitcham—that I would lead a junket from State to State.

This committee will find out the facts and do whatever is necessary to find them. If the committee decides to go to another State, we shall be going to another State; if the committee decides the reverse, we shall not be going to another State. I remind the member for Mitcham that he served once, through my actions, on a Select Committee where it was absolutely necessary to inquire into the situations in Tasmania. I refer to the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Bill. On that occasion, it was the decision of the committee, on my recommendation, to bring people to South Australia rather than go to Tasmania.

One never gets credit for the good things one does. The member for Mitcham always has a subjective attitude about what we might or might not do. The committee will function in its own right, honestly and sincerely, and will report some time in July.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Aren't we sitting until then?

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Unless there is an extraordinary sitting, as there was last year or the year before, in June, we probably will not sit much before July. The committee wants to do its job properly and effectively, and I do not think it would be possible to bring down such a report before the end of the present session. I will not hurry this matter. I do not think people in the community want it hurried. They want to see that everyone is given the best possible opportunity to make representations, and the committee will do that. I am

pleased with the committee members on both sides of the House, and I am sure we will be able to function properly together for the benefit of South Australia.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the further appropriation of the revenue of the State for the financial year ending June 30, 1978, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

I propose to make a few comments about the State's general financial situation and about some of the uncertainties facing us before I explain the items in the Supplementary Estimates.

In presenting the Revenue and Loan Budgets to the House in October last, I said that the forecast for the year's operations on the combined accounts was for a deficit of about \$18 400 000 and that this deficit would be met by using all of the Government's available reserves held on those combined accounts at June 30, 1977.

Recent reviews indicate that it will not be possible now to contain the final deficit on the combined operations for 1977-78 within the planned level. The present estimate of the position on the two accounts combined is for an overall deficit of some \$26 000 000. This represents an increase of some \$8 000 000 over that expected at the time the Budgets were brought down in October last. The increased deficit is accounted for by a \$6 000 000 shortfall in receipts and a \$5 000 000 increase in expenditures, partly offset by an increased rate of loan repayments and recoveries to the extent of \$3 000 000.

Like the private sector and the community generally, the Government is feeling the adverse effects of a depressed economy in which business activity is reduced and unemployment is at a record level. The fall in business activity is being felt everywhere, but particularly in regard to employment, real estate, and motor vehicles. Members would no doubt have seen the most recent grave national unemployment figures which indicate that the depression is by no means confined to South Australia. Indeed, South Australia has retained its rather unusual position in these difficult times of having slightly less unemployment than the national average.

The continued slump in activity has had an effect on this State's Budget position in a manner broadly similar to that which is now occurring in the Commonwealth Budget. Revenues are down because employment-based taxes, like pay-roll tax in this State's case and income tax in the Commonwealth's case, obviously yield less with higher unemployment. Moreover, expenditure-based taxes like stamp duties are also affected by the adverse conditions. On the other side of the coin, expenditures have had to be boosted in order to try to contain and to cope with the mounting unemployment. As I have said, that applies equally to the Commonwealth Budget position as to that of the State. Members opposite should bear in mind the Commonwealth's own Budget deficit for this year is now estimated to be many hundreds of millions of dollars higher than that originally projected. Indeed, I believe that Mr. William Wentworth is on record in the newspapers today as saying that that is about \$750 000 000 above what was originally projected.

With respect to Revenue Account for 1977-78, recent reviews indicate that stamp duties are now likely to be down on the original Budget forecast by about \$5 000 000, pay-roll tax by about \$5 000 000 and succession duties by

about \$2 000 000. For all other receipts there is likely to be a net increase of about \$6 000 000 made up of some movements above and below estimate. Thus, the shortfall in overall revenue receipts is likely to be about \$6 000 000.

Although the Government has kept a tight rein on all expenditures and, indeed, is seeking a virtual moratorium on all new expenditures in the health area, there will be a net over-expenditure as compared with the original Budget provisions of some \$5 000 000. Broadly, this is made up of a net over-expenditure of \$7 000 000 on Revenue Account, together with a saving of \$2 000 000 on Loan Account expenditures. The particular items which members should note include new additional requirements for health services (up \$5 000 000), further education (up \$1 200 000), water and sewerage services (up \$2 400 000), State Transport Authority (up \$1 200 000) and Special Acts in respect of debt services (up \$3 000 000). These increases have been offset somewhat by the recent moderation in the rate of salary and price increases, which give rise to an expected saving this year of about \$10 000 000 on the allowances estimated.

Before giving brief details in respect to the individual areas of the Supplementary Estimates, I would like to bring to the attention of members one matter which, if not resolved, would have a significant impact on this State's finances. Members may recall that, in 1975, the States and the Commonwealth Government entered into an agreement to share net hospital operating costs for certain approved hospitals. Members may recall also that, despite that specific and binding agreement, the Commonwealth Government provided in its 1977-78 Budget \$5 000 000 less than its obligatory half-share of the estimated minimum level of costs which was regarded by the South Australian hospital authorities as unavoidable to maintain effective hospital services in this State.

When presenting the Budget last October, I told the House that I had objected strongly to the Prime Minister at the arbitrary decision which his Government had taken in isolation and without reference to those qualified and responsible for the delivery of hospital services in this State. I asked the Prime Minister for his assurance that his Government was not contemplating any change in the agreed arrangements for cost sharing and that his Government would meet its half-share of net operating costs in 1977-78. Whilst his reply gave an assurance in respect to the first matter, it left me rather uneasy in respect to the second.

Recent events have done nothing to ease my concern. Whilst the Commonwealth seems prepared to agree to some small increase in its Budget allocation for net operating costs, it has so far failed to acknowledge that rising wages and prices have added greatly to hospital costs and that the Commonwealth level of support is well below that required to meet minimum standards of patient care and safety. There has been a reluctance even to accept a retrospective salary increase for medical officers which was quite outside the power of the Hospitals Department to control.

The Commonwealth seems to have the mistaken impression that it alone is interested in reducing hospital operating costs. The State has just as great a desire to do so and is making every reasonable effort to do so. This matter will be taken up at the next meeting of the Commonwealth-State Standing Committee in May, and I expect it to be resolved then. In the meantime, these Supplementary Estimates seek a sum of \$8 000 000 in order to provide appropriation for a temporary advance, late in the year, to cover any delay which might occur in the receipt of the full Commonwealth share.

I have circulated to the Opposition the detailed

explanations of the lines of the Supplementary Estimates, and I seek leave to have them inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

### Appropriation

Turning now to the question of appropriation members will be aware that early in each financial year Parliament grants the Government of the day appropriation by means of the principal Appropriation Act supported by the Estimates of Expenditure. If these allocations prove insufficient, there are three other sources of authority which provide for supplementary expenditure: namely, a special section of the same Appropriation Act, the Governor's Appropriation Fund, and a further Appropriation Bill supported by Supplementary Estimates.

Appropriation Act—Special Section 3 (2) and (3): The main Appropriation Act contains a provision which gives additional authority to meet increased costs resulting from wage awards. This special authority is being called upon this year to cover most of the cost to the Revenue Budget of a number of salary and wage determinations with a small amount being met from within the original appropriations. However, it is available only to cover salaries and wages increases formally handed down by a recognised wage-fixing authority in the current financial year.

The main Appropriation Act also contains a provision which gives additional authority to meet increased electricity charges for pumping water. The consumption of water this financial year has exceeded the quantity collected naturally in catchment areas by a greater amount than is usual, and it has been necessary to supplement natural collections by increasing the quantity pumped from the Murray River. The Government has tried to reduce this imbalance by appealing to the people of South Australia to avoid wasting water but, nevertheless, there will be some call on the special appropriation.

Governor's Appropriation Fund: Another source of appropriation authority is the Governor's Appropriation Fund which, in terms of the Public Finance Act, may be used to cover additional expenditure. I have explained the operation of this fund to the House several times previously.

The appropriation available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund is being used this year to cover a number of individual excesses above departmental allocations, and this is the reason why some of the smaller departments do not appear on Supplementary Estimates, even though their expenditure levels may be affected by the same factors as those departments which do appear.

### Supplementary Estimates

Where payments additional to the Budget estimates cannot be met from the special section of the Appropriation Act or excesses are too large to be met from the Governor's Appropriation Fund, Supplementary Estimates must be presented. Further, although two block figures were included in the October Budget as general allowances for salary and wage rate and price increases, they were not included in the schedule to the main Appropriation Act. To cover the costs of higher prices or of wage increases not falling within the special section 3 (2) of the Appropriation Act, the House is being asked now to make specific appropriation for some part of these general allowances.

I point out to members that, whilst these sums represent the best estimates of needs presently available, neverthe-

less, in most instances they cannot be regarded as accurate to the last dollar. In authorising the funds which may be actually needed, I propose to treat departmental requests as if they were requests for excess warrants on the Governor's Appropriation Fund. Excesses from that fund are permitted only with my specific approval after examination by the Treasury, and I propose that, although the procedures will not be quite so formal, the additional appropriations now sought will not be released without continuing examination of changing departmental needs.

### Details of the Supplementary Estimates

The details of the Supplementary Estimates are as follows:

Services and Supply: An additional \$130 000 is sought to cover salary increases for this department. This amount is needed to provide for the transfer of the office of the Chief Secretary to this department, and for additional terminal leave and other salary payments in the Government Printing Division. Additional contingency costs in the Government Printing Division have resulted from increased production and higher Public Buildings charges. Further, the initial provisions for workmen's compensation insurance premiums, repairs and renewals of plant and machinery, and automatic data processing charges have proved to be insufficient. The amount required to cover the increased contingency charges is \$270 000 and this, together with the \$130 000 required for salaries, makes up the \$400 000 in total sought for Services and Supply.

Corporate Affairs: Following discussions between the States and the Commonwealth about uniform legislation on companies and securities and, in view of the administrative efficiencies to be gained, the Government decided to create the Department for Corporate Affairs. The department is charged with the administration of legislation relating to companies and securities and the conduct of special investigations. It is expected that the department will form the basis of the Corporate Affairs Commission which will assume these functions later.

Previously, these activities were performed by the Law Department and the Companies Branch of the Public and Consumer Affairs Department. Co-ordination, efficiency and effectiveness are expected to improve as a result of the revised organisation. Therefore, while funds are sought for this new department, savings will occur in these other departments. I have implemented procedures to ensure that these savings are not used for other purposes without my specific approval but, of course, where justifiable increases in expenditure occur which offset the savings those increases will be allowed. This is the case, in fact, in the Law Department.

The amounts sought provide for the operation of the department for the whole of this financial year. Identifiable costs incurred in discharging these functions before the new department was established will be transferred accordingly. Whilst this is not strictly necessary, I am conscious of the need to provide meaningful information in the published accounts at the end of the year. The procedure adopted here will facilitate this.

The total provision for the Department for Corporate Affairs in the Supplementary Estimates is \$533 000, of which \$413 000 is for salaries and payments of a like nature, and \$120 000 represents other costs of administering the department.

Law: The amount provided in the Estimates presented to the House last October has proved to be insufficient to cover the activities of this department. It was estimated

that staff vacancies, which normally occur when staff resign or are promoted, would reduce the department's costs but these have not occurred to the extent expected. Insufficient provision was made in October for trainee court and Parliamentary reporters who commenced courses this year. Since the costs of printing and publishing *Hansard* are above estimated costs, the provision for contingencies also needs to be increased.

After making allowances for savings resulting from activities transferred to the Department for Corporate Affairs, the further provision sought for this department is \$400 000. If it were not for those savings, it would have been necessary to seek an additional \$90 000 in the Supplementary Estimates to cover the remaining cost of these activities this year.

Treasury: Late last financial year, as part of a \$35 000 000 programme designed to assist the flagging building industry, the Government granted a remission of stamp duty on the purchase of new houses. This measure was scheduled to terminate on December 23, and it was difficult to estimate the amount needed. Further, many home purchasers found it difficult to complete settlement in this period and, therefore, the Government has decided that conveyances accepted before December 23, which are settled before March 31 this year, may qualify for the concession.

A further \$200 000 is estimated to be required for this programme and that amount is included in Supplementary Estimates.

Lands: Increased salary costs, expected to amount to \$150 000 by the end of the financial year, have resulted from additional terminal leave payments, a reduction in staff wastage, and a greater incidence of overtime than is usual. The additional overtime was needed to clear accumulated accounting work. Owing to the very dry conditions early this year, more water pumping than estimated has been undertaken and, as a result, power consumption and maintenance increased, causing an estimated over-expenditure of \$200 000 on irrigation area operating expenses. In total, an additional provision of \$350 000 is sought for the Lands Department.

Engineering and Water Supply: This department requires a further \$2 017 000 to provide for additional salary costs, additional costs resulting from the reallocation of staff from other activities, costs associated with the treatment of dirty water, and extraordinary maintenance. Of this amount, \$550 000 is needed to cover salaries and wages increases which do not qualify automatically for additional provisions under the special clause of the main Appropriation Act I mentioned earlier. A further amount of \$450 000 is needed to cover the cost of design staff now engaged on revenue programmes due to a reduction of activity on major design projects under the Loan works programme.

The decline in the amount of subdivisional activity has made it necessary to transfer staff usually engaged on reimbursement works to work involving dragging of sewers, maintenance of pumping stations, house connections, and clearing choked sewer connections. The additional cost to be met from Revenue Account is \$350 000. As a result of dirty water problems which became more severe in the metropolitan area earlier this financial year, it became necessary to alum dose the Millbrook and Mount Bold reservoirs. Provision was not made for this expenditure in the original Estimates and the cost is estimated at \$500 000. Dry weather conditions have led to additional pumping costs and extraordinary maintenance charges have been incurred to cart water to tanks in the Ceduna-Penong area, to maintain the water supply at Coober Pedy, to replace a burst gullet at Lock,

and in connection with the Gawler, Kapunda, and Murray Bridge water supply. An additional amount of \$167 000 is sought to provide for this work.

Public Buildings: During recent inflationary periods, it has been standard practice to use existing rates when calculating the amount to be included in the Budget for rents due under leases. If increases occur when expiring leases are renegotiated during the year and the department is unable to effect offsetting savings elsewhere in its budget, additional appropriation has been provided. This year an additional \$600 000 is needed to cover increased rental charges.

Education: The Supplementary Estimates provide for an additional sum of \$3 250 000 for salaries for the Education Department. An amount of \$1 350 000 of this is to cover salaries and wages increases which do not qualify for automatic increases to appropriation. The remaining \$1 900 000 is attributable to incremental steps in teachers' salaries.

Further Education: An additional provision of \$1 200 000 is sought for Further Education. Of this, \$470 000 is needed to cover salaries and wages increases which do not qualify for additional statutory appropriations. The remainder is to cover additional staff costs, and the costs of pre-apprenticeship training courses, migrant education, and enrichment courses. A large part of the increase will be offset by receipts associated with these costs. Expenditures incurred on the pre-apprenticeship training scheme and on migrant education will be reimbursed by the Commonwealth Government, and it is anticipated that most of the costs involved in conducting enrichment courses will be covered by increased course fees.

Agriculture and Fisheries: Spotted alfalfa aphid and blue alfalfa aphid have done severe damage to grazing legumes in the Eastern States, and some destruction has occurred already in South Australia. As soon as it was realised that spotted alfalfa aphid had entered South Australia and that our lucerne and medic pastures were threatened, an emergency programme was initiated to deal with this menace. A comprehensive three-year programme for integrated control of both aphids on a State-wide basis is under way, and financial resources have been applied from other areas of the department and from the State Unemployment Relief Scheme to support the control programme. The Commonwealth Government has been asked to contribute \$185 000, which was recommended by Agricultural Council as the Commonwealth contribution to the South Australian campaign.

In addition, the department has found it necessary to engage additional casual workers to combat the higher incidence of fruit fly this year. To meet these additional costs of the department, a further allocation of \$600 000 is sought.

Marine and Harbors: The State has had an increased number of shipping movements relative to last year and this has caused additional expenditure, particularly outside of normal hours. While salaries and wages and related costs have increased, all overtime work is recoverable and some offset to these increased costs can be expected. Other increases are associated with a higher level of terminal leave payments, additional stores operating costs, and the initial cost of establishing a commercial division of the department. The total amount sought to provide for these expenditures is \$280 000.

Minister of Marine—Miscellaneous: Under the terms of the Mobil Lubricating Oil Refinery (Indenture) Act, 1976, the State is obliged to make refunds to Mobil Oil Australia Limited of wharfage payments made in excess of the



guaranteed amount.

It was not possible to estimate the amount of these refunds accurately when the Estimates were presented last October, but it is apparent now that an additional \$350 000 will be required. The Supplementary Estimates include provision for this purpose.

**Highways:** This department has met with a general increased level of costs in a number of areas, including its contribution to the National Association of Australian State Road Authorities, maintenance of the Walkerville administration building, hire of computer time, printing and stationery, and the State's contribution to the Co-ordinated State Road Authorities Data Bank System. The additional provision sought is \$320 000.

**Minister of Transport and Minister of Local Government—Miscellaneous:** An additional appropriation of \$1 500 000 is required to cover payments to the State Transport Authority and the Mitcham Dogs Home Incorporated. The additional amount of \$1 200 000 required by the State Transport Authority is related to excesses in each of its operating divisions. Net contributions on behalf of the Rail Division are increased by \$500 000, because receipts are running at levels lower than estimated, while payments are exceeding estimate. Similarly, net contributions for the Bus and Tram Division are greater than estimated due to an increase in retiring and death gratuity scheme payments following unscheduled early retirements (\$300 000), a carryover of the operating loss from 1976-77 (\$250 000), and other sundry cost increases (\$150 000).

The Dogs Rescue Home Incorporated was established at its present location at Belair Road, Mitcham, in 1928. Since then, urban growth has caused it to be surrounded by private dwellings, and the Mitcham City Council receives numerous complaints about the dogs kept at the home. The land occupied by the home is under contract for sale and must be vacated shortly. The home's management wish to relocate at Lonsdale, and the Government proposes to assist this move with a grant of \$100 000 and a loan of \$200 000.

**Community Welfare:** The Government has been obliged to increase its financial assistance payments in two main areas. The first of the increases which is in the general financial assistance area is a direct result of the decision by the Commonwealth Government to change the timing of amounts paid as unemployment benefits. Whereas previously applicants for unemployment benefits could expect a cheque for a two-week benefit to be available 10 days after applying now they must wait 18 to 19 days for a one-week benefit. Further delays occur while the applicant is waiting for the second cheque—this time a two-week benefit. Only when the third cheque is due can applicants expect to receive cheques spaced regularly at fortnightly intervals. The South Australian Government does not accept that people should have to suffer the hardship caused by this Commonwealth policy, and we have taken action to ensure that payments are made to eligible applicants as early as possible. Effectively this has shifted the responsibility for initial payments to the State. An amount of \$300 000 has been included in the Supplementary Estimates for this purpose. Secondly, the amount provided in October for payments to sole supporting parents will not be sufficient, because there has been a marked increase in the number of sole supporting parents applying for assistance and an increase in rates in line with similar increases in Commonwealth payments. This had led to a further requirement of \$700 000 on this line. In all, a further \$1 000 000 is required for community welfare.

**South Australian Health Commission and Hospitals**

**Department:** An additional amount of \$3 650 000 is being sought on the Supplementary Estimates to cover the net cost to South Australia of the hospitals and health programme. The amount sought is to provide for increased charges for medical and surgical supplies, drugs, laundry and domestic charges, repairs and maintenance, rent and administration expenses, and pathology services.

A further \$8 000 000 is required to provide an advance to the South Australian Health Commission to ensure continuity of operations should delays occur in the approval of programmes and receipt of moneys under the Medibank agreement. Whilst I expect these problems to be ironed out before the end of the year, our recent experience suggests that it would be unwise to leave the possibility of a shortfall in receipts from the Commonwealth uncovered. Naturally, I will not approve an advance unless it is necessary.

**Minister of Health—Miscellaneous:** The non-government recognised hospitals have faced increases similar to those encountered by Government hospitals and, therefore, it will be necessary to increase the amount available for distribution as grants towards current maintenance for recognised and eligible hospitals. The increase sought is \$1 350 000

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** I point out at the outset that the arrangement to carry on directly with the debate following the suspension of Standing Orders today was made, I understand, between the Whips, and the Minister was kind enough to give me a copy some time this afternoon of the Premier's second reading explanation. The situation is far from satisfactory. On the programme that was agreed for the week, the Bill was to have been introduced today and the debate completed tomorrow. I want to say as clearly and as pointedly as I can that the programme that is agreed for each week is set down as a guide for all members in the Chamber. It is a programme that we endeavour to stick to as far as we can.

I know that the Government's concern is that there is a grievance debate to be held on the motion to go into Committee on this legislation, but I do not think that that is the point. The point is that the Government is introducing legislation and serious matters are expected to be debated fully at extremely short notice. Although the Premier did me the courtesy of giving me a copy of this legislation this afternoon, other members on this side have not had an opportunity to examine it, nor have they really a fair opportunity to speak on it.

I point out that this Bill goes a little further than the usual Appropriation Bill. It covers rather more ground, and I believe that it has great significance in the matters that it covers. I believe that it presents a sorry future for the people of South Australia. Yet, on a matter as important as this, the back-bench members (indeed, all private members, I suspect) in this Chamber have not been given the opportunity to examine that legislation and the particularly important accompanying statement, to seek advice on the details necessary, and, if they wish, to speak in the debate.

Let us take the matter of inserting an explanation in *Hansard* without its being read. When that practice was adopted in this place, it was usual for the Minister involved to give the Opposition at least six copies (usually more) of the second reading explanation so that we could be sure that, in such a simple matter as the reading of a second reading explanation, we had all the matters at our fingertips.

I have had about two or three hours to look at these documents. Most other members on this side have had about 10 minutes, and I do not think that this is the sort of

treatment that a Government should give to any Opposition or to any members, regardless of which side of Parliament they are on. This obviously is another example of the Government's arrogance and the haste with which legislation now is being put through this place. It is another example of the absolute disregard for the principles of the Westminster system of Parliamentary democracy that this Government now shows.

I have prepared some notes on this matter and I am willing to speak on it now, but I would prefer to speak on it tomorrow in more detail and in some depth, having examined all the implications of the statements that have been made. I am certain that other members on this side also would greatly prefer to do so. If it means that we must come back into this Chamber after the Easter vacation, not having ended the session at Easter, by all means let us come back. We are being deprived of our basic rights of free speech. It is the practice in this House now for the Government more and more to ignore accepted practice.

I realise that the Government has not as much legislation before the House as it would like to have. I recognise that, if by any chance we were to adopt normal practice and now adjourn this debate until tomorrow, which would be the proper time, there would be nothing left to go on with, but that is not the fault of the Opposition. If the Government has nothing on its programme that it can continue with, that is its funeral, not ours. Accordingly, I now seek leave to continue my remarks later.

**The SPEAKER:** Is leave granted?

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** No.

**The SPEAKER:** Leave is not granted.

**Mr. TONKIN:** That shows exactly what sort of situation we have come to in this place. It is absolutely appalling. Now, let us get on with the business as best we can. I intend to speak at some length on the whole matter, to give my colleagues perhaps an opportunity to examine the explanation and the document in detail, and we may well be here for a considerable time.

The document that the Premier has presented to us today paints a very sorry future for South Australia, as I have said. It is a damning self-indictment of the Government's failure, of its failure to control expenditure and provide value for the taxpayers' money on the one hand, and, on the other, failure to attract and maintain the commercial and industrial activity upon which this State's prosperity depends. On the first count, that of failure in administration, one could say that it was encouraging to see in the document that has been presented to us reference (it is on page 2) to a need to "keep a tight rein on all expenditures". The Premier is a past master at saying things without really meaning them, of saying half truths, and of putting on a big show and doing nothing.

I noticed in another measure that was before the Chamber this evening that something was going to be the best, the biggest, the brightest, and almost Texas-like in its sparkle—the best thing that even happened. I know that it is one thing to like and praise what is going on in South Australia, but it is another to get things in proper perspective. To keep a tight rein on all expenditures is one thing, and it is long overdue, but I have yet to see it translated into concrete evidence by any positive Government action. I will refer to successive Auditor-General's Reports on this matter as time goes by. It is a vital part of this whole exercise.

The Government's control of expenditure has been monumentally negligent. It has resulted in wasteful expenditure on a massive scale. The second count, that of failure in industrial development, is, again, of grave and growing concern. It is shown quite clearly in the reduced

level of Government receipts, particularly in pay-roll tax and stamp duty. Obviously (no-one would deny it) the same factors that affect the rest of Australia are applying to South Australia. Indeed, it is refreshing to find in the document no direct reference to blaming the Fraser Government as an excuse. At least we have got away from that and I suspect that the trouncing that the Labor Party got in December may have had something to do with the absence of such sentiments from the document.

What does shine through clearly is that the South Australian Government is not making a real effort to overcome these difficulties. Indeed, by its policies, particularly that policy on industrial democracy, it is actively discouraging industrial development in this State. People are staying away from South Australia in droves. This Government stands indicted of failure on all charges: failure to manage, failure to account and, additionally, the failure to promote industrial and commercial development.

Frequently I have said that waste and mismanagement could well have been the watchwords of the Labor Party during the past seven years. I need mention only a few monumental examples of waste that have occurred during that time. Let me just refer to Monarto. That is probably the first time Monarto has been mentioned in this Chamber for a considerable time, but, it will not be the last, because it will be brought up time and time again as the classical example of the monumental waste of this Government.

**Mr. Mathwin:** It was a pipe dream of the Premier.

**Mr. TONKIN:** We understand that it was largely the dream of the Premier, a dream that has gone astray. That pipe dream, as the honourable member calls it, has cost this State dearly. Let us consider the Port Adelaide container terminal. We were all pleased to hear that, because of industrial trouble in Melbourne, it was being used more frequently. Sometimes it is being used nearly as often as once a week by one ship! An even greater example was the jubilation when we heard that a Russian passenger liner was to call at Outer Harbor and utilise the facilities there for the first time almost for years.

There has also been the frozen food factory and the Port Pirie bridge to nowhere. All of these expenditures have shown quite clearly a total lack of effective budgetary control by the Government. The other day someone reminded me that in the Cleland national park people have been digging holes in the ground, putting rocks in the holes, digging them up again and then putting sleepers into the holes. It may have been the other way round, but it does not matter much. Then the holes have been filled up again.

**Mr. Millhouse:** That was to build a car park.

**Mr. TONKIN:** A car park. The holes have been dug and refilled. Yet again that is evidence of the wasteful expenditure and the lack of budgetary control of this Government. Had all those measures been monitored properly and carefully checked and had account been taken of changing conditions, possibly (and I will not say that we could have avoided all the waste that has resulted) we could have avoided the expenditure of money, which, in many cases, has been poured away without benefit to the people of South Australia. As yet I have not mentioned the large number of potted palms that were placed in the new Motor Registration Division building and the scandalous expenditure that occurred in providing them.

Recently Mr. D. E. Byrne retired from the position of Auditor-General of this State. I must accept his public statement that he was not pressured in any way to retire

before the proper time for his retirement. I can only comment that the almost complete lack of notice that is being taken by the Government of his annually repeated remarks, which have been the subject of considerable comment in this House before now, must have been, to say the least, discouraging and most frustrating to the Auditor-General. I believe that he has been an officer who has served this State and this Parliament well. He is worthy of the highest commendation for the service that he has given to this State. His early retirement will be a sad loss to the people of South Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have listened to the honourable Leader for some time now, and some of the departments he has mentioned are not referred to in the Bill before the House. I hope that he will link up his remarks to the Bill, because as I look through the Bill, I cannot see anything about the Auditor-General's office. I hope the Leader will stick to the Bill.

**Mr. TONKIN:** With every respect, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that we are discussing the Appropriation Bill. We are discussing the proposed deficit in the State Budget of about \$26 000 000. We are dealing with the Government's failure to account and budget properly. If that is not something to do with this deficit of \$26 000 000, I do not know what is.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable Leader will stick to the Bill. I will listen intently to his remarks. Naturally, the grievance debate is quite wide—

**Mr. TONKIN:** We are not talking on the grievance debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader knows better than that. The grievance debate covers a wide field, but the Bill before the House does not cover such a wide area. The Leader must refer to what is covered in that Bill.

**Mr. TONKIN:** Yes, Sir. I intend to deal very carefully with the \$26 000 000 deficit which is now facing this State and for which this Bill has been introduced.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable Leader may do that, but I hope that he will confine his remarks to the areas affected by the deficit.

**Mr. TONKIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I certainly will. It is surely the Auditor-General's responsibility to check on those departments. I will, if you like Sir, read in some detail from the Auditor-General's Report and referring to various departments covered in this Bill where the deficit has been incurred.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable Leader has that opportunity if he sticks to the Bill before the Chair.

**Mr. TONKIN:** It would be better if I dealt generally with the Auditor-General's Reports on those matters.

**The SPEAKER:** As long as that is covered by the Bill.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I would point out, as all members know, that the Auditor-General is an officer who is directly responsible to Parliament. It is his duty each year to report on Government accounts for all departments, including those departments that are covered in this legislation. He cannot take action to correct anything that he finds in those departments, but he can comment on and ventilate various accounting deficiencies in those departments and draw attention to waste. Indeed, he can have matters specifically referred to him dealing, for instance, with the Hospitals Department, in which—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I want the honourable Leader to refrain from referring to the Auditor-General. He will have the opportunity in the Bill before the House to talk about a department, but he must not refer to the Auditor-General.

**Mr. TONKIN:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, how can one deal with the Appropriation Bill (No. 2), which deals with the finances of this State and the Government's accounting, if one cannot, as one has always done in the full debate on the Budget, deal with the Auditor-General's Report?

**The SPEAKER:** I want the honourable Leader to stick rigidly to the Bill before the House. If the honourable Leader disagrees with that, he can do so. As I said, the Auditor-General has nothing to do with the Bill before the Chair. The Leader can make a passing remark, but I am sure that he is not making just a passing remark.

**Mr. TONKIN:** Until now I have simply been making a passing remark about the high quality of the service of the Auditor-General who has recently retired. He has referred in his report to the Public Buildings Department, the Education Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Lands Department, the Treasury, the Law Department, the Hospitals Department, and Corporate Affairs Department, all of which have been covered in the Premier's statement that has been incorporated in *Hansard*. Therefore, I presume I am in order in referring to any comments that the Auditor-General may make on those matters.

**The SPEAKER:** There can be passing remarks concerning the Auditor-General.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I can refer to further education, agriculture, fisheries, and so on. It is important in looking at the public accounts, the accounts that have come from the Treasury, to remember what the Auditor-General has said is a principle, and that principle applies in all of these matters. The Auditor-General states:

Generally, the accounting work in these organisations—and he is referring to the various departments—is well done.

He points out the need for a constant review and the updating of accounting methods. This principle applies well because, without any doubt (although it is not spelt out clearly in this document), the reason for this deficit has been the Government's spending in its departments that has exceeded its expectations. Successive Auditor-Generals have said that in spending the criteria should be not how much has been spent but the value that is received for the expenditure. The object is to ensure the provision of projects of adequate standards at a minimum cost. Too much emphasis is placed by some on the amount spent rather than on the effectiveness for a given cost. Obviously, if costs are minimised, more projects can be undertaken.

That is a fundamental principle that applies to the Government's budgeting and management of its own affairs. In this regard I refer to the Public Accounts Committee which was established as a result of the initiative of the member for Mallee and which examines accounts that appear to be inconsistent. Can the Premier say whether or not that committee will be asked to investigate any of the matters referred to by him in this document as being the subject of additional expenditure? However, that committee can investigate wasteful spending only after it has occurred. Obviously, the Liberal Party believes that there should be much tighter budgetary control. Reference to unsatisfactory accounting procedures and comments on the need for improved budgetary control appear in the reports of Auditor-Generals with increasing frequency, and this statement, which is so clearly set out by the Premier, highlights the need for such increased budgetary control. The fact that we are looking at a deficit of about \$26 000 000 highlights the need for such control. The increase in the size of the deficit must be accounted for in some way.

Regarding the Hospitals Department, the Auditor-General has frequently referred to the need for the department to review procedures relating to inventories. He frequently says that little progress has been made. Many comments that have been made have not been taken up. As the member for Alexandra said, we are still awaiting the Public Accounts Committee report on the spending on Government hospitals and institutions, yet in this statement we find that the Government seeks a virtual moratorium on all new expenditures in the health area. Would it not be better to seek a moratorium on wastage in the hospital area, and in every other department? It would be much better to impose a tight moratorium on wasteful expenditure so that we would not have to impose a moratorium on new expenditures in the health area, if they are warranted, and I believe they are.

**Mr. Chapman:** The Premier made a public statement about that on September 6 last, when he announced a decision—

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

**Mr. TONKIN:** It will be interesting to see what that report comes up with when it arrives.

**Mr. Chapman:** He, having already—

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

**Mr. TONKIN:** It is apparent that the Government is unwilling to accept that the stringent financial conditions, which apply to everyone else in the community, should also apply to the Government's spending. That is the basic problem, and that is basically why we have this deficit now facing South Australia. Until the Government recognises that the same stringent conditions and controls that apply to everyone in the community must also apply to it, we will keep on getting a deficit such as this, and the deficit will continue to increase.

This statement is a statement of failure, a failure to account properly and to get value for the taxpayers' money. It is not enough to say that the Government has kept a tight rein on all expenditures: the Government must be seen to be holding excessive expenditure in check. Presently, the Government is not seen to be holding excessive spending in check. Indeed, it has been estimated that at least 2 per cent of our total Budget could be saved by careful and proper accounting and budgetary control, and I have no reason to doubt that figure. Indeed, that is the sum that is normally quoted for the management of a private undertaking and, if we could not beat that in dealing with Government bureaucracy, I would be much surprised.

I challenge the Government now to do more than just talk about these measures, and to take seriously the advice given to it regularly and repeatedly but the Auditor-General.

I refer now to the Government's failure adequately to meet the tremendous challenges of South Australia's financial situation. As all members know, during the past four decades South Australia has become an industrialised State, and we have much to be proud about in our history of industrial development. This is especially pertinent since the Treasurer in his statement stated that South Australia's income from pay-roll tax and stamp duty has fallen below the sum expected.

Neither I nor anyone else in this State is really surprised. Certainly, I do not have to outline the basis for the industrial success which South Australia once enjoyed and which was based on a cost advantage that was assiduously developed by Sir Thomas Playford and his Government. However, that cost advantage has been whittled away steadily by the activities and the administration of the

Dunstan Government. It is a sad picture with which everyone in the community is now only too familiar.

The Premier seeks to explain away the fall in Government revenue by referring to the gently depressed economy in which business activity has reduced, and he also referred to record unemployment. The Premier is right in saying that the fall in business activity is felt especially in relation to employment, real estate and motor vehicles, but it is of little comfort to be told that South Australia has retained its rather unusual position in these difficult times of having slightly less unemployment than the national average, especially when one recognises that the gap is steadily narrowing and that we are rapidly coming up to parity with the other States.

Of course, expenditure-based taxes, like stamp duty, are affected by the adverse conditions, and it is important to know how Government expenditure is being used to help reduce mounting unemployment. It is important to know why our pay-roll tax receipts are down from the expected sum. Heaven knows, they have gone up rapidly every year until now.

This Government steadfastly refuses to acknowledge that a revival of the private sector offers the best chance of improving short-term employment prospects in this State. This is not the time to deal with structural unemployment. It is another matter that we all accept we will have to give our full attention. In the short term, however, the private sector offers us the most hope for the future. The Premier talks about reduced income from pay-roll tax, but that situation would correct itself if pay-roll tax had been used, as was the policy of his Federal colleagues and is the policy of his New South Wales colleagues, to stimulate the private sector. He still has not explained to the people of South Australia why he did the tremendous back flip (yet another one) on that matter.

At a time when all other States are doing everything they can to revitalise the private sector, I cannot for the life of me understand why no provision has been made by this Government to stimulate the private sector by pay-roll tax incentives. This Government persists in placing its total reliance on unemployment relief schemes and, again, that clearly shows out in the document we have had presented to us.

The Government persists in following ideological policies, which, I repeat, are actively keeping industry from coming to this State in droves. I have been told in only this past week of three major industrial concerns proposing multi-million dollar expansions to their industries and operations that will not in any way consider coming to South Australia while there is any suggestion at all of the Labor Party's industrial democracy programme being implemented, either now or at any time in the future. Workmen's compensation is another factor that is frequently quoted. State taxes and charges are also referred to.

**The Hon. D. A. Dunstan:** Will you tell us who these people are?

**Mr. TONKIN:** I hope to be in a position to let the Premier know at an appropriate time. Unfortunately (and I will deal with this in another debate this evening), many people in the industrial field in this State and outside of it, but particularly those with interests in this State, are afraid to speak up because they are afraid that in some way they will be discriminated against by the Government of this State. And that, Sir, is a fact. That fact should be stated more and more frequently now because most people in the community admit that that is so.

Workmen's compensation is another factor that is being quoted frequently, but even the decentralisation programme involving pay-roll tax, land tax and other

concessions is not helping industry, as it should in this State. Our entire industrial base is being whittled away; people will not come to this State. I charge this Government with its total failure to do the things which ought to be done and which its colleagues are doing in other States.

I said at the outset that this document paints a sorry picture for South Australia, and that it is a damning self-indictment of the Government's failure to manage the economy, a failure just as great as its failure to attract industrial and commercial development to this State. It stands doubly damned because it actively discourages people from coming to this State. The statement that we have before us is clear evidence that both of these factors are now threatening our entire way of life.

We have a deficit of \$26 000 000, compared with the \$18 400 000 that was originally forecast. That is harder to understand when the statement acknowledges that there has been a decrease in the expected amount necessary for salary and price increases of about \$10 000 000. I have already quoted the Premier's 1977 Budget speech in which he stated that his budget was predicated on an inflation rate of about 12 per cent. As we all know, thanks to the determined efforts of the Fraser Government, the present figure is 9.2 per cent.

The Premier has previously said that partial wage indexation and higher price increases have implied an inflation prediction of about 12 per cent, and that it was agreed by almost everybody that in the short term things would get worse before they got better. To what extent that was a pre-Federal election speech I do not know, but I suspect that that was the main object of the exercise. The fact remains that inflation has come down to 9.2 per cent. The Premier said later in that same speech in 1977 that, in allowing for inflation in prices and wages, the forecast of payments comprised detailed provisions for normal running expenses of \$1 107 000 with salaries and wages rates, as at June 30, and at price levels with an allowance for inflation, a round sum allowance of \$43 000 000 for the possible cost of new salary and wage rate approvals that might become effective during the course of the year, and a round sum allowance of \$5 000 000 for the possible cost of further increases during the year in the cost of supplies and services.

He made allowances for inflation at about 12 per cent. We are told that the decrease in the expected amount necessary for salary and price increases is about \$10 000 000, yet the deficit has gone up from a proposed \$18 000 000 to a proposed \$26 000 000. We can only say (and it is no good the Premier's making poo-pooing noises, as he did in answer to a question) that the State's finances are worsening despite the marked improvement in the rate of inflation. The whole point is that we have got into the habit of spending money in this State in a profligate way. We have spent away all the surpluses that we have had, and all the reserves that we have built up by way of the medibank agreement and the railways agreement; we have gone through the lot.

The plain fact of the matter is that the State is nearly broke and is running on a deficit. The Premier will say that that is nothing to worry about, that Sir Thomas Playford ran on a deficit on occasion—but not very often. The Keynesian theory, which certainly implies deficit budgeting (and I suspect that the Premier is a devotee of that theory), will not fit the present circumstances, and most other authorities recognise that. Nothing that the Premier has said in defence of his Government's administration—its lack of response to the Auditor-General's Report, its lack of recognition of the factors causing a down-turn in commercial and industrial development, its lack of

appreciation of the factors which will actively discourage industry from coming to this State—can remove from his administration the blame for bringing this State to its knees.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that what the Fraser Government found necessary to do following the Whitlam Administration a Liberal Government will find necessary to do in South Australia following the Dunstan Administration. South Australia has had a pretty fair run for its money, mostly because we have had money to spare, but instead of putting it aside for a rainy day the Premier has used it in order to spend his way into yet another term in office.

The only doubt now remaining in the minds of people is how bad things are likely to get in the next two or three years before a Liberal Government will have the opportunity to start putting things right again. It is with great reluctance and grave misgivings for all that it implies that I find myself obliged to support this Bill.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** We have had put before us a document indicating clearly the dire financial straits in which we find ourselves at present under the Dunstan Labor Administration. If we examine Budgets presented in other States, South Australia appears in an extremely poor light, because we find that, of all the other States in Australia, South Australia is the State that has budgeted for by far the largest deficit. The Premier made no bones of the fact that he intended to use up all of this State's reserves in introducing a Budget with a deficit of \$18 400 000. New South Wales, a far bigger State than South Australia, budgeted for a deficit of \$400 000; Victoria, a larger State than South Australia, budgeted for a deficit of \$500 000; Queensland budgeted for a surplus of \$400 000, and look at the abuse directed to the Administration in that State by this Labor Administration; Western Australia budgeted for a balanced Budget; and Tasmania for a deficit of \$2 900 000.

I thought that that was an appalling enough picture when we examined the Budget presented to this House some time ago, but the situation that has been revealed in these latest Supplementary Estimates indicates a far more serious position in relation to the rest of Australia than was indicated then. The \$18 400 000 deficit has swelled to the colossal figure for a State of this size of \$26 000 000. In his second reading explanation the Premier states:

The present estimate of the position on the two accounts combined is for an overall deficit of some \$26 000 000. The increased deficit is accounted for by a \$6 000 000 shortfall in receipts and a \$5 000 000 increase in expenditure.

To me this is an alarming situation. The Premier said in his second reading explanation that we have a slightly better situation in relation to unemployment than have the other States. A few months ago he was bragging loudly about the unemployment situation in this State and its being far superior to that in other States, because he had instituted an unemployment relief scheme which, to me, was one of the most wasteful schemes that could have been devised for the deployment of public funds in this State. The Government had devised this unemployment relief scheme in order to take people off the streets and had paid them well in a most inefficient way. The example quoted by the Leader concerning the efforts in the National Park is a case in point concerning the relief scheme to which the Premier has referred in this document.

It is like the classical story of digging a hole and filling it in again. These people at the National Park did that, and it took about two months to put in the stones, then sleepers and then chicken wire, and then two months to pull it all down. This is the sort of unemployment scheme referred

to in this document and which resulted in the Premier's saying that we have slightly better unemployment figures than exist in other States, although he said that the position was vastly better when the Budget was introduced last September. The present document indicates a rapidly deteriorating financial situation in this State. We have a vastly escalating Budget deficit and an unemployment situation that is deteriorating quickly.

I notice a refreshing absence in these Supplementary Estimates of the political garbage that the Premier has inflicted on the House from time to time: "We are the greatest; we are the best because I say so; I am the most popular Premier in Australia; I am a financial wizard; my Government provides services that this State demands."

Fortunately, that sort of clap-trap is notably absent from the document. Even the Premier realises that the public will not swallow that sort of garbage in the present disastrous situation.

I say with some force, that, if a small State like South Australia has to consider a deficit of \$26 000 000 when every other State is looking at a balanced Budget, and this includes New South Wales, then we are obviously in a bad way. We had the much vaunted railway deal, which I think was going to benefit us by \$800 000 000: what has happened to that? Without it, apparently, we would have been literally bankrupt. I believe that we are bankrupt now, and in addition we have lost the country railways.

I know that the economist opposite, the Minister on the front bench, has said that my approach is too simple. I have said that we should run the affairs of the State in the same way as a person runs his own affairs, but the Minister has said that that is too simple. If I flogged off half of my property, the equivalent to selling the country railways, and found I was having a deficit in like terms to that envisaged and found that it has escalated to the proportions mentioned in this document, I know that I would be on the verge of bankruptcy. If in the process I had put more and more people on the pay-roll as this Government has done and transferred more and more resources into non-productive areas, I would find that I would have been in queer street years ago.

The economist opposite says that that is a simplistic way to view the situation, but I believe that the only way to approach the finances of this State or that of the country is that you cannot spend money that you do not have. In this State we are spending money that we do not have: when will the day of reckoning occur? I believe that this is the most frightening (and that is not too strong a word) financial document that I have seen presented in my life in this place in the past eight years. Never in those eight years has this State shown up in such a poor light in relation to the finances of other States.

I understand from the document that the Government is to use its unemployment relief scheme to control the spotted aphid! Also, the document refers to people being taken off a works programme in the Engineering and Water Supply Department because there is no money to do the works. Heaven knows what they are doing, and there is no indication in this document. Unemployment relief scheme money was used by the Engineering and Water Supply Department to put a fence around the Millbrook reservoir some time last year. It is my habit to visit my electorate office every Friday, and, when doing so, I pass this reservoir. I say without fear of contradiction that the most expensive fence ever erected in South Australia is the fence that goes around the Millbrook reservoir.

There were about eight or 10 men in the gang and I went past for some weeks or months and noted the progress in the work they were doing. We would be sitting during the

week, and I would notice on Friday how far they had progressed. I suppose that, in all, they erected about a mile of fencing, but I never saw a fellow strike a blow with a crowbar or handle a post. That must have happened, because the fence went up about 100 yards a week. I say without fear of correction that all unemployment relief money is doing is taking men off the dole so that they can say that they have a job, when obviously many of them are poorly motivated, and the public is paying about 10 times what those assets would be worth. What would it cost if someone else did it? I have previously referred in the House to a major works programme carried out by local government, and it was estimated by the engineer that it cost five times more if done that way than if it were done by private enterprise. The Government has done this in the name of doing something for the unemployed, so that it can pad this State's unemployment figures and say that it is doing something realistic.

I do not know what it will do next year. It has spent all of the State's reserves (that is equivalent to spending all the money in the bank), so it has no liquid assets behind it. I do not know what the Government will use for its unemployment scheme next year in this deteriorating situation. Various Government departments are referred to in the Bill, and I noticed in the time during which I have been able to peruse the speech, that the Premier made a few vague references to money not being available for Loan programmes, so people have had to be transferred from one activity to another. There is a mention of a slow-down in activity in the Engineering and Water Supply Department's digging of trenches, and that these people have had to be transferred to revenue projects. I do not know what that means. I wish the Premier would be more specific. These people have had to be transferred to revenue projects. The Premier said:

A further amount of \$450 000 is needed to cover the cost of design staff now engaged on revenue programmes due to a reduction of activity on major design projects under the Loan works programme.

What are they doing? The Monarto Development Commission was costing us about \$900 000 a year in salaries, it folded, and the big problem was what to do with those highly-paid staff. Under the agreement the Government had with them, it unloaded a percentage of them, and I do not know what the remainder are doing. We have no money in the Loan programme. There is nothing in design; we cannot build anything, but they are now doing something else. I ask what. The Premier also stated:

The decline in the amount of subdivisional activity has made it necessary to transfer staff usually engaged on reimbursement works to work involving dragging of sewers, maintenance of pumping stations, house connections and clearing choked sewer connections. The additional cost to be met from Revenue Account is \$350 000.

That is juggling the books. That is meaningless. All it means is that, because the money is not being taken out of the Loan programme, it is being taken out of the revenue programme. Regarding public buildings, I can tell the Government how it can save money. The Premier stated:

This year an additional \$600 000 is needed to cover increased rental charges.

That is for public buildings, but what does the Auditor-General have to say about public buildings? Rented office accommodation for Government departments last year totalled about \$5 100 000. The Auditor-General's Report states:

A number of instances have occurred where accommodation was vacant for protracted periods of time.

Four buildings are noted in the report and, if we add up

the money the Government paid out in rent for accommodation that it did not use, it cost \$454 000, whereas the Bill votes \$600 000 for increased rent. Let us face it, if this was private enterprise, it would be out of business. The managing director would be sacked tomorrow. If he and the company auditor came up with such statements and statistics, they would be unloaded more quickly than the Government unloaded Mr. Salisbury, and it would be done in this case with justice. An appalling state of affairs is unfolded in the Auditor-General's Report. It is no wonder that he got the stitch and retired before his time. If ever there would be a frustrating job, it would be that of the Auditor-General trying to keep tab on the waste of Government expenditure so evident under this Labor Administration. Again, in relation to the Public Buildings Department, the Auditor-General's Report states:

An internal audit system has been established in the Public Buildings Department but, during the year, the performance of that section was affected by the transfer of personnel to other duties.

Heaven knows what! The report continues:

Internal audit staff were appointed, during the year, to the Department of Lands and the Highways Department but, as yet, internal audit in those departments is still in the early stages of development.

Good heavens, those departments have been in existence for many years! The report continues:

I consider that the establishment of internal audit in Government departments, especially some of the larger departments, is overdue and I am concerned that, although some departments have included internal audit positions on their manpower budgets, those positions remain unfilled.

We are voting an additional sum of \$3 250 000 to the Education Department for salaries. What does the Auditor-General say, at page 87 of his report, about how the Education Department is run? He says:

It is considered that budgeting should be carried out in much greater detail to enable the appropriate authorities to make sounder judgments of the estimates. In some cases, e.g., staffing—

that is what the extra millions are for—

costs should be recorded in similar detail to enable periodical comparison with the budget with the objective of exercising greater control of expenditure.

Although we are voting \$3 250 000 to that department, the Auditor-General is saying that far greater control over costs is needed there. He goes even further, by saying:

The deterioration of the accounting standards and the inability of the department to produce meaningful financial management information led to the formation, in 1975, of a steering committee comprising representatives of the department and the Financial Management Advisory Committee to review all aspects of the accounting activities of the department.

I have already referred to the Agriculture and Fisheries Department. The big deal there is to put some of these people under the unemployment relief scheme on stamping out the spotted aphid. I ask you! The sum of \$600 000 is sought for this kind of scheme!

We are also voting extra money to the Marine and Harbors Department.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Aren't you in favour of stamping out the spotted aphid?

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes—but not by that means. If I wanted to erect a fence around my place, I would not use the labour I saw putting up the fence that has been built around the Millbrook reservoir. They are the last people I would engage for the job. These people will stamp out the spotted aphid at public expense.

Then we come to the Minister of Marine: \$350 000 extra is going to "Miscellaneous" under the Minister of Marine. There is the question of refunds in relation to wharfage. Wharfage charges which were increased last year are now about the highest in Australia. We have the fiasco of the container terminal at Outer Harbor. The Auditor-General mentions that; he says about that white elephant for 1975, at page 220:

Revenue—passenger fees: \$5 518; rents: \$306;  
Expenditure—interest: \$43 276; depreciation: \$12 059  
Maintenance provision: \$7 300; operating expenses:  
\$3 958;

Operating Deficit: \$60 769.

Last year's income of \$5 824 from passenger fees and rents deteriorated to \$3 008, and the cost of operating increased to \$70 253. In private enterprise, the manager of that department would be asked to either justify the existence of the thing or get rid of it, or do something else with it.

**Mr. Whitten:** What would you do with it?

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** The fact is that it is a complete white elephant. I refer to the container terminal, which is also mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report. It cost over \$8 000 000. The interest figures no doubt are in here. When I asked a question in this House about how much use it was getting there were some weeks when not even one ship pulled into the container terminal; on an average, it would have been less than one ship a week. What sort of way is that to run a State?

The Highways Department gets an unfavourable mention, as it has for many years. The Highways Department, along with the Engineering and Water Supply Department, is one of the major Government departments, one of the big spenders, and this is what the Auditor-General says at page 151 about that department, where we are voting a lot of money: we are looking at \$320 000, which is only peanuts to this Government! The Auditor-General states:

Financial Management—My last report referred to continuing inadequacies in financial management and control systems . . .

I will not read it all, but he finishes up by describing the committee that was set up to investigate a further committee and a further committee was set up to investigate that committee, and so on. This started sometime ago. He refers to the Design Management and Pre-Construction Activity systems, and the Financial and Management Accounting system. He continues:

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

There are all of these adverse comments. We can turn to every department. There is a vote here for Community Welfare and for Health. The Premier complained bitterly about \$5 000 000 he thinks he may not be getting from the Commonwealth Government. I suggest he could save a lot more than \$5 000 000 in relation to the operation of the health services of this State, if prudent financial control was exercised. There is an adverse comment about financial management in that department. At page 158 we see:

I have previously drawn attention to inadequacies in the preparation of Budgets and reporting thereon. The present pattern of budgeting does not relate costs to identified areas of functional responsibility. It merely presents cost information by object of expenditure and is therefore not designed for control purposes.

He is saying there that there is no control over expenditure, and that department is another one of the major spenders. Even the meanest intellect in this place can understand that. Let me continue:

The reporting function does not provide a base of information which reflects the activities over which responsible persons at each level of the organisation have control and does not highlight those activities which require corrective action.

He is saying here, "Anything goes in the Hospitals Department." Here we are voting for an increase in the deficit of South Australia from \$18 400 000 to \$26 000 000. As I said at the commencement of my remarks, in the light of the Australia-wide context, South Australia has by far the biggest Budget deficit anywhere. How the Premier can get up here and crow publicly, as he does, about being prudent—he even called himself conservative, the snappy dresser, the pace-setter—I do not know. In terms of financial management, he even has the gall to get up and say he is a conservative Treasurer, so the word does get an air of respectability even from our pace-setting Premier. It is an appalling and deteriorating situation. It is occurring in a State where the growth in the public sector, where we have these stupid and wasteful unemployment schemes, is faster, and not merely faster, but very much faster than in any State in the Commonwealth.

The Premier says the public demands these services; I do not believe it for a minute. That is how he explains it away. He took up the two emotive issues of health and hospitals when he came to Government, the two emotive political issues, and we have spent millions and millions of dollars on health and hospitals in South Australia, but I do not believe for a moment we have got value for money. The Premier says the public demands these services; that is eye-wash. Nobody has demanded these services from me as a member of Parliament. The people say, on the contrary, they are sick and tired of seeing Government money being wasted on schools and people on the Government pay-roll not pulling their weight, and "jobs for the boys" being created by the Dunstan Labor Administration; they are sick and tired of the escalation of cushy jobs and conditions in the public sector in South Australia: conditions that cannot be matched in the private sector, conditions produced by this pace-setting Premier and the Government, which I say in terms of this document have bankrupted this State. For us to be facing up to a deficit of \$26 000 000 this year, when around the rest of Australia, including Wran in New South Wales, they are looking to balanced Budgets, indicates an appalling situation.

**Dr. EASTICK (Light):** The Premier's preoccupation with a programme over many months of damning the Federal Government has left him quite obviously with insufficient time to give proper consideration to the finances of this State. For the Premier to come here today with a document which is an indictment of his own Government, and to have the gall to suggest that it should be waved over without adequate debate, without scrutiny, shows a complete lack of recognition of the importance of this matter to the people of South Australia.

The document, whilst it might not (and I agree with the member for Kavel on this point) have been as damning of the Federal Government as other documents have been, still follows along in the same train, although the Premier does not spend quite the degree of time on that subject that he usually does. One thing is very significantly missed out in the documents presented to us tonight. It should be brought into the open, because it has a significant part to play in the dilemma in which the Government finds itself, one largely of its own making. There would be a slight relief to the Government's embarrassment if the Premier would accept the word "drought" as being of some

importance in the whole approach to this subject.

It is a fact of life that the drought situation in South Australia on this occasion (and it has been highlighted to the Premier on earlier occasions) is having a serious influence on this State's ability to weather the storm and to show a recovery in significant areas. I draw a very simple parallel, which the member for Napier and the member for Elizabeth would be fully aware of. If anything happens to the motor car industry involving the General Motors plant at Elizabeth, the whole of Elizabeth suffers. I am not speaking of the present moment but of the experience at Elizabeth since G.M.H. started in the late 1950's and early 1960's.

As a professional person, having once practised in that area, I can go back to my practice records, more especially relating to receipts and bad debts, and almost to the day, by looking at the bad debt record, I can say when the car industry in Elizabeth was in difficulty. The same situation applies today in relation to South Australia and the effects of the drought. Many of the problems we have, many of the deficiencies outlined by the Premier, have been a direct result of the drought. He was warned of it. He and his Ministers were prepared to gloss over it as being of no real consequence. Not only the Premier but everyone in the South Australian community is now beginning to recognise the effects of a downturn of production or of spending power from the rural sector.

Another point which is extremely important, because again it is a measure which relates to this whole issue, one which has been pinpointed on earlier occasions in the House, is that the Premier would have us believe in these documents that the control of inflation is not of any great significance. I am interested in the editorial in the *News* today. Referring to the opening of the Federal Parliament yesterday and the address delivered by His Excellency the Governor-General, the editorial states:

True, the speech did contain a reassertion of the Government's oft-stated view that the solution to unemployment is to cut back inflation.

But then the editorial staff try to have it both ways. After introduction they give a little bit of background urging which is regrettably so much a part of the news media today, the editorial continues:

But in the absence of any new initiatives that reads more like a pious hope than a policy.

I am pleased to be of the same political persuasion as the Federal Government and accept the continuing attitude being expressed by the Federal Government in its determination to bring inflation into check, fully appreciating its genuine belief that, by controlling inflation, we can then have the other advances which are so important. It is not only the Federal Government that views matters in precisely that way. I refer to the Chancellor of the British Parliament. In an address on July 19, 1977, he made the following brief comment:

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

If the socialist Government of Great Britain, fellow travellers of members opposite, can see the wisdom of that comment, why cannot the Government of this State and the Premier accept it? On July 25, 1977, the British Prime Minister said:

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. The real issue for this country during the next 12 months is whether our



democratic structures will enable long-term common sense to triumph over short-term expediency.

Why does the Government of this State not accept that view?

**Mr. Mathwin:** They are losing about a million dollars a week on their nationalised industry.

**Dr. EASTICK:** Exactly. I repeat my earlier comment: I am pleased that the Federal Government has maintained its forceful attitude to the importance of combating inflation for the benefit of Australians generally. I find that this view is accepted by many people in the economic area, and I want to refer briefly to statements made in the past few months by the banking leaders. These are statements which have been available to members opposite. They have been available to the Premier and, if he had been giving due consideration to these matters instead of working out ways to damn the Federal Government, he may not have been placed in this embarrassing situation (as it must be) of trying to explain away his financial mismanagement. The Bank of New South Wales *Review* of December, 1977 contains the following statements:

The Australian economy at year's end is still stalled along the road to recovery. After a number of hopeful starts, business activity remains fairly static, though at a reasonably stable rate of less than full capacity. The increase in the value of retail sales during the year barely kept pace with the upward trend in prices. Statistics of production this year point to generally flat and listless manufacturing activity, especially in the key industrial and building materials sectors.

That does not pull any punches. It states the matter realistically, going on to point out that the bank still accepts the attitude expressed by the Federal Government and the effort it is making to get Australia back into proper production, proper harmony and proper economic management, for the benefit of everyone. I mentioned earlier the situation in rural areas. The National Bank, in its monthly statement of November, 1977, makes the following comment:

The predicted decline of 16 per cent in real income per farm this year is disturbing, because the rural sector accounts for 45 per cent of Australia's exports, and large sections of the community are directly or indirectly dependent on it.

This afternoon, the Government defeated a practical motion which my colleague the member for Chaffey had moved and which would have benefited everyone in the wine industry, not only the grapegrowers (a matter that Government members cannot appreciate). If grapegrowers are experiencing problems, the whole community will experience problems (based on that grapegrowing enterprise). If a person cannot produce and deliver to his markets, all the various support groups are disadvantaged. That is the problem to which the member for Chaffey was drawing attention. It is similar to the point made in this National Bank report. In the leading article, the National Bank states:

The past financial year witnessed a modest increase in the level of aggregate farm income which rose by 13.7 per cent to \$1 822 000 000. However, over the past three years, total rural income has shown virtually no growth. After allowing for the impact of inflation, real income per farm has fallen by 56 per cent from the peak reached in 1973-74.

There is much more in the report to which members can refer and which highlights the problems that I have mentioned. Without a spending power from the rural area, there is reduced spending in the metropolitan area, and that is having a serious effect on the Government and its returns from several areas. However, the Premier, in his preoccupation with damping the Federal Government, does

not say in this document that a drought is influencing our present situation.

It has been said that a first-class brain and a second class attitude will never get as far as a second-class brain and a first-class attitude. I suggest to the Government that, in the way in which it is conducting its financial affairs, it is acting like a group which questionably has a first-class brain but which definitely has a second-class attitude. We must have our attitudes right. I compliment the Federal President of the Australian Chamber of Commerce. In his presidential address as reported in the 73rd annual report of the Australian Chambers of Commerce (May-June, 1977) he states:

It is imperative that we examine some of the attitudes that we see evident in Australia today. It has been pointed out many times that another man's pay rise can mean another man's job. But instead of taking that self-evident truth seriously we often see a smugness and a lack of concern which says that if my pay rise is another man's job, too bad, let him be looked after by social welfare.

It is interesting that, in the document before us, the Premier states that one problem of the State Government is that it must find more and more money for the social welfare area, but much of the difficulty is the Government's own making. The member for Kavel has highlighted the wanton waste of funds involving the unemployment scheme. I have said previously that no-one in this House wants to see unemployment. However, it is a fact of life at present, and whatever can be done to lessen it is a distinct advantage, yet members opposite continue to accept and agree that their Ministerial colleagues may undertake unemployment schemes with a 20 per cent loading for those employed, and they accept that the State Government Insurance Commission will provide the workmen's compensation cover at a rate that is more than twice what the employing organisations outside can obtain from their own insurance companies.

If we want to get down to facts and if we are genuinely interested in the plight of the unemployed, for the amount we are paying out in unemployment we will make sure that the extra one on every five will be employed. We will reduce the 20 per cent loading, which is of no significance in the measure, and employ that extra person. We will then look at how they are employed so that there is a genuine chance of the public getting value for the money spent, and we will look closely at the fact that the S.G.I.C. is overcharging on workmen's compensation, when it is not even competing with private enterprise in this regard. As the Federal President of the Australian Chamber of Commerce has said, we need a considered and sensible approach. It is interesting to note that the National Bank monthly summary of October, 1977, states:

It is axiomatic that for a nation such as Australia, which is so heavily dependent upon overseas trade and investment, world economic and financial developments will have a major bearing on the outlook for the economy. A continued recovery in world trade and output is necessary to provide the scope for increased activity by our export-oriented industries and to encourage investment in natural resource based enterprises. At the broader level, Australia is obliged to maintain a careful watch on the types of economic policies being pursued by our major trading partners because of their potential direct effects and possible relevance to policy formulation in this country.

It expands on how we must adopt the right attitude to our overall role. It points out clearly that we cannot accept being in isolation from the rest of the world. Again, in relation to confidence and eliminating inflation, the Bank of New South Wales *Review* for October, 1977, at page 7, states:

The restoration of business confidence and the elimination of inflationary expectations cannot be accomplished at a single stroke. In Australia, as in most of the western world, the recent policies of restraint and a less activist government involvement in the economy, have resulted in some positive advance towards reducing inflation. Yet real evidence of progress on that front has been slower than expected and at times unconvincing.

Again, that is a realistic statement. The report continues:

The biggest danger in these circumstances would be if governments lost faith in their resolve to combat inflation and indulged themselves in expedient programmes to stimulate output, thereby hoping for a speedy end to recession. Such an approach would most likely only deepen recession by sparking off a further bout of inflation, encouraging employers to restrict their labour forces, producing a climate unpropitious for rational investment decisions, and increasing pressures for protectionism.

I commend to members opposite other details in that report, which has been available to all of us, including the Premier and his advisers. Yet the Premier's economic adviser hares off to Darwin to examine the likelihood of

the Northern Territory becoming a State and, in trying at public expense to resolve what should happen with the Northern Territory and its elevation to Statehood, that officer does not even bother to see the members of the governing Party there, meeting only members of the university campus and the A.L.P. Opposition. There was not even a courtesy call on the majority Party in the Assembly or an attempt to find out from it exactly what was the problem and what could be done. That is another area of wanton waste of public money.

The Bank of New South Wales *Review* of July, 1977, contains evidence of the increase in employment in Government and local government spheres. The *Review* indicates clearly that many of the problems highlighted by the Premier this evening in relation to additional expenditure involve an increased commitment to wages and salaries. Tables 7 and 8 in the Bank of New South Wales *Review* indicate clearly that we in South Australia from 1973 to 1975 enjoyed a higher rate of public expenditure than did any other State. I seek leave to have those two statistical tables inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Table 7

## GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT BY STATES

	Total in Private Employment			Total in Government Employment			Total Employment <sup>(a)</sup>			Government Employees as Proportion of Total Employed		
	June 1973	June 1976	Change	June 1973	June 1976	Change	June 1973	June 1976	Change	June 1973	June 1976	Change per-centage points
	'000	'000	%	'000	'000	%	'000	'000	%	%	%	
N.S.W.	1 300.5	1 268.6	-2.5	408.0	431.2	+5.7	1 708.5	1 699.8	-0.5	23.9	25.4	+1.5
VIC.	1 013.1	995.5	-1.3	288.0	318.1	+10.5	1 301.1	1 313.6	+1.0	22.1	24.2	+2.1
QLD.	435.4	448.7	+3.1	157.7	177.0	+12.2	593.1	625.7	+5.5	26.6	28.3	+1.7
S.A.	298.8	308.3	+3.2	117.6	136.7	+16.2	416.4	445.0	+6.9	28.2	30.7	+2.5
W.A. <sup>(b)</sup>	256.3	267.9	+4.5	100.5	113.1	+12.5	356.8	381.0	+6.8	28.2	29.7	+1.5
TAS.	93.2	94.4	+1.3	36.0	40.6	+12.8	129.2	135.0	+4.5	27.9	30.1	+2.2
Total Six States	3 397.3	3 383.4	-0.4	1 107.8	1 216.7	+9.8	4 505.1	4 600.1	+2.1	24.6	26.4	+1.8
Males	2 104.4	2 055.8	-2.3	824.5	863.4	+4.7	2 928.9	2 919.2	-0.4	28.2	29.6	+1.4
Females	1 293.0	1 327.5	+2.7	283.3	353.4	+24.7	1 576.3	1 680.9	+6.6	18.0	21.0	+3.0

(a) Wage and salary earners only and excludes employees in agriculture, private domestic service and armed forces.

(b) Western Australian figures compare June 1973 with June 1975.

Discrepancies because of rounding.

Table 8

## GROWTH RATES IN COMMONWEALTH, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

		State Government Employees		Local Government Employees		State and Local Government Employees	
		Total	Change 1973 to 1975	Total	Change 1973 to 1975	Total	Change 1973 to 1975
		'000	%	'000	%	'000	%
N.S.W.	June 1973	234.8	—	57.4	—	292.2	—
	June 1975	252.7	+7.5	64.5	+12.4	317.0	+8.5
VIC.	June 1973	170.4	—	24.7	—	195.1	—
	June 1975	189.6	+11.3	29.8	+20.6	219.4	+12.5
QLD.	June 1973	99.3	—	22.0	—	121.3	—
	June 1975	112.9	+13.7	24.4	+10.9	137.3	+13.2
S.A.	June 1973	79.9	—	7.5	—	87.4	—
	June 1975	92.9	+16.3	7.9	+5.3	100.8	+15.3

**GROWTH RATES IN COMMONWEALTH, STATE,  
AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT—continued**

		State Government Employees		Local Government Employees		State and Local Government Employees	
		Total	Change 1973 to 1975	Total	Change 1973 to 1975	Total	Change 1973 to 1975
		'000	%	'000	%	'000	%
W.A.	June 1973	71.4	—	7.8	—	79.2	—
	June 1975	79.6	+11.5	10.2	+30.8	89.8	+13.4
TAS.	June 1973	25.6	—	3.1	—	28.7	—
	June 1975	29.2	+14.1	3.9	+25.8	33.1	+15.3
Total six States	June 1973	681.2	—	122.5	—	803.7	—
	June 1975	756.7	+11.1	140.7	+14.9	897.4	+11.7
Commonwealth Government Employees	June 1973 '000	359.4		June 1975 '000	397.7		Change 1973 to 1975 %
							+10.7

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry)** moved:

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

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Kenegally, Klunder, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Wells, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Noes (17)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown (teller), Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Hopgood and McRae. Noes—Messrs. Nankivell and Venning.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

**Dr. EASTICK:** The A.N.Z. Quarterly Survey of January, 1978, in an article headed "Unemployment—a universal problem", states that over the past two or three years high rates of unemployment have been common to most major industrialised countries, rising well above what

has been regarded in the post-war period as the limit for a well managed economy. The article then indicates the difficulty that exists in clearly defining what is unemployment and refers to variations in the definitions from country to country.

The international definition of unemployment states that an unemployed person is one above a specified age who, on a specified day or a specified week is available for work but whose contract for employment has been terminated or temporarily suspended; who has never been previously employed; who has made arrangements to start a new job at a date subsequent to the specified period; or who is on temporary or indefinite lay-off without pay.

This afternoon we had the spectacle of the member for Napier criticising the Federal Government for seeking to determine the true situation regarding unemployment in this State. Because that subject will be debated at another stage, I will not pursue it further. The A.N.Z. Quarterly Survey of January, 1978, contains at page 14 a table of the relative unemployment figures for a number of Organisations for Economic Co-operation and Development countries. The table is purely statistical and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

**Adjusted unemployment rates in selected OECD Countries\* Per cent of total labour force—seasonally adjusted**

	Aver. 1962-73	1974	1975	1976	1976				1977
					Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
United States	4.6	5.4	8.3	7.5	7.4	7.3	7.7	7.7	7.2
Japan	1.2	1.4	(2.0)	(2.1)	(2.1)	(2.1)	(2.1)	(2.0)	(1.9)
Germany FR	(0.6)	(1.5)	(3.6)	(3.5)	(4.2)	(3.3)	(3.2)	(3.4)	(3.9)
France	(2.2)	(2.7)	(4.1)	(4.0)	(4.1)	(4.1)	(3.9)	(3.8)	(3.9)
United Kingdom	(3.1)	(2.9)	(4.4)	(6.0)	(5.5)	(6.0)	(6.4)	(5.9)	(6.0)
Italy	(3.5)	(3.1)	(3.6)	(3.9)	(3.5)	(4.0)	(4.2)	(4.1)	(4.1) <sup>b</sup>
Canada	5.1	5.4	6.9	7.1	6.8	7.1	7.2	7.4	7.8
Australia	1.6	2.2	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.5	5.2	4.0	4.5
Finland	2.4	1.7	2.3	4.0	3.2	4.2	4.4	4.2	5.1
Norway	(2.0)	1.5	2.3	1.8	2.0	2.0	1.7	1.4	1.6
Spain	(2.0)	(2.3)	(4.1)	(5.8)	(5.0)	(5.7)	(6.2)	(7.0)	(7.1) <sup>c</sup>
Sweden	2.1	2.0	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7
Totals	(2.8)	(3.3)	(5.1)	(5.1)	(5.0)	(5.1)	(5.3)	(5.2)	(5.1)

Source: *Economic Outlook*, OECD, July, 1977.

\*Figures in brackets have been adjusted to international definitions by the OECD. A description of the method used is included in *Economic Outlook*, No. 19, July, 1976.

<sup>b</sup> Assuming no change. <sup>c</sup> January. <sup>d</sup> Representing about 90 per cent of total OECD.

**Dr. EASTICK:** The A.N.Z. Quarterly Survey of October, 1977, refers at page 2 to productivity, as follows:

It is for these reasons that Australia might well place more attention on efficiency and productivity of existing industry. While it is understandable to bewail the total loss of output caused by some five per cent of the work force having no jobs, it is easy to overlook the loss of output arising from the fact that those in work are likely to be operating at less than 95 per cent of their potential, either because of poor work effort, inappropriate training, inadequate plant, mismanagement, or excessive Government interference and high taxation. Thus the loss from the 95 per cent is greater than from the 5 per cent.

I do not revel in the fact that we have an unemployment problem in South Australia. As I have indicated previously, it is not to the advantage of anyone in the community that unemployment is so high, but we have to recognise the other factors involved. Regarding productivity, we have to recognise that the State Government's initiatives and innovations in so many areas have cost us dearly, as they pass on from the public sector into the private sector, having repercussions far beyond the South Australian borders. In many respects this has been responsible for the marked increase in our unemployment.

We have exported our jobs overseas and interstate. South Australia's Government has got to accept the responsibility for the major thrust in this area. In stating this evening that his budgetary problems were based on the Federal Government's activities and other factors, the Premier failed to acknowledge the importance of productivity and the need for the State Government to set a reasonable pattern that can be followed without additional cost, without the export of jobs, and without the export of contracts and all the other associated activities.

I emphasise that the Premier completely overlooked the fact that many of the problems facing us are regrettably associated with the drought which is a reality in South Australia and which has and will have repercussions for many months. Therefore, I support the Bill, not because I desire to do so but because I recognise the necessity to do what we can for the people of this State. I support it in the hope, which I trust is not a forlorn hope, that the Government, which has a responsibility for the next three years, will at least pull up its socks and do a few of the realistic things necessary to make South Australia a State to which people will want to bring their industry so that increased employment opportunities will result.

**Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** I support the Bill, and in doing so I acknowledge the incredibly large job that the Premier has in managing the affairs of the State. I am most concerned that, when we have such a Bill as this involving funds of such magnitude, we should be expected to speak to the Bill without any opportunity whatever for careful perusal of it. I believe that this only reflects the general attitude of the Government towards the other part of Parliament: the Opposition does not get an appropriate or a fair and reasonable opportunity to scrutinise the State and public documents handled by the Government in its total management of the State's finances.

For the benefit of the House I refer to the means available to the Government for its many sources of funding. The largest source of funds is from the Commonwealth through the Commonwealth's States Grants Act. Our share of the income tax collected by the Government is distributed in accordance with the agreed State and Commonwealth formula. Apart from the major portion of our State funds from that source, other sources provide financial assistance. I refer to special grants

recommended by the Grants Commission, financial assistance grants, special revenue assistance, and capital grants. The Commonwealth makes payment to the States for many specific purposes, some details of which I shall bring to the attention of the House.

For example, we receive in this State grants specifically for schools, universities and a host of other public facilities which we are unable to finance through our own revenue system. South Australia enjoys money by reimbursement via the Grants Commission for the purposes of funding local government. Through the terms of section 96, we receive grant funds, which are available for special purposes for which we qualify as a claimant State, a State which does not enjoy the internal revenues that, for example, New South Wales enjoys. As a claimant State, we enjoy special consideration but, along with that special consideration, we have special responsibilities, not the least of which is to demonstrate that we can manage our affairs properly at a State level.

It also means that at the State level our service charges and other State taxes must remain comparable with the charges levied in other States. That issue itself is subject to much criticism, and I refer particularly to the service fees chargeable in this State compared with the service fees levied in other States. Finances received from these Commonwealth sources are granted to the State without encumbrance of State contribution and, accordingly, are non-repayable grants. All these payments are recorded federally, and these records are available annually for public scrutiny. All the payments through these various sources are subject to Federal audit and are reported on annually in the appropriate detail, as they should be.

South Australia has funds available for expenditure from within its own general revenue system, general revenue being accrued from the taxes, licences, registrations, pay-roll tax and other rates and like service fees levied within our own State. These details, too, are available annually in our income and expenditure statements, which are made available to the Parliament with the Budget each year. I support the continuance of that practice, so that open Government is not only claimed to exist but is seen to be practised.

The final avenue from which funds can be obtained from without South Australia involves loans. The Loan Council was established to receive submissions by respective States and, on approval, the Commonwealth, on behalf of the States, agrees to borrow moneys at the best possible interest rate and make those funds available to the States. The Financial Agreement, which is part of our Commonwealth Constitution, 1927, in part, states:

If at any time the Loan Council by unanimous decision so decides, a State may in accordance with the terms of the decision borrow moneys outside Australia in the name of the State, and issue securities for the moneys so borrowed. The Commonwealth shall guarantee that the State will perform all its obligations to bond holders in respect of the moneys so borrowed. For all the purposes of this agreement, including the making of sinking fund contributions . . .

That has been a clear and exercised avenue of raising funds for a long time, and I hope it continues. However, we found, especially after the last meeting of Loan Council, that the Premiers (and this applies particularly to our Premier) were not satisfied with the allocation of Loan funds received at that level, despite the warning issued by the Prime Minister at that time that, under the Commonwealth-State Financial Agreement, the States cannot go outside the Loan Council for borrowings: they can go outside the council for borrowings for semi-Government projects such as are required for the Electricity Trust, and the Housing Trust, etc. but there is a

catch, even though the States are only bound by a gentlemen's agreement.

That is the specific area that concerns me, that quite apart from all those other avenues available to our Government to raise funds, it has sought to exercise the extended benefits of that invitation by the Prime Minister at the last conference. I believe that on linking those remarks with the remarks made by the Premier immediately before the last State election, it can be seen that the Premier is launching on a disaster course for this State. We may be in trouble now, but we will be in a hell of a lot more trouble if he pursues the line he has threatened to pursue of exercising the opportunity for the borrowing of money within the State by these semi-governmental or internal authorities. We will be in more trouble than we can cope with.

Traditionally it has been the practice in Australia to rely on borrowing to finance public works other than roadwork. Under the Financial Agreement of 1927 of the Loan Council, which I have spoken about, the States were precluded from direct public borrowing, which is undertaken on their behalf by the Commonwealth. In this way the States obtain lower interest rates by eliminating mutual competition and by borrowing in effect on the credit of the Commonwealth. The size, terms and timing of the Commonwealth loans issued on behalf of the States had to be approved by the Loan Council, as did those loans raised directly by the larger State semi-governmental and local authorities from 1936. I suggest that 1936 is a landmark in this matter, since it marks the gentleman's agreement whereby the Loan Council specifically formed a policy to prevent the erosion of its effectiveness through State Government use of semi-government authorities as a substitute source of Loan moneys. Therefore, the Loan Council agreed in May, 1936, to strict limitations on borrowing programmes from semi-government and local authorities. Borrowings after that time of \$200 000 a year or more were to be subject to council approval and required approval as to the aggregate amount. Since 1962-63 the Loan Council has placed no limits on borrowing by smaller authorities, and in 1967-68 the borrowing limit covered by the gentlemen's agreement was raised 50 per cent from \$200 000 to \$300 000. I have taken those details from the Mathews and Jay book on Federal financial matters.

It should be noted that some States have in the recent past made proposals to reduce the cost of borrowing and to circumvent loan Council restrictions. In special circumstances, however, the Commonwealth Treasury's view in the Loan Council procedures is sufficiently flexible to cope with such problems and has indeed been used in the past. The South Australian Government's borrowing policy has precisely the effect of circumventing the supervision and control of the Loan Council. In fact, semi-governmental authorities, have been empowered to borrow direct from outside these sources. Borrowing is without the mediation of the Council and is not subject to public scrutiny.

This brings us to a point where I believe we are running into dire trouble with out financial management in this State. We have lost total control as a public State over the activities of the Government. This Government has, in the process of borrowing and obtaining funds from all of those earlier mentioned sources, extended outside of those traditional practices, set up authorities in this State, given them the power to borrow, and underwritten that power by Treasury guarantee. I believe that it has been a dangerous practice. If it is continued it will be much more dangerous and outside our long-term interest.

I will now mention some of the undesirable effects of

such procedures. Without public scrutiny the possibility of irresponsible borrowing leading to over extension and failure to meet interest commitments is encouraged and enhanced. Within this framework, and short of such a failure, it is also possible that inefficiency and wasteful practices will be enhanced. I am sure that we could cite many cases where wastage and inefficiency has been identified. We do not have to search for these items because, as the earlier speakers have mentioned, the Auditor-General's annual report, year after year, has brought to our attention and the public's attention details of these inefficiencies.

The original Financial Agreement was framed principally to prevent competition for funds between State and Federal Governments and thus to restrain interest rates. This competition had proved particularly costly to Australian Governments in the London money market after the First World War. The tendency for semi-government authorities increasingly to operate independently in the money market and therefore in competition with the Loan Council itself may signal the return to the interest rate problems which preceded the Financial Agreements, bearing in mind, when speaking of Loan funds, that on all of those moneys we are subject to ever-increasing interest rates.

In their book on Federal financial matters published in 1972, Mathews and Jay argued that the Loan Council concept had the special advantage that it contributed significantly to the situation whereby the Commonwealth had the physical powers necessary for the promotion of economic stability and growth and that, with the relative growth of the autonomous borrowing powers of the State semi-government authorities this situation is disrupted. The unco-ordinated borrowing activities of a growing number of these authorities, whose financial considerations are purely local in character, could conceivably grow to a point where they weaken the financial controls necessary for economic stability. Again, that is being reinforced by political writers on fiscal and financial matters at a Federal level time and time again in their warnings of the dangers that are involved in borrowing from all sorts of authorities outside of the control authority, outside of the authority that tables its documents for public scrutiny, and outside of authorities whereby we have access to the actual activities of the Government. It is a hidden commitment and a hidden practice that is being pursued by this Government in relation to its continuing widening of the powers of corporations and authorities, and, in turn, the exercising of those powers by the respective authorities in borrowing moneys that they do not have to identify.

We have a situation where authorities can borrow up to \$1 000 000 by the new gentlemen's agreement without the scrutiny or approval of the Loan Council. Even the Public Works Standing Committee, which has the oversight of most of the construction work (at least all of the construction expenditure exceeding \$500 000), has no scrutiny or oversight of the moneys obtained and expended by the 29 authorities I have been talking about. No Parliamentary Papers that come into this House present to the Parliament the source of the borrowings in the total sense. No Parliamentary Papers presented to this House at any time during the year indicate to the Parliament the term loans that are involved, the terms of the loans, the capital repayments, or the interest rate details applicable to those loans. We are considering an amount of about \$100 000 000. That is quite apart from the figures that are publicly available. This is \$100 000 000 that has been borrowed by the statutory authorities, which are not subject to the scrutiny of anyone.

They are completely autonomous in this practice, but overall the Treasury is responsible to pick up the tab if they go bad. That is the only time that we as representatives of the public become aware of any details involved in this sort of financial fiddling and practice. We become aware only when the authorities are in default and cannot meet the commitments applying to their respective borrowings. Not even the Auditor-General, who has a clear responsibility to audit the financial activities of the Government directly and to audit the financial activities of all authorities and arms of the Government that borrow under this canopy and protection of Government guarantee, has reported on the detail of these 29 authorities since 1975. Hence Sir, you may recall my question to the Premier today when I called on him to assist in bringing this vital information to Parliament, so that his claim of open Government is not only words but is demonstrated by tabling material for which we are responsible and to which we are entitled.

I place on record the Auditor-General's comments since 1975, and indeed since the time when he listed all of the 29 authorities that have this borrowing power and the protection of the Treasury's underwriting and guarantee. In his report of 1975, under the heading "Guarantees by the Treasurer", the Auditor-General stated:

Financial guarantees have been sanctioned by various Acts of Parliament which authorise the Treasurer to meet any claims for the repayment of moneys deposited or borrowed by certain undertakings in the event of default. There is thus a contingent liability upon the Treasurer to meet such claims. The undertakings which are currently subject to guarantee by the Government and details of such guarantees are as follows:

He went on and listed all of the 29 authorities and their commitments to that date. In 1976, it was a list only of the names of the authorities, as it was in 1977. Because of this incredible amount that we as a State have underwritten, we are entitled to know what is going on. This Parliament and the public are denied access to these details, and we have been snubbed again after a request for them of the Premier. On that basis and on the Premier's refusal to even attempt to answer my question today, how can we be reasonably called on to trust him and his management in future?

To me it is a devious and dangerous practice to continue to gain finances and to build up debts of the magnitude built up by the Premier. It is also dangerous to go outside the traditional and safe practices of raising funds and reporting on the borrowing details, keeping the public informed of what is happening and also keeping an open Government policy. It is a dangerous practice to go outside those guidelines. The Premier's own promotion and actions of continuing to authorise separate wings of the Government and semi-government authorities, giving them powers to borrow and the protection of Treasury guarantee as he has done and in accordance with his statement immediately before the recent election, as he intends to do, is a very dangerous and shonky practice and one that I will not accept, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that there is no other avenue for him to explore or any other method of raising the required funds for the needy areas and facilities in the State, and unless he undertakes to table in Parliament the true financial position of the State and the true and full financial encumbrances and details surrounding those authorities.

It is unfair and improper to allow this practice to continue, and it is no wonder there is an element of doubt about his activities held by the Opposition and that there is a growing doubt over his hidden activities of this type by the general public. He is inviting suspicion by this sort of

practice. I cannot stress too strongly that it is not desirable in the ordinary business sense; it is not desirable in the public sense; and, with the greatest respect to the integrity of his political actions in the past, I suggest that it is far from desirable in the political sense, too.

Whilst I support my colleagues in supporting the Bill, I warn the Government that it is on the wrong track in seeking to grasp at funds through wider avenues than have been traditionally available to the Government exercising those powers and, at the same time, failing to draw fairly and reasonably to the public's attention the actions that it is undertaking in the process.

**Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** I support the Bill but, before referring to it, I comment on the astonishing haste once again with which a substantial document has been presented to the House. This is the third time this has happened in two days, the previous two being the Bills before the House yesterday. In each case Opposition members have been faced with the problem of either neglecting their duties and not debating the issues, or of debating cold, as we are this evening and hoping we will do justice to the material before us. I suppose that later speakers will benefit from having waited for some time and being given a chance to peruse this Bill.

In my case I will not get beyond two-thirds of the Bill, and I hope that those who speak after me will attend to other matters such as community welfare and health. Most of the salient points have been made, but I add a few comments. I find it incredible that the Government should need to sit late this evening. Perhaps we will go to 4 a.m., but it is surprising that there is a need to debate this issue so late when, after all, it is intended to end the session rather early by Easter, and, judging by the comment of the Minister of Labour and Industry earlier this evening, we will not sit again until July.

I cannot understand the haste, when one considers that much of the \$26 000 000 which is included in this legislation will not be required until later in the session; for example, \$8 000 000 for health is set aside for possible delays in Federal Government payments towards the end of June. I cannot understand the haste with which we are being asked to debate this matter this evening.

One point that worries many Opposition members is the very rapid decline in prosperity in South Australia. We are aware that the whole of Australia has suffered from drought or flood for several years, causing economic crises of various kinds throughout the Commonwealth, but it was not long ago that the Premier was attending a press conference, in Perth, and praising his own financial acumen. He said that we were about \$50 000 000 in credit, whereas a little less than two years later we find that we are budgeting for a \$26 000 000 deficit. We are the only mainland State that is going into deficit budgeting (New South Wales \$500 000 hardly counts).

**Mr. Groom:** Fraser's not doing too brilliantly. He had to borrow \$2 000 000 000.

**Mr. ALLISON:** I am glad the honourable member has pointed that out. If the Federal Government has had to borrow \$2 000 000 000, the honourable member should not forget that we were last into the economic recession in Australia. If we have 400 000 people being paid unemployment benefits for a year by the Commonwealth, not by the State Governments, it, too, is facing a decline in income tax and other reimbursements.

Apart from that, we were told, only in 1975, that, by selling part of the State's railway system, South Australia would benefit over a 10-year period by \$800 000 000. If the member for Stuart says, "So it has," it highlights the fact that the finances of this State are in a parlous

condition, because not only have we got rid of everything of which normally Governments of mainland States have rid themselves, we have also spent the money for the railways. Once I had a railway, but now it has gone—Buddy, can you spare a dime, should be our signature tune.

We were in a favourable position, but we have been faced with a rapid decline during the past two years. This highlights the fact that somewhere along the line there must have been mismanagement and extravagant spending. I do not have to quote many people away from the Government front bench, because the Minister of Labour and Industry, in a press release only a few days ago, said that, of the \$45 000 000 spent on the State unemployment relief scheme, the Government could not claim that all of it had been spent wisely and that now, after two and a half years of pressure from the Opposition, the Government was at last appraising the manner in which it spends SURS money.

I could quote at least one scheme which was well supervised and which spent some unemployment relief money on the construction of saleyards in the South-East. If the Minister is looking for an adequate way of administering State unemployment relief money, he should have a word with the Mt. Gambier District Council, which administered State unemployment relief money on mechanisation, automation and producing saleyard rails, and installing them and doing an excellent job. I think it was the envy of many people. The Minister views the spending of \$45 000 000 with some trepidation (and I do not blame him), because there must be many instances (I know that some were quoted this evening) of money that was wasted.

Another case brought to my notice was where holes had been dug in which to plant trees. The trees were not available, so the holes were filled in on the premise that to dig for a second time would not be so difficult, because the holes had already been excavated. Although it might be a logical conclusion, it was a terrible waste of money to have to do the job twice.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Very annoying for the dogs.

**Mr. ALLISON:** Yes, to find the holes and not the trees.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope that the honourable member will stick to the Bill.

**Mr. ALLISON:** Yes. The dogs home is referred to later in the Bill.

**The SPEAKER:** I hope the honourable member can link up his remarks.

**Mr. ALLISON:** The member for Glenelg was referring to that. The Premier's claim that we have slightly less unemployment in South Australia than the national average tempts me to say that I will be interested in looking at the population statistics for South Australia because, on personal observations, I have assumed that many people have been leaving South Australia for the relative boom State of Western Australia and for the more relaxed State of Queensland, either to find work in the one or to retire to the other. On a population basis, the per capita unemployment figure would have declined. One has only to look around at the number of industries which have automated, using foreign-made machinery that did not provide employment for Australians and which, as a result of automation, was scaling down their work force, to realise that the unemployment situation is more than just a passing thing. It is not necessarily something that can be cured on a short-term basis by either State or Federal Governments. Nevertheless, there has been a continued slump in activity in South Australia. The Premier admits this, and says that the condition applies equally to the Commonwealth. He said that both State and Federal

Governments have had declining reimbursements from a wide range of taxes. South Australia, with its 1 000 000 population, hardly compares equally to the Commonwealth. As the Commonwealth has almost unilaterally maintained that massive unemployment figure simply highlights that fact.

The Premier also claims that he has kept a tight rein on all expenditures, and I will examine the Supplementary Estimates paper briefly later to check on that. I think there is evidence that not all expenditures have been kept in rein. The Premier says that he is seeking a virtual moratorium on all new expenditures in the Government area and that, too, is understandable. There are several instances of saving, and one I cite is the education bill. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out that the education increase was \$3 250 000 but, on examination on a percentage basis of the \$254 000 000 (the original estimate), it is only an increase of 1.27 per cent. That highlights the fact that, by careful examination of expenditure in the Education Department, some success has been achieved in pruning costs without necessarily diminishing the quality of education. There are few other increases that can compare with that for their lowness. The only other one is the Minister of Lands figure, where the increase in salaries is 1.13 per cent. There are some specific increases to which I will draw members' attention later.

There are additional factors which have not been mentioned by the Premier this afternoon and which would have thrown us into considerably greater deficit than the \$26 000 000. The inflation rate was budgeted for at 12 per cent, whereas the actual rate was 9.3 per cent. That means that we have already expended that 2.7 per cent, for which we have allowed for salaries and wage increases. We are now asking for substantial increases over and above that, and the year is only a little over half way through.

There is also the point that, as usual in South Australia, we get many extra-budgetary increases that are made by regulatory powers. They do not come before the House. One made last week was the 15 per cent increase in motor registration fees, and that alone will increase the income to \$48 000 000, representing an additional \$6 000 000 in fees that the Government is going to expend.

Without these extra-budgetary increases by regulation, we find the deficit far greater, and the people of South Australia are being asked regularly to pay more and more in this type of taxation. The point made by the member for Alexandra must be repeated, that Government mismanagement can effectively be covered up if we increase the number of statutory bodies in South Australia which have the power to borrow independently of the Loan Council; and we already have the Government asking us to accept that sort of thing. It would be possible for statutory bodies to borrow up to \$1 000 000 each. Their boards are appointed by the Government; the State underwrites the loans, and yet nowhere in any Parliamentary Paper is Parliament made aware of the size of the borrowings, the interest rates and the repayment rates; and that is something which any Government could use to cover up very substantial amounts of money—in our case so far, \$100 000 000. I believe, as the member for Alexandra does, that all loans by Government or semi-government bodies should be accounted for in this House by the Auditor-General and his department.

I commented a little earlier that the amount of money appropriated in addition for the Hospitals Department is only provisional: it is in case the Federal Government makes late payments for moneys due to the State for hospital services later in this year, in June; that is something that this House could have considered much

later, if necessary, instead of dealing with it at this time of the year. There is also the point that the Minister says that the Commonwealth alone appears to think it is interested in reducing hospital operating costs. It is an ironical remark, when there was a case of mismanagement or misappropriation brought to the Government's attention in the Northfield wards case, yet the Premier made light of it and went to great pains to dismiss that case completely when we on this side of the House were sure there was something behind it. We wonder how many more things there may be of that description that the Premier appears to be unconcerned about. It is a strange approach when we are voicing concern and yet doing nothing about things that are brought to our attention. It is an odd state of affairs; it makes one rather cynical.

The Minister of Works assured us that the consumption of water in South Australia could well and truly be met when he spoke to the Budget earlier in this financial year, when he said, "If people want extra water, they can have it, but they will simply have to pay for it." Here tonight once again we see that that remark was not strictly true because we are asked to foot the bill for considerably greater Engineering and Water Supply Department expenditure than we had envisaged. So the hint we had that people could have the water if they paid for it has proved to be untrue: work is being done for which money is not being recouped. Some of it is attributable to the irrigation areas, and we had another ironical debate this afternoon when we were asked by the member for Chaffey to help people who were in the irrigation areas to get some assistance for their grapes that they had produced under irrigation, and yet the Government backbenchers, with the concurrence of the front bench members of the Government, wiped that argument completely.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is now speaking to a debate we had this afternoon.

**Mr. ALLISON:** I am sorry. It is ironical that, when people need help, we cannot give it to them; yet we are providing a tremendous amount of water to produce crops that we cannot get rid of. It is one of the ironies of life, and that again was dealt with on Party lines instead of on merit lines. The Premier says that all additional appropriations sought in the Estimates will not be released without a continuing examination of changing departmental needs, but he does not say that restraint will be urged upon those departmental needs. There is no promise that what the Auditor-General asked the Government to do has been carried out, and the Education Department expenditure is the only one where I can see effective pruning already having been carried out without changing the policy of education.

Another surprising item is the additional contingency cost in the Government Printing Division and the higher Public Building Department charges. These charges are dealt with lightly in two paragraphs on page 7, under "Services and supplies" but, when we look at the Estimates, we see an amount under the Chief Secretary's Department, under the Government Printing Division, of \$270 000. This represents a 54 per cent increase in expenditure in less than six months. Under the Law Department, *Hansard*, printing and publishing, there is \$140 000. That, too, represents almost a 54 per cent increase in expenditure. That is a very substantial amount and, coupled with the fact that the Public Buildings Department has, for some reason, been using an archaic method of estimating the amounts of rents payable, it highlights the need for a review of method in that area.

There is also the question whether the Public Buildings Department is holding too much property that it could profitably dispose of, and also whether it is holding office

space on lease that it could effectively dispose of or sublet to someone. These issues have to be looked into and they can be dealt with in the Committee stage; I shall certainly be asking questions on them. The provision of the Department for Corporate Affairs may or may not have been a wise move since it is a move to co-ordinate the activities of supervising corporate law at State and Commonwealth level. The aims seem to be good. There is a strange claim, however, that the provision of a new department has resulted in savings in the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch and in the Law Department, but it is very euphemistic to think that the expenditure of \$500 000 can be seen as resulting in a saving because, had that department not been created, only an additional \$90 000 would have been required in the Law Department, for example.

The claim the Treasurer makes that the housing programme included in the Supplementary Estimates has made a considerable difference to his original estimates seems rather odd. Housing sales, in fact, were above the estimate. This implies that there was a better situation than the Government had anticipated, and this is further highlighted when one considers that prices were down on expectation, so many more houses were sold in the first six months of the financial year; and, therefore, there should not be any complaint when we make provision for the remission of stamp duty on the sale of houses. At least, that should have had some effect in boosting the economy, and money spent on stamp duty remissions should be reflected in an improvement in the work that is being carried on in the building industry in South Australia.

That should have been a statement on the credit side rather than one viewed with pessimism. Turning now to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, there is a statement by the Minister that the decline in the amount of subdivisional activity made it necessary to transfer staff. There was also a transfer of staff from one department into another of the drafting staff. Here again, the Government has steadily increased the staff of Government departments. It has reduced the amount of private contract work and, as a result, in times like the present, when we have something of a work recession, the Government has to carry the whole of the work force. Here again, there should be no cause for complaint by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The Government has to carry the whole of the work force. In fact is finding work for those staff members when, under normal conditions, private enterprise would have had to stand them off and retrench them. This is a different method of getting work done when Government departments insist on doing everything, and it reflects the depressed state of private industry and the fact that the Government has been doing far more work than it has been allocating to private enterprise.

I am concerned that \$500 000 was spent on giving an alum dose to the Millbrook and Mount Bold reservoirs. While this may have been an effective method of precipitating the excessive amount of mud which came into those reservoirs, there is still the point that flocculation of mud will greatly increase the precipitation of silt on the reservoir floors. If this work is unable to continue, I can only say that those reservoirs will have a rapidly increased silting rate, a greatly decreased storage rate, and that before long we will need extra reservoirs or the existing reservoirs will have to be subject to massive excavation. The remedy may have been effective this year, but it is not to be recommended as a continuing measure for flocculation and purification of water.

Turning now to the further education area, there is mention of additional staff costs and the cost of pre-



apprenticeship training courses, migrant education, and enrichment courses. I was under the impression that people doing enrichment courses were being asked to pay for them and that the courses in future would be run on a cost basis; if they were not profitable, they would not be run. I am also wondering, in relation to migrant education, whether the saga entered into at the end of last year has been resolved, because the Commonwealth Government made it quite clear that supplementary funds were available, if applied for, for adult migrant education. Therefore, I shall be asking the Minister whether those funds have been applied for, because I am sure the Commonwealth could be asked to foot at least part of the further education bill.

There are many areas which we have not been able to examine in the short time the Bill has been before us. I simply cannot understand why members on this side should be asked to debate this Bill so late into the evening with so little notice, and why Government members should be asked to have us inflict this upon them when it could be done much more efficiently and in a more leisurely manner later this week and early next week. I support the Bill.

**Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles):** I join my colleagues in deploring the manner in which this Bill has been brought before the House and the manner in which the Government has introduced Bills during this session, without allowing proper time for consideration before we are obliged to debate them. It is an indictment of the Government that, at one stage a short while ago, there were only one Minister and one backbencher on the opposite side to hear the Opposition debate matters which are of great importance to the people of South Australia, and to hear in fact debate on an Appropriation Bill involving a sum of \$26 000 000.

I should say that I have noticed, since I have been in this House, an air of unreality about many of the deliberations that are conducted here. When one witnesses the situation tonight, one can see the reason. For my own part, it is a great relief to step out on to North Terrace occasionally, to see people walking by, and to be reminded of the reason why we are here. Quite often, I think members in this place, particularly Government members, forget that we are here to represent the people. If the people could be in those empty galleries right now, I think they would be deeply disappointed in the Government they elected last September.

I think the Bill should be subjected to thorough scrutiny and informed debate, but that has simply not been possible in the circumstances in which it has been introduced. The Premier's second reading explanation gives the same distorted view of the State's financial situation as did his Budget speeches in October. His ploy seems to be, "Cry poor, and blame the Commonwealth, and then you can get away with murder"; indeed, I believe that the Premier did get away with grave misrepresentation in his second reading explanation.

I do not propose to speak at length, but I should like to dwell on two matters which I believe would be of interest to my constituents and in fact to all South Australians. One is health; the other is community welfare. On page 4 of his speech, the Premier made the following statement:

Whilst the Commonwealth seems prepared to agree to some small increase in their budget allocation for net operating costs, they have so far failed to acknowledge that rising wages and prices have added greatly to hospital costs and that the Commonwealth level of support is well below that required to meet minimum standards . . .

That is outright misrepresentation. Overall, the States, in

the last year, sought an increase of 22 per cent in negotiations with the Commonwealth for hospital costs. Inflation has been running at about 9 per cent, 10 per cent, or 11 per cent. The Commonwealth cut back the 22 per cent that was requested overall by the States, but South Australia's hospitals budget was increased by about 12 per cent. This amply compensates for inflation, and yet the Premier has made the following comment:

The Commonwealth have so far failed to acknowledge that rising wages and prices have added greatly to hospital costs and that the Commonwealth level of support is well below that required to meet minimum standards of patient care and safety.

Does the Premier not know that inflation takes account of rising wages and prices and that the State percentage increase therefore covers increased recurrent costs which are the result of inflation, and allows for a growth rate as well? Had the Commonwealth Government not been so resolute in its determination to bring down inflation, the Premier would have been placed in an infinitely more difficult position in framing his Budget and this Appropriation Bill.

The main misrepresentation in the Premier's speech results from his ignoring the fact that South Australia is so much better off under the federalism policy of the present Commonwealth Government. In the current year, we have received a total revenue assistance from the Commonwealth of \$507 700 000, an increase of 17.4 per cent. That is a clear indication that the ball is at the Premier's feet and at the Government's feet, to determine where that increase should be spent. It is no use blaming the Commonwealth for the fact that South Australia supposedly cannot make up its needs in relation to hospital expenditure.

If the Premier chooses to spend the additional money he has on wasteful and unnecessary projects, his complaining that he is short of money for hospitals is of no use. It is his responsibility to allocate priorities and it is of no use blaming the Commonwealth. I also remind the Government that health care costs are soaring, and it is very much a State responsibility to try to contain them. The editorial in the *Advertiser* of February 15 states:

Such is the alarming rate of increase of health costs in Australia that any proposal that may arrest, or even slow, the upward spiral deserves serious consideration. The total cost of health care in the present financial year has been estimated at \$8 000 000 000, compared with 5 235 000 000 last year and \$2 505 000 000 in 1972-73.

The \$8 000 000 000, which is for the whole of Australia, represents about \$615 for each person and, if that is what is being spent in South Australia, it seems that there is much room for pruning and improvement.

I will deal now with community welfare expenditure. The amount provided by the Appropriation Act (No. 2) of 1977 for financial assistance to sole supporting parents was \$6 200 000, and an additional \$700 000 is required under this Bill, bringing the total for the current year to about \$7 000 000. It will be interesting to note (and I will ask the Minister about this when the opportunity arises) how many of these sole supporting parents are widows or widowers and how many are sole supporting parents as a result of family breakdown or a choice not to marry in the first place.

I remind honourable members that the destruction of the family relationship is not only of incalculable cost in human terms but also has massive economic consequences for which the whole community must pay. The amount of about \$7 000 000 for the current year is just the tip of the iceberg in terms of the total economic consequences of family breakdown. It is appropriate to refer to the matter

in connection with this Bill, because it is the Government's responsibility to make many planning decisions that affect home and family life.

I believe that Government failure to identify and relieve the stresses of family life in an urban community, notably stresses caused through isolation resulting possibly from transport difficulties, has a profound effect and results in our considering provisions of that kind in this Bill. In addition, of course, legislation is before this Parliament that is divisive of family relationships.

I have touched on only two aspects of this Bill. I regard it as extremely unfortunate, not to say wrong, that so few members have been able to speak, because of the way in which the Bill has been introduced. It is hardly surprising that Opposition members, who have had barely an evening in which to consider it and who would want to make an informed contribution to the debate, have not been able to do so. In the knowledge that this Bill must be supported if the Government is to continue its responsibility, I support the measure, but I do so hoping that my remarks and those of my colleagues about proper consideration of Bills will be taken into account by the Government.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare)** moved:

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

**Dr. EASTICK (Light):** I indicate quickly that I am not the principal speaker in this grievance debate. However, I want to bring before the House a matter, the importance of which is highlighted by the announcement this afternoon that as from Thursday, March 2, private members' time will not be allowed. Between November 22 and 29 last, I placed on notice question No. 209. It is at present at the top of the Notice Paper and has been there for the past three weeks. Regrettably, it has not yet been answered, and it is a matter of importance to certain people, three of whom are drastically involved.

The matter relates to the variable attitude to persons who became candidates for the 1977 State election. The problem may well have existed in the past, but certainly it existed at the 1977 State election. Until I get the answer to the question I, as a member of this House, cannot seek to rectify the situation of those people who have been so grossly disadvantaged. I refer members to other questions that I have asked during this session, particularly at page 913 of *Hansard* of November 22. There, under the heading "Election candidates", there is information about persons associated with Government service in this State who were candidates for both principal Parties and for the Australian Democrats, and it indicates that they came from a variety of Government employment. It also shows that some were not re-employed for a considerable period. What it does not pinpoint (because the information was not asked for) is that some were denied employment long before they needed to be so denied under the Public Service Act.

As a result of that loss of employment, people were gravely disadvantaged financially, whilst other similar candidates suffered no loss of seniority, pay or entitlements, and certainly no loss of continuity of service. Page 1186 of *Hansard* of December 6 indicates the dates on which the various polls were declared, some within four or five days of the election, whereas others, where it was just as easy to determine the result, were not declared until two weeks later.

In several cases people were refused the opportunity to apply for re-employment until the poll was declared, whereas other people (and it will be noted from the detail

on page 913 of *Hansard*) were employed on the Monday after the election. They applied on Monday morning and were permitted to go back into employment in the Government service immediately, while others were denied the opportunity for employment for more than three weeks. That loss of employment for three weeks, in addition to the time they lost before the election, has been a significant embarrassment to them, when their case is compared to the cases of other persons who did not resign and cases of persons who were not required to resign until the day on which nominations closed.

One candidate in a country area heard on radio the announcement that there was to be an early State election. Members of this place will recall that it was announced just after 2 p.m. on Wednesday, and the news was broadcast. The person to whom I refer was in the teaching profession and indicated to the Principal that she had heard this news and wanted him to know that she intended to stand as a candidate.

The Principal would not allow that woman to go back into her classroom to claim her private possessions. He would not let her go back in to obtain those basic articles that she had taken into the classroom, and he certainly would not allow her to continue teaching in that classroom during the period leading up to the closure of nominations, which was about 2½ weeks later. She was therefore prevented from fulfilling her role as a teacher.

**Mr. Gunn:** Wrongful dismissal.

**Dr. EASTICK:** That is what it amounts to, whereas other people in the teaching profession did not even resign their position during the course of the election and remained in employment in the education system from go to wo. I mention these matters briefly now, but more must be said about them unless the Government quickly gives me an answer and resolves the situation for all those who were candidates.

It is entirely wrong that a period extending from the end of November until almost the end of February has been allowed to elapse without the Minister giving a complete report or even an interim report on the matter. It is a serious matter when the Government fails to acknowledge the right of a member of this House to know these details.

Hopefully, more can be said about this before I as a back-bencher am prevented from speaking on behalf of these people who, unfortunately and regrettably have been given what might be termed a "bum steer". They have been prevented from obtaining justice, and that is against the best interest of the Parliamentary system.

At the end of February we still do not know whether a green belt in the northern areas between Elizabeth, Smithfield and Gawler will be established. This is a matter of great urgency. We want to know now whether there will be Government support for the maintenance of a green belt that will help preserve the character of that area. I know that the Adelaide metropolitan plan of 1962 and the Munno Para District Council's plan for the area have given due regard to the existence of this area as a green belt. People want to know whether the Government has accepted the responsibility of guaranteeing that there will always be a significant green belt in that area, thereby removing the indecision, concern and question constantly being expressed by everyone who has a genuine interest in retaining the aesthetics, character and amenity of this area of the State.

**Mr. WHITTEN** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 11.15 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, February 23, at 2 p.m.