

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 18 July 1978

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

PETITIONS: MINORS BILL

Mr. **BECKER** presented a petition signed by 323 residents of South Australia praying that the House would reject any legislation which deprived parents of their rights and responsibilities in respect of the total health and welfare of their children.

Mr. **WILSON** presented a similar petition signed by 110 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITION: INNESTON

Mr. **WILSON** presented a petition signed by 40 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to preserve the town of Inneston and allow entry of domestic pets.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ALBURY-WODONGA PAPER PULP MILL

The **Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister for the Environment)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J. D. CORCORAN**: The Leader of the Opposition, in a recent press statement, accused the South Australian and New South Wales Governments of a conspiracy of silence over a plan to build a \$155 000 000 paper pulp mill on the Murray River at Albury-Wodonga. I totally reject his assertion. It is completely untrue, and I suspect that the Leader knew, at the time he made the statement, that it was untrue. If he did not, he was guilty of culpable ignorance, because in the two years prior to the Leader's accusation I issued at least eight public statements on the matter. I have also sought from the New South Wales Government assurances that the interests of South Australia be protected, and on numerous occasions I have informed the public of these approaches. In this House last Thursday, the member for Chaffey spoke in similar vein to his Leader, and I also emphatically reject his statements.

Two years prior to the Leader's showing any interest in this matter, I first wrote to the relevant Minister in New South Wales on 20 July 1976.

Mr. **Tonkin**: Read *Hansard* of 1976.

The **Hon. J. D. CORCORAN**: Well, Mr. Burdett, in the other place, had something to say. I did not see where the Leader had anything to say about it.

At the same time, I wrote to the relevant Victorian Minister. On 28 October of that year, following the concurrence of contracting Governments that the River Murray Commission could consider matters of water quality, I instructed the South Australian Commissioner on the River Murray Commission to raise, at the next meeting of the commission, the question of the establishment of the mill.

On 17 March 1977 the Premier wrote to the President of the River Murray Commission and expressed the

following sentiment:

It is essential to the continued development of this State that the quality of Murray River waters not be degraded by industrial or other wastes and, accordingly, the initiatives of your commission in this matter will be extremely important to South Australia.

On 21 March this year, I again wrote to the New South Wales Government. I wrote to the Minister for Planning and Environment, seeking his assurance that all downstream users of the Murray River would be protected by any effluent disposal agreements entered into with Australian Newsprint Mills.

During the past two years there have been intensive and extensive studies involving the relevant authorities in New South Wales, the River Murray Commission, and the Engineering and Water Supply Department and Environment Department in this State. Those studies are still continuing.

Let me make one point clear. That is that no go-ahead has been given to the Albury project. There are many questions to be answered and many conditions to be met before the final approval for the project is given. All that has happened to date is that the environmental aspects of the project have been endorsed by the State Pollution Control Commission of New South Wales, subject to the company meeting a number of conditions.

The company has to take two further steps and meet all the conditions laid down before final approval is given. First, the company must apply under the New South Wales Clean Waters Act for approval of the design of the plant. If this approval is given the company then must make application under the same Act to discharge effluent to the Murray. During both of these phases information will be made available to enable authorities, such as the River Murray Commission, to make comment.

I have instructed South Australia's Commissioner on the River Murray Commission to keep me fully informed on every development in this matter. He has made clear to me that the commission is seeking further information on a number of matters, including the quality of the effluent, and the biological monitoring programme.

The commission is also awaiting reaction from the New South Wales State Pollution Control Commission on the River Murray Commission's assessment of the addendum to the environmental impact statement before moving further on the matter. In view of all this, it is completely erroneous for anyone to say that the Albury project has been given the go-ahead.

The Leader has behaved in a cynical way on this matter, without the benefit of adequate, if any, research. He has levelled wild and baseless accusations at this Government.

I do not intend to call a halt, as the Leader has done, before all investigations are complete: to do so would be irresponsible and foolish. But I assure the House that when all the questions are answered and all the strict conditions are met by the company, if I am still not satisfied about the effects of the plant on the Murray River in South Australia, I will be shouting loud and clear that the project be halted. I also give the House an assurance that, if such a situation arises, the matter will be taken up on a Government to Government basis. I hope this clarifies for the House the attitude of the South Australian Government and that of myself in this matter.

QUESTIONS

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

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT BUILDING

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): How much did the Government pay for the building to be occupied by the Department for the Environment at 45-47 The Parade, Norwood?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The amount is \$412 500.

EYRE PENINSULA SCHOOLS

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What long-term plans has the Education Department to upgrade the education facilities and standards in the Port Kenny and Elliston schools?

2. Does the department intend to build new schools at either centre, or has consideration been given to developing a similar complex to that now operating at Karcultaby in the area?

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

1. The Regional Director of Education has identified Elliston Special Rural School as one which should be considered for upgrading and conversion to an Area School. Although the need for upgrading is recognised and consideration will be given to developing Elliston as an Area School, the project is not on a current planning programme. It will probably be included when the next forward building programme is prepared. The Education Department is planning a small schools redevelopment programme. This programme aims at the upgrading of one, two and three teacher schools and it is in the feasibility study stage. Some preliminary design work has been undertaken to support the study and funds have been allocated in the cash flow programme. Port Kenny Special Rural School has been included in the small schools redevelopment programme.

2. No consideration has been given to the nature of the facilities that will eventually be provided at Elliston. If a decision is taken to establish an area school then specialist facilities will be provided but not on the scale of Karcultaby. The secondary enrolment at Karcultaby is 70. Elliston has 34 secondary students and Port Kenny has 12. Present thinking is to retain two separate schools and not to build a single school to serve the area.

HALLETT AREA SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Does the Government intend to upgrade the buildings at the Hallett Area School and, if so, what improvements are planned and when is it anticipated that work will commence?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Upgrading is planned for Hallett Primary School but firm commencement dates have not been determined. A two-module Demac unit will provide library and administrative accommodation. Upgrading of the toilets is planned as part of the regional minor works programme for 1978-79.

YOUTH CLUBS

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Is the Government still providing funds to youth clubs during school holidays and, if so, what are the criteria for determining eligibility?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:

1. The Commonwealth Government is continuing to

provide funds for vacation care programmes, for which youth clubs are eligible to apply.

2. The criteria are as follows:

(1) Priority of admission will be given to children in needy circumstances.

(2) The sponsoring organisation will:

(a) adopt a sliding scale of fees, allowing for contributions according to capacity to pay;

(b) accept responsibility for children in the period they are in care, according to parent or guardian's advice;

(c) make the service available to all members of the community;

(d) comply with States and local government requirements in its operations and facilities;

(e) co-operate with other organisations and welfare services as appropriate;

(f) take out all normal and appropriate insurances, including public liability insurance.

3. All activities related to the employment of staff and care of children shall be the sole responsibility of the programme sponsor. Neither the Commonwealth nor the Childhood Services Council shall indemnify the sponsor for any act or claim resulting from its operations.

4. The organisation agrees to maintain the equipment purchased with Commonwealth Government funds, and which has a life expectancy beyond the immediate project, in good order for use in any future programme as directed by the responsible administering authority.

5. Within two weeks of the conclusion of the vacation programme, the organisation will provide to the responsible administering authority, a certified statement of income and expenditure, prepared by a qualified accountant, which relates to the total project. This statement should clearly identify all sources of income, including grants and all expenditures, by item.

6. A statement by the sponsoring organisation will accompany the income and expenditure advice, to the effect that Commonwealth moneys have been used for the approved purpose, and specifying the amount so applied.

7. Within two weeks of the conclusion of the vacation programme, the sponsoring organisation will provide a report to the Childhood Services Council on a form to be provided by the Childhood Services Council.

Applications should be sent to the Chairman, Childhood Services Council at the address shown below:

Childhood Services Council,
168 Melbourne Street,
North Adelaide, 5006

TEACHER HOUSING

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What plans has the Teacher Housing Authority for the new township of Leigh Creek?

2. Is it anticipated that the authority will build homes, or will they be provided by the Electricity Trust?

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

1. The Education Department has requested that the South Australian Teacher Housing Authority arrange for provision of accommodation for 12 married teachers, plus 12 single teachers, in the new town of Leigh Creek.

2. This is still subject to negotiation between the Teacher Housing Authority and the Electricity Trust of South Australia.

LEIGH CREEK SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What type of school will be built in the new township of Leigh Creek, and when is it anticipated that work will commence?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: While preliminary planning has begun on the assumption that the replacement school will be Demac construction, there remains a possibility that the modular construction adopted by the Electricity Trust could be used. Both the Public Buildings Department and ETSA commissioned architects have produced notional plans. A clear directive from the Electricity Trust on the type of construction to be permitted at Leigh Creek has not been received. Present planning is for construction to commence early in 1980, and the cash flow programme provides for this. However, the Electricity Trust has not set a firm date for the occupation of the new town and consequently the commencement date for the construction of the new school has not been determined.

MOUNT BRYAN SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Does the Government intend to upgrade and repair any of the buildings or facilities at the Mount Bryan School and, if so, when and what is the programme?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Although the upgrading of Mount Bryan Primary School is not on a current planning programme, it has been included in the small schools redevelopment programme for which a feasibility study is being made. Provision had been made in the Loan works programme for funds to be available for the implementation of the programme if it is approved. It is likely, therefore, that the redevelopment of Mount Bryan Primary School will be placed on a planning programme in the near future, but firm dates have not been determined. If the project is programmed it would be for complete redevelopment.

MARIHUANA

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Does the Government support the statements put forward by the New South Wales Attorney-General, Mr. Walker, that marihuana should be decriminalised to a degree that people would be permitted to grow it in their backyards for their own use and, if so, does the Government intend to introduce legislation which would have the effect of decriminalising marihuana?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Government has not at this stage formed any policy on this matter and does not intend to do so pending the receipt of the report of the Royal Commission set up to investigate the non-medical use of drugs.

GOVERNOR

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Does the Government require written undertakings of any kind from any person who is invited to accept the position of Governor and, if so, what undertakings are required and who receives them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM

Mr. WILSON (on notice):

1. What plans does the Government have to relieve the accommodation crisis at the South Australian Museum,

and what will they cost and, if no plans have been made, why not?

2. Does the Government have any plans to increase the number of staff at the South Australian Museum and, if so, what are the planned increases and, if not, why not?

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

1. This matter is currently under review.

2. Not during the current financial year because of restrictions on funding due to the policies towards the States of the Federal Liberal Government.

SCHOOL CATEGORIES

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What formula exists for determining the staffing arrangements of high schools and, if categories exist, what are those categories and their purpose?

2. Have the categories changed since 1 January 1977 and, if so, in what way and for what purpose?

3. Are any changes contemplated in the category system in the foreseeable future and, if so, what are the proposed changes, when will they be implemented and for what purpose are the specific changes being effected?

4. Is any similar scheme in operation for primary schools and, if so, what are the details and what changes, if any, are contemplated?

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

1. Over the past several years high schools have been staffed by considering staff under various categories and status levels:

A category staff normally teach classes of enrolment 30 plus in general subjects (that is, mathematics).

B category staff normally teach classes of enrolment under 20 in subjects where, for safety or other reasons, it is important not to exceed this limit (that is, technical studies).

C category staff are those that teach very little or very small classes and hence have little effect on class sizes (that is, principals and student counsellors).

The past ratio of these various categories for a particular school is used, in conjunction with the projected enrolment, to give a base staff figure. The principal then negotiates with the staffing superintendent for extra teachers to meet special school needs not covered adequately by the base figure (N category staff). Once the staff numbers had been determined the senior and deputy principal establishment is determined by applying a formula based on the total full-time equivalent number of staff. These teachers fall within this count.

The purpose of categories is to allow an automatic adjustment for variations from a strict pro rata formula so that schools with a curriculum rich in B category subjects are not pressed for staff in the A category area.

2. Schools with secondary students were staffed using this basic formula in 1977 and 1978. Only very minor changes of definition were made to those teachers of subjects who should be included in the various categories.

3. This formula has been useful during the period of transition of many ex-technical schools to the present situation where all secondary schools are comprehensive co-educational institutions. At the same time the staffing process has gone from almost open-ended teacher recruitment in a period of teacher shortage to strictly controlled staff allocation in a period of teacher surplus.

4. In 1978 an alteration was made in the method of staffing primary schools. The total staff or establishment was composed of a basic target and a negotiable factor. The basic target included principals, deputy principals, classroom teachers as well as provision for non-contact time and was sufficient for most schools to operate

effectively and efficiently. The basic target was calculated by dividing the anticipated February opening enrolment by a staffing factor and adjusting that total to include senior staff.

Schools operating special programmes or whose enrolments were expected to increase markedly made application for additional staff and these requests were considered and additional appointments made. However, the basic target is geared to provide the maximum number of classroom teachers thereby ensuring small class sizes. As a consequence there is a very limited number of teachers available for this negotiable area. The formula has worked well in all cases except small schools where a very slight increase in enrolment can mean an additional teacher. In 1978 the librarian entitlement was not included in the basic target but it is planned to do this in the coming year. No major changes are planned for the 1979 staffing exercise other than modification for small schools and the inclusion of the librarian in the basic target.

CREDIT TRIBUNAL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is Judge Rogerson engaged full-time on duties as Chairman of the Credit Tribunal and, if not, what proportion of his time does he spend on these duties and what other judicial duties does he undertake?

2. What salary is he being paid and what are the arrangements regarding superannuation for him?

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

1. No. It is proposed once Judge Rogerson has settled in that he will undertake other duties of a similar nature to those performed by the other judges of the Local and District Criminal Court.

2. Judge Rogerson receives the normal salary and is subject to the normal arrangements regarding superannuation applicable to judges of the Local and District Criminal Court.

JUDGE DAUGHERTY

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What financial arrangements with regard to superannuation were made with Judge Daugherty on his appointment as a judge?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The contributions made by Judge Daugherty to the Superannuation Department were returned to him with some interest thereon.

CHIEF JUSTICE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. When does the retirement of the Hon. the Chief Justice become effective and when is it proposed to appoint his successor?

2. Is it proposed to appoint the Hon. Mr. Justice King as Chief Justice?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Honourable Chief Justice will retire at the end of October, at which time consideration will be given to the appointment of his successor.

SALISBURY REPORT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it proposed to introduce legislation to give effect to the recommendation of the Royal Commissioner, Justice Mitchell, in her Report on the Dismissal of Harold Hubert Salisbury, that

the Police Regulation Act, 1952-1973, should be amended to provide that the Commissioner of Police may be removed from office by the Governor for any of the causes to be specified in the amendment and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As announced at the time of publication of the report, the Government will introduce legislation to give effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commissioner during this session.

VICTOR HARBOR LAND

Mr. CHAPMAN (on notice): Does the Government intend to acquire the land adjacent to the Victor Harbor High School and, if so, when, and does the land acquisition proposal include section 593, Kullaroo Road, Victor Harbor?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: An interim management committee has recently been formed to assist with the redevelopment of the Victor Harbor High School as part of the South Coast Educational Redevelopment Plan. In making recommendations to the Education Department this committee will advise on any additional land as part of the redevelopment. This additional land may include the Victor Harbor oval. The interim management committee has yet to forward a report to the Education Department and therefore it is not possible at this stage to state precisely what land may be required.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT POSITION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Has a new position in the Education Department, senior to that of Director, Administration and Finance, been created and, if so:

(a) when;

(b) why;

(c) what is the title to be given to such position; and

(d) has an appointment yet been made to it and, if no such appointment has yet been made, is it still proposed to make an appointment, and when?

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

1. Most recently on 24 March 1978.

2. To strengthen the financial management structures of the Education Department.

3. Director.

4. A nomination has been made and an appeal has been lodged against the nomination. It is still proposed to make an appointment. An application will be made after the due process of appeal has been completed.

ADOPTION COMMITTEE

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. When was the Community Welfare Advisory Committee on Adoption Matters re-established?

2. How many members have been appointed?

3. Who are those members?

4. What are its terms of reference?

5. When is it due to report?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. 9 June 1978.

2. Six.

3. Professor Peter Eisen, Dr. G. W. Dahlenberg, Reverend Father Foale, Mr. P. A. Fopp, Ms. Marie Mune, and Mr. G. Pope.

4. (1) To recommend to the Minister of Community Welfare general criteria, from the criteria already accepted, which should be adopted in relation to adoption applicants wishing to adopt children from overseas, to

ensure that the needs of these children are met.

(2) To consider what changes or additional criteria, if any, should apply to these adoption applicants.

(3) To relate the proposed criteria to the criteria applying generally in those countries from which children are available for adoption.

(4) To recommend to the Minister any action that should be taken in relation to the list of applicants already approved to adopt children from overseas.

5. 30 September 1978.

ADOPTION AGENCIES

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. How many private adoption agencies have operated from South Australia in the field of inter-country adoption during the period 1972 to 1978?

2. What are the names of those agencies?

3. How many applications to adopt from overseas were made, how many were refused, and how many children were placed by each of these agencies during consecutive six-month periods from January 1972 to June 1978?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. Three.

2. Australian Adoptive Families Association Adoption Agency (A.A.F.A.). Australian Society for Inter-Country Aid Children Adoption Agency (A.S.I.A.C.). International Children's Association Adoption Agency (I.C.A.A.).

3. Figures were not recorded on a six-monthly basis.

Year ending 30 June	Applications received	Applications refused	Children placed
1973	26	—	} 38*
1974	53	2	
1975	366	3	139*
1976	34	1	60*
1977	220	—	A.A.F.A. 7 A.S.I.A.C. 53
			60
1978	170	3	A.S.I.A.C. 11 D.C.W. 34
			45

* Separate figures not available for private adoption agencies.

ADOPTIONS

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): How many approvals were outstanding, and applications for approval were made, for inter-country and South Australian adoptions, and how many children were placed from each area during one-month periods covering the last four years?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is not possible to retrospectively count at any given time the number of approved prospective adopters who did not have children placed with them for adoption. At present, the numbers are:

For Australian children	548
Inter-country adoption	194

Statistics are not available on a monthly basis. Annual figures are:

Year ending 30 June	Applications received	Children placed
1975	639	275
1976	476	239
1977	326	189
1978	300	149

Inter-country Adoption

Year ending 30 June	Applications received	Children placed
1975	366	139
1976	34	60
1977	220	60
1978	170	45

ADOPTION GROUPS

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Why have no representatives of inter-country adoption groups been appointed to the re-instituted Community Welfare Advisory Committee on Adoption Matters?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The independence of the committee is seen as important and it would be impracticable to have every interest group represented on such a committee. The advisory committee has written to the inter-country adoption organisations inviting their written submissions.

ADOPTION PANEL

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Will the Minister of Community Welfare allow adoption agencies and associated bodies to nominate, for his consideration, members to the panel established by the recent amending Act?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Adoption of Children Act Amendment Act provides for "two . . . members of the public with special interest in the field of adoption of children" to be members of the adoption panel. The Minister of Community Welfare has invited the South Australian Council of Social Service to nominate four qualified people, from whom he may appoint two.

ADOPTION PROCEDURES

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Why do prospective adopters who are involved in Government-to-Government arranged inter-country adoptions continue to seek the advice of private adoption agencies on matters of basic procedure?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Prospective adopters can seek advice from any source they choose.

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Will people who are refused approval to adopt by the Community Welfare Department retain the right to contest such a decision in a court of law, free of the administrative powers of the department and the Minister?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Adoption of Children Act Amendment Act does not provide a right of appeal to a court. Adoption boards provided for in section 72 of the Adoption of Children Act and the new adoption of children regulations will hear and decide applications for re-consideration of decisions of the Director-General. The boards will have power to vary or reverse decisions of the Director-General. They will be free of the administrative powers of the department and the Minister.

INTER-COUNTRY ADOPTIONS

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. When inter-country adoptions formalised in residence overseas are automatically recognised in Australia what will be, in detail, the effect on the various processes of inter-country adoption?

2. Will the Community Welfare Department continue to issue approvals and will these approvals conform to the adoption of children regulations even though formalisation of the adoption would be outside the jurisdiction of the South Australian courts?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. The present Adoption of Children Act provides for recognition of foreign adoptions subject to certain conditions (see sections 39 and 40 of the Act). Amendments to section 39 are subject to agreement on uniform legislation between the States and Territories of the Commonwealth. This is still under consideration. The effect on processes of inter-country adoption cannot be categorically stated until this matter is finalised.

2. See 1. above.

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Does the Department for Community Welfare impose quotas on adoptions arranged through private inter-country adoption agencies and, if so, why?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes. In the interests of the children concerned, if the principal officer of the agency is engaged on a part-time basis, limits may be placed on the number of adoption placements that may be arranged in a specified period to ensure quality service.

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): What procedures are currently required for inter-country adoption agencies to be permitted to operate as such in South Australia and overseas to place children for adoption?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: To meet the requirements of the Adoption of Children Act and regulations as they relate to private adoption agencies.

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Do the terms of reference of the Community Welfare Department advisory committee on adoptions enable it to examine thoroughly the objections to the new legislation lodged by the adoption agencies that have operated in the field of inter-country adoption?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes.

GOLDEN GROVE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Does the Premier propose to answer the letter dated 19 March 1978 written to him by Mr. John A. Longhurst of 29 Allen Drive, Para Hills concerning the proposed development of Golden Grove and, if so, when and why has he not yet replied to it and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A reply was sent to Mr. Longhurst on 7 July 1978.

CONTACT REGISTER

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Is the Community Welfare Department satisfied with the way the Adopted Persons Contact Register is working and, if not, what action does it intend taking to promote the register and when will any such action be taken?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes.

DON DUNSTAN'S AUSTRALIA

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Did any member of the Premier's staff assist in the compiling and writing of the book "Don Dunstan's Australia" and, if so, whom and to what extent?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. My personal secretary undertook some typing in her own time.

LICENSING COURT MAGISTRATE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. For how long is it proposed that Mr. J. D. Claessen act as a Licensing Court magistrate?

2. Is it proposed to appoint him permanently as a Licensing Court magistrate?

3. What is now the salary for such magistracy?

4. Is Mr. Claessen a practitioner of the Supreme Court?

5. What are his qualifications for his present appointment?

6. Is he expected to carry out judicial functions under the Licensing Act?

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

1. It is proposed that Mr. Claessen will act as Licensing Court magistrate until the position is filled on a permanent basis.

2. Applications will be called for the position in the usual way. An application from Mr. Claessen would be considered along with any other applications received.

3. \$28 654.

4. No.

5. Mr. Claessen holds the degrees of Bachelor of Law and Master of Law. He has wide experience in the Public Service, including service in the Supreme Court Department and the Law Department.

6. Yes.

COMMUNITY WELFARE

Mr. CHAPMAN (on notice):

1. Will the Minister provide a list of the situations of the established Community Welfare Department offices in South Australia?

2. Does the Government intend opening any further community welfare offices during the next three years and, if so, where?

3. How many field community welfare officers resigned during 1976-77 and 1977-78, and who were they?

4. How many field officers had their services terminated by the department during the same period, who were they, and what were the reasons for the termination of their employment?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. A list of the situations of the established community welfare offices in South Australia is available on pages 79-81 of the Annual Report of the Department for Community Welfare for the year ended 30 June 1977. Additions to this list are:

METROPOLITAN

Henley Beach Visiting Office,
378 Seaview Road,
HENLEY BEACH, 5022

Hillcrest Branch Office,
515 North East Road,
GILLES PLAINS, 5086

Hindmarsh Branch Office,
173 Port Road,
BROMPTON, 5007

Kangaroo Island Visiting Office,
KINGSCOTE, 5223

Morphett Vale Branch Office,
159 Main South Road,
MORPHETT VALE, 5162

Mitcham District Office,
Mitcham Shopping Centre,
2 Princes Road,
TORRENS PARK, 5062

Norwood District Office,
81 Osmond Terrace,
NORWOOD, 5067

Port Adelaide District Office,
64 Dale Street,
PORT ADELAIDE, 5015

Stirling Branch Office,
Merrion Terrace,
STIRLING, 5152

Taperoo Neighbourhood
Office,
101 Strathfield Terrace,
TAPEROO, 5017

Unley Branch Office,
333 Unley Road,
MALVERN, 5061

Victor Harbor Visiting
Office,
10 Coral Street,
VICTOR HARBOR, 5211

Woodside Visiting Office,
3 Tiers Road,
WOODSIDE, 5244

The Central Regional Office is now situated at the:
Hindmarsh Branch Office,
173 Port Road,
HINDMARSH, 5007

COUNTRY

Gawler Branch Office,
21 Adelaide Road,
GAWLER, 5118

Oodnadatta Branch Office,
OODNADATTA, 5734

Waikerie Visiting Office,
4 Peake Avenue,
WAIKERIE, 5330

2. Yes. In the 1978-79 financial year, the department intends to open offices in the following locations, subject to the availability of finance:

West Torrens Branch Office,
Corner Anzac Highway and James Street,
Plympton.

Golden Grove Branch Office,
Corner of Golden Grove Road and Grenfell Road,
Surrey Downs.

Payneham Branch Office,
Corner Payneham Road and Portrush Road,
Marden.

Munno Para Visiting Office,
To be located in the new Munno Para housing
development suburbs.

Salisbury North Branch Office,
Hissar Avenue, Salisbury North.

Whyalla Branch Office,
Whyalla Stuart.

It is not known at this stage where further community welfare offices will be opened during 1979-80 or 1980-81.

3. Thirty community welfare officers resigned during 1976-77 and 40 resigned during 1977-78. It is not appropriate to provide the names of these persons.

4. None.

CHARITABLE ORGANISATIONS

Mr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what the Government will do to protect voluntary workers in charitable and community organisations who are currently under pressure by militant union officials to join unions and therefore become paid employees bound by industrial awards and conditions? With an action presently before the Industrial Court, considerable concern has been expressed by the voluntary workers of many charitable and community organisations, including drivers for both Red Cross and Meals on Wheels, who wish to continue to give their services on a voluntary basis

to the organisations in which they are deeply interested. A Government concerned to preserve the principle of voluntary services could seek to intervene in the present case on behalf of voluntary workers and could introduce legislation designed to protect their status in the future.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: As I understand the position before the Industrial Court regarding the Australian Government Workers Association and St. John Ambulance Brigade as expressed to me by both organisations, the A.G.W.A. believed that it was necessary to try to obtain an award. I thought I was in the midst of what would be going a long way to solving the problem without disputation and I thought there was no necessity to have a court case about the situation. Unfortunately, those negotiations broke down. It is important for the House to know that Cabinet expressed the view that there ought not to be any interference with voluntary organisations. Surely the Industrial Court was established to determine and settle disputes of an industrial nature, and that is as I understand the case before the court now. The Industrial Court's decision on what it may do about this industry will be important. To the best of my knowledge, and unless there has been a change on the part of the A.G.W.A., the association is not trying to envelop into awards all voluntary workers in the community. The agreement within the industry that has been operating for some time is no longer working, and I cannot see how the Government can possibly intervene when the court is there to determine what may happen in this industry. As I said earlier, Cabinet has expressed the view that the charitable and community workers in the industry should have a right to work if there is a job for them. I think the Government's position is clear and I cannot see any good reason for interfering in a court case. I think the court is there to determine what may happen.

STATE TAXES

Mr. KLUNDER: Does the Leader of the Opposition agree with the oft-repeated statement by the Liberal Leader in New South Wales, one of which that gentleman made a feature of in the Earlwood Primary School on 4 July 1978 when opening the Liberal campaign, that New South Wales residents pay the highest State taxes in Australia? How is this consistent with his own statements on South Australian State taxes, and is it possible that Mr. Scanlan, who was formerly on the Leader's staff and is now on Mr. Coleman's staff, is simply recycling inaccurate material?

The SPEAKER: Does the Leader of the Opposition wish to reply?

Mr. TONKIN: Do I what! I have much pleasure in replying to the Dorothy Dixier, which I noticed the Premier setting up with the honourable member.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the Leader will stick to the answer.

Mr. TONKIN: I am simply following the technique being adopted constantly by honourable members opposite in answering questions.

The SPEAKER: Order! I want the Leader to answer the question.

Mr. TONKIN: I should like to answer the last part of the question first. I do not know what my former research assistant (Mr. Phillip Scanlan) is doing in New South Wales, but I am certain he is providing sterling service to the Leader of the Opposition there (Mr. Coleman).

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many

interjections, and they will have to cease. The honourable Leader.

Mr. TONKIN: The statement made by the honourable member that New south Wales is in some way paying the highest rate of State taxation is, in fact, possibly true. All I know is that South Australia is also paying, out of the taxpayers' pockets, amongst the highest levels of State taxation of any State in this country. What the honourable member and the Premier have deliberately avoided doing, whenever answering statements and claims made that we are amongst the highest taxed States in this country, is mentioning the effects of mining royalties.

The Premier has become adept at fudging this issue. He has taken mining royalties, added them to the total of State taxation, divided the result by the population, and has come up with a per capita figure which, in fact, shows that other States, such as Queensland, Western Australia, and perhaps New South Wales, on that basis pay a higher per capita rate of taxation. Because we have such a low level of mining royalty returns as a result of the low level of development of our mineral resources, what the Premier fails to take into account is that in Western Australia, Queensland, and to some extent New South Wales, the taxpayers' out-of-pocket expenses are helped by the considerable volume of mining royalties that come back to State revenue. In Western Australia, for instance, about \$48 000 000 comes back by way of mining royalties directly into general revenue. That relieves the burden on taxpayers' pockets. In Queensland, the amount is about \$48 000 000, and in New South Wales (and I am not certain of the figure) it is between \$30 000 000 and \$40 000 000, I think \$34 000 000. That is money that is not available in South Australia to relieve the load on taxpayers' pockets. If we consider the money that actually comes out of taxpayers' pockets in this State, we are the highest taxed State in the Commonwealth, and nothing the Premier or the honourable member for Newland can say can possibly refute that.

VOLUNTARY WORKERS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether he expects that any services now provided by voluntary organisations will be taken over by a State Government department or instrumentality in the near future, and whether the Government will consider introducing legislation, if necessary, to protect the status of workers in voluntary organisations, to give effect to the policy that the Minister stated today has been espoused by Cabinet?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I think I made the position clear when I replied to the Leader, that the Government is not in a position to interfere in any case of this nature that is before the court. Surely, it is the right of any organisation to go to the Industrial Court to put its argument, and for the court to decide whether or not an award ought to be granted. I do not think it would be proper for the Government to intervene.

Members must surely be aware that an agreement, similar to an award, has been operating in this industry. The request now before the court is to make it an award rather than an agreement. I confidently believe that there has been no attempt by any industrial organisations to interfere in the voluntary areas. If, in the context of this determination coming out in the St. John Ambulance area, the union is granted its application in full (and I am unable to determine what the court may or may not do, and I will make no forecast), it could mean that there would be no requirement for voluntary workers in the area

in which the application had been requested.

Mr. Chapman: You'll stand by and let that happen?

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

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That would not mean that the whole of the voluntary areas of the ambulance brigade would no longer be required. It would mean only in the area where there is provision for an award at present.

Mr. Dean Brown: In the whole of the metropolitan area.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It does not mean that. It means only for the driving brigade, but not those who attend at football games, cricket matches, or organised picnics. There is no attempt to interfere in that area. It means that, where the agreement provision has applied before, the union is applying for an award in the court. Cabinet has decided that it will not be part of any organisation that will destroy the right of people to make their services available voluntarily in the community, and I do not think that I can make it clearer than that.

Mr. Dean Brown: Why don't you intervene?

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Davenport to order.

GAWLER RIVER

Mr. HEMMINGS: Can the Minister of Works reassure me that, in the event of the Para reservoir reaching a level this winter whereby it is necessary to release water into the Gawler River, the release will be controlled so that the possibility of the flooding of that river, as happened in 1974, will not be repeated? The heavy rains of the past few weeks, together with the long-range weather forecast that August will be very wet, have caused concern to many of my constituents who experienced severe financial losses when the Gawler River flooded in 1974.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a full report for the honourable member. Following those floods and representations by the member for Light, there was a vast extension to the monitoring of the reservoir; in other words, rainfall in certain places had a dramatic effect on the level of the reservoir. I think, too, that the plug being placed in the Little Para will have a bearing on the situation.

Dr. Eastick: In 1974 it did not involve the reservoir.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, I realise that, but the reservoir was full at the time. If we had had earlier warning, we might have been able to take action to lower the reservoir to take the top off.

Dr. Eastick: It was in 1971.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This is what the member for Napier has alluded to. I will obtain a full report for him to ascertain what actions have been taken to prevent this happening and what may happen if it continues to be wet (and I hope it does) in order to allay fears he has expressed on behalf of his constituents.

HOSPITALS DEPARTMENT ACCOUNTING

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Treasurer say why the Corbett Committee of departmental officers was appointed to inquire into the Hospitals Department at the same time that these matters were still under investigation by the Public Accounts Committee, unless it was an attempt by the Government to minimise community reaction and its own embarrassment by pre-empting the findings of the Parliamentary committee?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can appreciate the chagrin of the honourable member. The Government, having

received the reports of the Auditor-General in the matter of hospitals accounting procedures, determined it would remedy the faults that were shown in the Auditor-General's Reports. Those Auditor-General's Reports were not ordered by a Public Accounts Committee inquiry, but by me, as Treasurer.

Mr. Tonkin: They've been reporting for about six years: why the sudden move?

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader. If he interjects again, I will name him.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is not being truthful in that interjection. I was informed last year that certain actions had been taken by the Hospitals Department, in conjunction with the Auditor-General's Department, in relation to accounting. I wanted to be satisfied with the accounting system and, therefore, as Minister in charge of the Public Service, I discussed with the Public Service Board an inquiry that would ensure that accounting procedures were effective. The inquiry was held to that end. When the report of the inquiry has been discussed by Cabinet, I propose to publish it. It will give full information to the Parliament and to the public about accounting procedures in this area and the action taken by the Government in relation to them. It would be quite absurd for the Government to wait around while the Public Accounts Committee goes through an inquiry which has gone on now for some considerable time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Alexandra: if he interjects again I will name him.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Honourable members who joined the Public Accounts Committee from the other side of the House (and a very strange course of action during the last election was taken by those members from the other side who were on that Public Accounts Committee) required that they be informed about the matters fully before a report was completed by the Public Accounts Committee. That is the reason why, I gather, the Public Accounts Committee's hearings have taken the length of time that they have taken. Entirely apart from what the Public Accounts Committee is doing, which is a matter for the Public Accounts Committee, the Government is going to see to it that accounting procedures in the Hospitals Department meet the requirements of the Auditor and of efficiency in the Public Service, in accordance with the Public Service Act. The inquiry was held for that purpose, and it has achieved that purpose.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Community Welfare give any indication of the response from the public to the proposals contained in the report of the Corbett Committee into Community Development and Assistance? I am aware that the time for public comment has been extended by a month, but I would appreciate some indication of whether this extension of time is having the desired result and producing a greater flow of comment.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: There seems to be a growing response from individuals and organisations with an interest in the area to the proposals contained in the report of the Corbett Committee. The latest figures I have seen indicate that 53 persons or groups have either lodged or given notice of submissions. Some were pleased to see that additional time had been allowed for putting in submissions.

At this stage I prefer not to go into detail on the content of the submissions, except to say that the opinions contained in them ranges from total support to almost

total opposition, and all shades in between. Most submissions support the development of more community participation groups, and state there is a need for the introduction of community development offices throughout the State. I understand that several local government groups, Community Councils for Social Development, and other community groups are still working on submissions.

Even yesterday further advice was received from groups still wishing to put in submissions: they were checking on how strictly the deadline would be applied. When the various submissions have been collated I will take them to a Cabinet subcommittee for consideration and examination.

There was a slow response initially, and few submissions were received. However, members can see from what I have just outlined that there is now a much greater awareness in the community of what was contained in the report and that submissions have been coming in at a steady rate.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Mr. RODDA: Can the Premier say whether the Public Accounts Committee was notified or consulted by the Government in any way before the appointment of the Corbett Committee to consider the matters referred to by the member for Mount Gambier, and can he say what exchange of information and co-operation, if any, has occurred between the two committees?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware whether there has ever been a passage of information between the committee of the Public Service Board, which was proceeding to do the normal work of the Public Service Board in seeing to the efficiency of the Public Service as it is required to do under the Public Service Act, and the Public Accounts Committee. The report of the Corbett Committee will be forwarded to the Public Accounts Committee for its information.

DOMICILIARY CARE

Mr. OLSON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare confer with the Federal Minister of Health about whether there are any prospects for assistance to those people required to give full-time attention to chronically ill or infirm parents who might not now qualify for domiciliary nursing care benefits? At present many people who wish to care for members of their family, or relatives, or friends in their own home environment are denied the domiciliary care nursing benefits because the patient is not 65 years or more.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will, together with my colleague, the Minister of Health, consider the question raised by the honourable member. I think he referred to chronically ill or infirm parents and other persons. I believe, as a result of discussions I have had with the Minister for Social Security (Senator Guilfoyle), there has been a distinct liberalisation in the use of special benefits, particularly as they are used in South Australia.

I have actual knowledge of a case that might be termed the early retirement of a husband in a family. He was 53 years old and working, and his wife was a paraplegic. Because of approaches I have made on the State scene to the local Assistant Director, I understand that this case is to be treated sympathetically (and, I would add, quite sensibly) by the Commonwealth authorities, as one meriting the application of a special benefit. The position in that household is that the lady, who is unfortunately

afflicted in the way I have described, needs practically 24-hour full-time care.

As the husband concerned had been torn between continuing in his employment and having to leave his wife at home uncared for it seems to me a sensible and humane application of Commonwealth rules regarding special benefits to say that that man could take care of his wife 24 hours a day and at the same time receive from the Commonwealth a benefit similar to what would apply if he were unemployed or receiving a full invalid pension. In this case I understand the family has been granted a special benefit. If this is correct, I applaud this action by the Commonwealth Government, and I suggest it ought to have been applied earlier in many cases and should be applied in this way throughout Australia.

The honourable member referred to the payment of a domiciliary care benefit, which I think is \$14 a week, to help persons in the community take care of aged parents at home, so that is not a direct parallel. However, it may be that some of the cases the member has in mind which caused him to raise this question could be resolved by an approach to the State representatives of the Department of Social Security. If the honourable member cares to make such an approach he may succeed in individual cases. I will discuss with the State Minister of Health the general case the honourable member has referred to me and see whether we can take the matter up at Commonwealth level.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Mr. WILSON: My question is directed to the member for Florey in his capacity as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. Bearing in mind that the Premier has just said that the committee has been inquiring into the activities of the Hospitals Department since December 1976, I ask when the Public Accounts Committee will table its report on the matter and, if its deliberations have not yet been completed, whether it will table an interim report forthwith.

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Florey wish to reply?

Mr. WELLS: Yes, I do. The answer to the first part of the question is that the report will be tabled when the committee completes its inquiries. The answer to the second part of the question is "No".

WHYALLA EDUCATION

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Education give every consideration to the recent submissions made by the Whyalla College of Further Education in respect of its need for additional staffing appointments to the new \$8 000 000 extensions of that college? These proposed appointments include 16 additional full-time teaching staff and six contract lecturers with support staff. I am concerned that, as a result of the recent announced demands by the Federal Government that there must be severe cut-backs in the growth of the public sector, and the non-availability of finance for education from the Federal Government, an \$8 000 000 complex, which has every facility to teach apprentices and more importantly to retrain people who have become redundant through no fault of their own and who have been thrown into unemployment through the Fraser policies, will become severely ineffective and will not serve the purpose for which this college was built.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Whyalla is going to have

severe problems of retraining which we will have to look at seriously indeed. This is why the new facility must be used to the full extent. Bearing that in mind, this Government will give every consideration to the honourable member's request and that of his constituents, but just how far we will be able to go in this financial year will be severely limited. The honourable member has mentioned the parsimony of the Federal Government generally concerning education.

The technical and further education field is the sole area in Commonwealth education funding which has some growth in real terms. We have to remember the base against which this growth is predicted—no more than \$80 000 000 for the whole of Australia. To talk in percentage terms is fairly meaningless in the TAFE area in terms of percentage growth when one considers that the Commonwealth still funds only a small proportion of the total effort that goes into the TAFE field. That is the problem we face at the moment regarding the matter that the honourable member has referred to me. We will certainly give his request every consideration, but in view of the difficult situation that faces this State, along with every other State, as a result of the outcome of the Premiers' Conference and Loan Council discussions, I cannot at this stage guarantee how far we will be able to go.

SAMCOR

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture in another place, explain to the House the Government's intention in respect to the maintenance of export licences and the future of the Samcor works at Port Lincoln? I have been contacted by several constituents who have been informed that the Samcor works at Port Lincoln is to be scaled down, that the United States export licence is to be dropped, and that the works will eventually be closed. Workers are concerned about their future employment, and business houses in Port Lincoln have expressed concern about the likely economic effect such a closure would have on Port Lincoln. Can the Minister either confirm or deny such allegations?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask my colleague the Minister of Agriculture to furnish a report as soon as possible.

RESERVOIR HOLDINGS

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Works give details of the current holdings of metropolitan reservoirs, and say whether there is any likelihood of those reservoirs filling this year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the honourable member's interest in the water supply system. I can recall your great interest in this subject, Mr. Speaker, and I know that you, too, will listen to the reply with great interest.

The first figure I will give in each case will be the holding at this time last year, and the second figure will be the present holding.

Mount Bold, 10 199 megalitres (Ml)-12 278Ml; Happy Valley 7 809Ml-7 924Ml; Clarendon Weir 302Ml-242Ml; Myponga 11 235 Ml-16 503 Ml; Millbrook 6 903Ml-7 327Ml; Kangaroo Creek 3 675Ml-3 325Ml; Hope Valley 2 178Ml-2 386Ml; Little Para (which is filling for the first time) 2 292Ml; Barossa 3 703Ml-3 810Ml; South Para 15 743Ml-15 857Ml; Mannum 163Ml-181Ml;

and Murray Bridge 356Ml-267Ml. The total storage at this time last year was 62 266Ml, and this year it is 72 392Ml. Honourable members will see that that is a big improvement on last year's storage. If the season continues as at present appears, I have every hope that most of the reservoirs will fill, or very nearly fill.

FOOD PILFERING

Mr. MATHWIN: Why did the Corbett Committee give the police only one week to investigate the alleged pilfering of food from Queen Elizabeth Hospital? Is the Premier aware that this time restriction forced the police to make public raids on the Hospitals Department and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, thus warning any possible offenders?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is talking nonsense. There are two institutions on which the Corbett Committee has not reported and in which police investigations are continuing. Those police investigations were instanced by information which came to the Government, in no way relating to the Public Accounts Committee. Those investigations are continuing, and it is simply not true to say that the police had one week in which to investigate the matters. The investigations have not yet been completed.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Premier inform the House how a reduction in Government spending and any resultant retrenchments in Government departments and in industries largely dependent on Government contracts will improve South Australia's employment situation? The idea of reducing employment opportunities as a remedy for unemployment is the strange policy of such noted economic thinkers as the Prime Minister and the Leader of this State's Opposition.

Mr. Tonkin: You're commenting.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have noted that the Leader of the Opposition has advocated that we should reduce employment opportunities. I have here a copy of a press statement made by him supporting the attitude of the Prime Minister that we must cut spending in the public sector. I have had a procession of people from the private sector to my office begging me to let additional contracts from the public sector to the private sector so that the latter may maintain the employment of its workers. We are now forced into the position by the Federal Government that we are made to reduce the number of our contracts in the construction field particularly. This flows over into numbers of areas of industry in South Australia. The reason why a number of metal trades areas are facing unemployment in Australia is simply that there is no present demand for structural steel. For the Opposition to make statements, as the spokesman on this matter chose to do, that the South Australian Government should somehow or other have stimulated the market for the subsidiaries of the Johns-Perry group which have been closing down shows an abysmal ignorance of the position of those companies. It is about time he referred to his Party colleague in another place, who specifically told me that there was absolutely no reflection on the South Australian Government in the moves that his companies had to make. It has been the experience of this Government that when anyone in the industrial area wants to refer to someone in the Opposition with some

responsibility towards industry he goes to that particular member in another place and not to the spokesman in this place, and that is a sensible course to pursue. What is happening at the moment under Liberal policy in Australia, so vociferously supported by the South Australian Opposition, is that employment opportunities are being deliberately reduced by the financial policies being imposed on this country by the Federal Government.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Dr. EASTICK: Is the Attorney-General aware of the considerable community concern at the fact that persons who are over 70 years of age holding commissions of justices of the peace are being phased out of service in the courts, with the result that many courts are finding it difficult to be suitably staffed?

I appreciate that over a period the Attorney-General has been asked to consider the staffing of the courts and a possible reduction in the age of persons sitting in the courts as justices of the peace. However, the action taken recently has been taken without the prior knowledge, I am informed, of the courts or of the districts concerned. With the appointment of justices on only two occasions in a year (that is, on a twice-yearly basis), a number of courts are finding it difficult to provide justices for use in those courts.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am not aware of any public concern over this matter. I imagine that some justices who are over the age of 70 years have expressed their concern to the honourable member. Whilst those justices have no doubt given good service to the State over some years, and it is understandable that they should feel at this stage that it is regrettable that their services are no longer required, nevertheless this matter has been alive for more than 2½ years. The Government's policy is that, as we have a retiring age of 70 years for Supreme Court judges, no person over the age of 70 years should sit in the lower courts in South Australia. That has been the policy. It has been discussed with the Justices Association and with other interested persons over a number of months. For the honourable member to suggest that this was done precipitately, without any prior warning, is not factually correct. This matter has been under discussion over a long period; in fact, if my memory serves me correctly, it has been raised in this House before now.

The honourable member did not give any details of the courts that allegedly are suffering delays as a result of this decision. My information from the department is that this is not the case. In one court in the metropolitan area a decision had been made, unbeknown to me, that justices from the Justices Association in Adelaide were to sit on the bench, where previously justices from the local area were sitting on the bench. That decision has been reversed. To my knowledge, there is no difficulty in manning the courts with people under the age of 70 years who are justices and who have the necessary training and experience.

HENLEY PEDESTRIAN LIGHTS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Would the Minister of Mines and Energy ask his colleague the Minister of Transport to consider the early provision of pedestrian safety lights in the vicinity of the Henley Beach square, where a redevelopment programme that is going on at present will attract more people to the beaches, at the

same time considerably increasing the shopping area? With the increased traffic on Seaview Road in this vicinity, young children and aged persons in the area are having difficulty in crossing the road in safety. Whilst the council has indicated that it intends to provide a pedestrian refuge, it seems that this will not be satisfactory for the traffic that will be in the area. I should appreciate the Minister's ascertaining whether some priority can be given to this matter.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall see to it that my colleague's department looks into the matter and makes available a report on it for the honourable member.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Works say whether, and, if so, to what extent, there have been any incidents of thefts or pilfering during the past 18 months at the Public Buildings Department stores and/or garage at Netley? Have any persons been apprehended, and what action is being taken to prevent such occurrences in future?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: To my knowledge, there has been one case where a person has been apprehended, but I do not know the details. I do not know whether the case is continuing or whether or not charges have been laid as yet. However, I shall get a full report from the department and let the honourable member know.

LABOUR FORCE

Mr. GROOM: Has the Premier seen a statement by the Opposition spokesman on industrial affairs, as reported in the *Advertiser* on 12 July 1978, concerning the proportion of the labour force working for the State Government, and does the Premier have any comment to make? In that report, the Opposition spokesman on industrial affairs said that the proportion of the labour force working for the State Government was higher in South Australia than in any other State.

Mr. Dean Brown: The Commonwealth Grants Commission report of 19 August 1976.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Davenport. If he continues in this vein I will name him.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have seen that statement and a number of others attributed to the member for Davenport. I am aware that the honourable member sought some material through the research officers of the library, who were then able to get material from the Public Service Board. I am aware that the honourable member has figures—

Mr. Dean Brown: I haven't.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If he has not got them, they must be on the way to him. I am surprised that he has not yet received them. The figures he has quoted are not correct. State Government employment in the following figures includes employment in semi-government authorities. The reason is that, as between States, there are not strictly comparable positions as to people employed in the Public Service and in semi-government authorities, because certain States employ people in semi-government authorities who, in South Australia, are employed in the Public Service.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Like the Metropolitan Board of Works in Melbourne.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is a case in point, as against the Engineering and Water Supply Department in this State. To get comparable employment figures, it is necessary to include employment in semi-government authorities. The most recent estimates from the Bureau of Statistics show that State Government employment as a

percentage of total State employment in June 1977 was as follows: Tasmania 26.3, Western Australia (under a Liberal Government) 25.4, South Australia 24.9, Queensland 22.4, New South Wales 18.8, and Victoria 18.8. If we include State and local government employment as a percentage of total State employment, and that is employment in the public sector, the percentages are as follows: Tasmania 28.5, Western Australia (under a Liberal Government) 27.4, South Australia 26.4, Queensland 25.9 (so we are .5 per cent above Queensland), New South Wales 22, and Victoria 21.

The larger States, as against the States which at any time have been claimants on the Grants Commission, have a smaller proportion, naturally, because the smaller States have to provide certain base levels of employment that are applicable to everyone. If we take the percentage growth of State and local government employment from June 1977 to April 1978 (because we have been attacked about the growth in the Public Service), the percentage is as follows: Victoria 3.7, Western Australia 3.6, Tasmania 3.6, New South Wales 2.9, South Australia 2.5, and Queensland 1. We were the second lowest. Taking June 1976 to April 1978, we were still in the middle group of the States and not above the Australian average. The percentage growth of purely State Government employment from June 1977 to April 1978 is as follows: Tasmania 3.6, Victoria 3.5, Western Australia 3.1, New South Wales 2.8, South Australia 2.3, and Queensland 2.2. We were .1 per cent above Queensland, and were the second lowest State.

If we turn to the statements made by the Leader that private employment declined from 229 100 in 1971 to 295 000 in 1977, a decline of about 1.4 per cent, we see, indeed, that private employment increased from 285 100 in 1971 to 295 300 in 1977, an increase of 3.6 per cent. The statement was then made that public sector employment increased from 108 900 to 149 000, an increase of 37 per cent. In fact, the increase was from 111 900 to 149 000, an increase of 33.2 per cent.

The Leader then said that 34 per cent of employees worked in the public sector in South Australia. In fact, it is 33.54 per cent. The figure for Tasmania was 34.4 per cent, Western Australia, 33.2 per cent, and Queensland, 32.4 per cent. We were not the highest State. If one takes State and local government figures, and takes the public sector as a whole (and "public sector" was the term that was used), our figure was 26.4 per cent, Tasmania's was 28.5 per cent, Western Australia's was 27.4 per cent, and Queensland's was 25.9 per cent. We are on the Australian average.

Then it was said that South Australia had the highest proportion of the labour force of any State working for the State Government, and that in August 1976, 17.4 per cent of the labour force worked for the State Government in South Australia compared to 11.9 per cent in New South Wales and 11.8 per cent in Victoria. However, they are dishonest figures, because the definition of South Australian Government employees used above included semi-Government, which is the only comparable figure that can be taken. The reason for that, of course, is that New South Wales and Victoria do not, in that figure, include health and hospital employees. That is how the Leader gets the 11.8 per cent and the 11.9 per cent in those two States, whereas the figures are 26.3 per cent for Tasmania; 25.4 per cent for Western Australia; 24.9 per cent for South Australia; 22.4 per cent for Queensland; 18.8 per cent for New South Wales; and 18.8 per cent for Victoria.

If we take the position of growth in the Public Service over the period since complaints have been made by the

Liberal Party about growth in the Public Service, and take them from 1974 to 1977 (figures available for the period during which there has been a debate on this matter), we see that the Leader has said that South Australia has led the way in the increase in its Public Service, particularly in the creation of senior administrative positions, when other States and the Commonwealth have been cutting down. True, the Commonwealth has cut down Public Service numbers but State Public Services have increased over the past few years. A favourable comparison for South Australia occurred from 1974 to 1977, with the total Public Service growth being: 21.2 per cent for Victoria (under a Liberal Government for the whole of that time); 17.8 per cent for New South Wales, which was under a Liberal Government for most of that time; and 17.1 per cent for South Australia.

VANDALISM

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier say, because vandalism is still rife within our community, when the report of the committee inquiring into vandalism in this State will be tabled in this House? I have directed the question to the Premier, as Leader of the State, because I believe that vandalism is a real problem. Telecom, for instance, a Federal body, has suffered a loss of about \$3 000 000 a year from vandalism. Local government is concerned about the losses it faces and about ratepayers' money going down the drain because of vandalism. The State Government, too, has many losses because of vandalism, as does the private sector. I therefore ask the Premier when we can expect a report to be tabled in Parliament so that we can consider the committee's recommendations and findings.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I cannot give an exact date. I understand that the committee, which was set up by the Government under the auspices of the Community Welfare Advisory Committee umbrella, has found just as the honourable member has outlined in his explanation. The inquiry has proved to be a large task, and much work and energy has been required to enable the committee to reach the present stage. I understand that a final draft is being prepared, and I have nothing more accurate than that to give to the House now.

COMPUTER INSTALLATION

Mrs. ADAMSON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health why the Hospitals Department decided to go ahead with the installation of the Flinders Medical Centre computer at a cost of \$1 900 000 despite overseas experience that a similar installation had been a failure and when it was common knowledge in the medical profession that public funds spent on the computer had been wasted? Also, why did the Government wait until the matter was reported in the press before ordering an inquiry?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will bring the matter to the attention of my colleague.

WATER ALLOCATIONS

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Works say how the Government justifies its decision not to grant the additional 10 per cent water allocation to Government irrigators in view of its decision during 1977-78 to grant the additional water to private irrigators? I raised this matter in the House on 28 February this year, and I wrote to the Minister on 28 March, pointing out that the problems

facing Government irrigators were exactly the same as those faced by private irrigators because of the drought and because they had not received assistance from a rainfall of about 200 mm a year normally obtained in the summer. The rainfall for the period concerned was virtually nil, and this put a great strain on permanent plantings of irrigators, whether private or Government irrigators. The problem also varies from soil type to soil type. The reply I received from the Minister assisting the Minister of Works (the Hon. D. H. L. Banfield) indicated that water was made available only to private irrigators to grow cash crops and, because irrigators within the Lands Department did not have additional land for this purpose, the request was denied. That is not the problem at all; the problem is that we have had an extremely dry summer and that an excessive amount of water was required to maintain permanent plantings. I ask the Minister whether he will again consider this problem.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to consider again this matter for the honourable member and to consider the points he has raised. I could not recall having replied to the honourable member, so I am grateful that he said that it was the Minister assisting me who replied. However, I can recall the honourable member's raising the question with me. I will have the matter examined again, and will let him know whether there is to be any change.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. GUNN: Can the Premier say whether it is true that the South Australian Government is maintaining its present attitude towards succession and gift duties in order to encourage private enterprise and its political opponents to leave this State and, if not, for how long does it believe that it can afford to maintain its present attitudes in the face of the policies of the Commonwealth and other States that are phasing out this unfortunate type of taxation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: How precisely the other States are going to be able to phase out succession duties in the face of their present revenue situation I have yet to be told. I will be interested to see what they do when they bring down their proposals, if we get to see them at all. In the meantime, I point out to the honourable member that this State cannot afford to do without revenues from succession duties.

Mr. Gunn: Do you want the people to move out?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not believe the people will move out. They certainly have not been doing so to date.

Mr. Gunn: Oh yes, some have.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can only say that the number who have left the State has been markedly exceeded by the number who have come to the State, because the recent figures show that the highest net migration figure for any State is recorded in relation to this State. In other words, we have had more people by far coming here than have been leaving the State. They are coming here because of the good quality of life.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: LABOUR FORCE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: I remind the honourable member that he may explain himself on a personal matter but he may

not debate the matter.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In answer to a question a moment ago the Premier accused me of seeking information through the Parliamentary Library's Research Service, and I understand that that service then went to the Premier's Department or to the Public Service Board seeking figures. I have never made any such request of the library. The library must have confused me with another person. I have certainly not made such a request. I was disturbed when the Premier said that, because it showed that the confidentiality of the research service could be broken to the House.

Secondly, I was accused of using selected figures, and those figures were quoted by the Premier. I took my figures from the 44th Report of the Commonwealth Grants Commission, as at August 1976. The figures I quoted from page 123 of the report exclude certain employees engaged in agriculture. Table C6 "State Government Employees (a) as Percentage of Labour Force" lists the following percentages: New South Wales 11.92, Victoria 11.80, Queensland 13.39, South Australia 17.36, Western Australia 15.85, Tasmania 17.35, the figure for the six States being 13.13. They are the figures I quoted except for the six States' percentage.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They're not comparable.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: They are taken from the report.

The SPEAKER: I hope Government members will cease interjecting. The honourable member for Davenport has the floor.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He is debating.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The third thing I was accused of—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable Minister to order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thirdly, I was accused by the Premier of quoting wrong figures because I said—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member will cease debating the question. He can use the figures but I do not want him to debate them.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will certainly not debate the issue. I simply wish to indicate whence I took the figures. I quoted the number in the public sector in South Australia in June 1971 as being 108 900, and the Premier said it should have been 111 900. The figure I took came from the Bureau of Statistics. The figure was collected two months ago but I found out this morning—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating. He may use the figures but he must not debate the question. Also, he must resume his seat when the Speaker stands.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The bureau informed me this morning through Mr. Cameron that it is adjusting figures as far back as 1971, and the figure quoted by the Premier is the adjusted figure which has not yet been released. The figure I took was as supplied by the bureau about two months ago, and therefore the percentages I have worked out are correct on the figures supplied by the bureau two months ago. I emphasise that on those three points the speech I made was correct.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 July. Page 23.)

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill, its main object being to overcome a situation similar to that which arose over hotel licensing fees about 2½ years ago. Honourable members will recall at that stage that there were certain people whose licensing fees were

calculated on the turnover of the previous 12 months and who were disposing of their licences, or failing to take them up again, with the effect that the sum payable for a year's heavy trading was based on a figure of light trading in the previous year. At present annual licences for wholesale tobacco merchants are issued on 1 October, and the fee is based on sales made by the merchant during the previous financial year.

The way in which payment can be avoided is similar to that applying in the case of hotel licences. A merchant may obtain a licence on the basis of a small turnover and conduct a substantial business during the next 12 months and then not renew the licence either by going out of business or by transferring or selling the business to another person or company already licensed as a wholesaler and whose fee has already been determined. The additional turnover of the acquired business is not taken into account when setting the fee for the acquiring firm. The Bill overcomes this situation by providing for the grouping of wholesale tobacco merchants into people who are associated in trading in any way, whether on a corporate basis or an individual basis. It also reduces the currency of tobacco wholesale licences to one month, and this also will overcome some of the difficulties that have arisen.

The points which I have noted particularly are that there are no provisions for retrospectivity, which was a bone of some contention when the liquor licensing legislation was introduced, and that there is also obviously a considerable avoidance of tax payable by the techniques which have been set out. This is not the time to debate the overall principle, the principle generally that a tax of this kind should be assessable on a franchise basis, that is, the degree of business activity of any company or industry. There is some doubt in my mind whether this is a desirable scheme, and I think most people would agree it tends to penalise effort and initiative. If a company is prepared to work and increase its sales then it is not getting an advantage from so doing when it comes to paying its franchise fee. The effort it puts into returning it increased sales in fact simply means it is going to have to pay more tax by way of franchise. I do not think this is a good thing from the point of view of a private enterprise system.

I repeat that this is not the time to investigate that matter. This Bill is directed at correcting an anomaly and closing a loophole in the existing Act. For that reason I support it, but I give notice that the whole principle will be under examination by the Liberal Party in the months to come.

I note, in looking at the Bill, that there are a number of new features. The group provisions in clause 3 provide a tremendously complicated method of determining what shall constitute a "group". I must pay tribute to the obvious brainpower that went into this Bill. I hope that the provisions stand up, but from the look of the Bill it will be a lawyer's paradise, although I hope it is not.

The provisions in clause 5 relating to the power of inspectors are also widely expanded to cover processing, packaging and distributing, as well as selling or purchasing tobacco. There are one or two additional requirements placed on tobacco merchants in obeying the reasonable demands of inspectors. I note one in particular which requires that a wholesaler will produce a statement written in the English language and setting out in any such record particulars that are not written in the English language. I suppose there is a particular reason for that, and I will be interested to hear what the Premier has to say about it.

Penalties have been increased significantly from \$200 for failing to comply with the request of an inspector, or for obstructing or hindering an inspector in the exercise of

his powers, to \$250 or imprisonment for three months. There is an additional penalty by way of default penalty, which does not appear in the original Act. I would also like to hear from the Premier how many inspectors are currently employed by the department and how many will be employed; in other words, what increase will result from this change in procedures being adopted?

There will also be, of necessity I would judge, an increase in the number of staff in the department to cope with the change from annual to monthly licensing. I would like to know, further, how many people are associated with the administration of the Act at present and how many more people will be necessary after the passing of these amendments. The last question necessary along these lines is: what is the net return expected to the State? In other words, what will the additional costs be, and what effect will they have on the net return to the State?

There is a principle which I think is important and vital in any matter pertaining to State administration and spending; that is, what benefits to the community, by way of cost benefits, will come from the activities of any Government department, and what benefits will result from the passage of any piece of legislation?

This matter has been raised by my colleagues in the past. I think it is important that Ministers of the Crown give some estimate of the costs of administration of any piece of legislation brought into this place, and some cost benefit analysis, so that when we discuss matters (and this Bill particularly) we know exactly what it is likely to cost the taxpayer in terms of administration, as well as knowing what the return to the taxpayer will be.

One of the things that Governments are tempted to do more and more frequently is ignore the fact that the money they use comes from the taxpayers' pocket. For that reason, Governments have a real responsibility in terms of value to the taxpayer to account for their actions and the legislation they introduce. There is nothing further I wish to say about this matter, except that the Bill will correct anomalies and put everyone in the same boat. The reputable tobacco dealers and wholesalers will not find themselves in the position of having to pay a franchise which, at the present time (as I understand it), is quite wrongly being avoided by one or two firms. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Membership of a group of wholesale tobacco merchants."

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I have already referred to the difficulties which obviously have arisen in determining the definition of a group and what membership of a group shall constitute one body and what will not. Does the Premier expect any great difficulty to arise from these definitions? We have not had a chance to study the detailed legal implications.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The definitions are based upon definitions contained in the Victorian and New South Wales Acts, which have stood the test of some time.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Power of inspectors."

Mr. TONKIN: This is, I think, an appropriate time for the Premier to let me have answers to the questions I posed to him during the second reading debate regarding staffing and costs.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not taken out a

precise cost, but when I give details of the staffing the Leader will probably see why. There is one part-time inspector, who is involved in inspections under this Act. It is not anticipated that we should increase that staff. There are, however, two full-time inspectors for all of the work of the department of the Commissioner of Taxes. On the strong recommendation of the Public Service Board, the manpower budget allows for the increase of one inspector, because it is considered that the revenue gained thereby will far exceed the cost of one extra inspector. To provide for that extra inspector, there will be a reduction somewhere else in the Public Service.

Mr. TONKIN: I am particularly grateful to the Premier for adopting the principle that we on this side of the House wish to establish in matters such as this. While it may be a matter of no great moment in this case, when it comes to millions of dollars of taxpayers' money I think it is important that we do understand that there will be an increase but that the increase is well and truly covered by the returns that will come from the passing of the Bill. That is exactly the principle that the Opposition wants to establish, and I am glad that the Premier has set a precedent on this occasion. I hope this practice will continue whenever legislation is introduced in this Chamber by the Government.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Fees."

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

Page 8—

After line 38 insert paragraph as follows:

(ba) by inserting in paragraph (a) of subsection (2) after the passage "a wholesale tobacco merchant's licence" the passage "or a group wholesale tobacco merchant's licence";

After line 41 insert paragraph as follows:

(da) by inserting in paragraph (a) of subsection (3) after the passage "a wholesale tobacco merchant's licence" the passage "or a group wholesale tobacco merchant's licence".

The purpose of these minor consequential amendments is to insert the provision for a group wholesale tobacco merchant's licence in the relevant clauses.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 8 to 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Enactment of ss. 27a, 27b and 27c of principal Act."

Mr. TONKIN: Will a licensed wholesaler's endorsements on invoices always be in English and, if so, why is it necessary to include a provision for inspectors to require a translation in English to be given on demand, bearing in mind the provision outlining the powers of inspectors?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no connection between the two matters. The endorsement is required to be in English, but an inspector on occasions may require a translation of something that he is inspecting, but that will not be the endorsement.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (19 and 20) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PETROLEUM PRODUCTS SUBSIDY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 July. Page 24.)

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the Bill. I am pleased again to have the opportunity of supporting one of the many enlightened steps taken by the Fraser Government to

provide assistance to people in the outlying areas. What is disappointing is that it took this Government a considerable time to avail itself of the opportunity to implement the scheme. Unfortunately, the scheme has operated for many weeks in other States but not in South Australia. However, I am pleased to see that the Government has introduced the legislation, as it will give some small relief to people, particularly to those in my district.

I believe that there is some confusion in the community, because many people believe that this legislation is similar to an excellent scheme that operated prior to 1972. Unfortunately, after the 1972 Federal election, the then Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) set up a committee to review the previous Government's continuing expenditure and policies. That committee was headed by the notorious Dr. Coombs, who is well known for his extreme socialist views and who has never done any good for country people. The only good thing that came out of the report was that Dr. Coombs' recommendations cost the Labor Party hundreds of thousands of votes in rural areas.

The previous scheme involved an actual subsidy arrangement, whereas this scheme subsidises the freight on fuel requiring a payment of only up to 4c a gallon. If one examines the subsidy arrangement throughout South Australia, one will see that many places will not benefit. Coober Pedy, I am pleased to say, will receive a benefit of 2·8c a litre on motor spirit, 2·9c on power kerosene (I do not know how much power kerosene is sold at Coober Pedy or anywhere else in South Australia), 2·7c for distillate, and 4c a litre on aviation gasoline. I selected Coober Pedy because, when the Whitlam Government arrangements were implemented, the cost of fuel there increased drastically, thus having a detrimental effect on those engaged in mining. I am pleased to see that they will now get a small benefit. This scheme will eventually lead to a suitable arrangement to reduce the cost of fuel in the country. I hope that on a future occasion I will be able to say a great deal about the practice of the discounting of fuel in South Australia (on which I have strong views), but I do not think that I will be permitted to speak on that matter now.

The Fraser Government has clearly demonstrated that it is aware of the problems affecting country people. I am sure that during the next decade it will introduce many other enlightened pieces of legislation to the benefit of those not only in the country but throughout Australia. When we have a South Australian Liberal Government to assist people, the benefits will be even greater. The Bill is really only complementary legislation. I suggest to members, particularly to the temporary member for Morphett, that they examine the report, particularly page 225, where Dr. Coombs sets out his recommendations to take away from country people about \$30 000 000 worth of benefits they had received under the previous arrangements. I hope that in the future the scheme will be able to be modified so that it can revert to the original proposals which existed prior to the Whitlam era.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I, too, support the Bill and join with my colleague the member for Eyre who, I think, could properly be described as the catalyst in this exercise, because I think it was he who got the Government working on this matter. I was in Victoria when I heard the member for Eyre being lauded for having literally dragged the Attorney-General to the post on this matter. I do not know how true that is, but perhaps the Minister will tell us when he replies to the debate.

Mr. Gunn: He didn't know anything about it.

Mr. RODDA: Three weeks ago, I was privileged to

travel extensively in the Eyre District, and I know why the honourable member has been so active and so eloquent in his requests, leaving no stone unturned in his efforts to have this complementary legislation passed. As he has said, it has been on the Statute Books in other States, giving effect to a benefit by way of subsidy to people in the far flung areas of the States. The subsidy will mean much to people operating businesses in the development of South Australia. You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would be familiar with the effect of this on people in northern areas. Indeed, it will help some people in the areas represented by the member for Mount Gambier and me. I commend the Minister on his catalytic action, affording the people the benefits of this legislation. I support the Bill.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs): The member for Eyre said he regretted that the scheme was not along identical lines to the previous schemes. I am glad he realises that. Unlike the Prime Minister, I have not tried to pull the wool over people's eyes in this matter. In a telex received by the State on 26 January 1978, the Prime Minister stated:

My dear Premier, You will be aware of my Government's intention to reintroduce the scheme to subsidise the price of petroleum products sold in country areas. The scheme proposed will be along similar lines to the one which operated from 1965 to 1974.

I join with the honourable member in expressing my unhappiness that Mr. Fraser has not chosen to reintroduce a scheme along the lines of that previously existing in this and other States. As the honourable member has pointed out, that was a much better scheme than that now introduced, which is a poor copy of the scheme previously existing. I think the member for Eyre well knows that country people in South Australia and elsewhere will soon realise that they have been duped by the Federal Government into believing that this is a worthwhile scheme.

In a couple of areas, such as Coober Pedy, it will make some significant difference to a few people, but overall the amount of money involved in savings to country consumers will be very little in most instances. South Australian consumers have been well protected by this Government, which refused to pass on the differential increases over the past eight months that had been approved by the Prices Justification Tribunal. When that freeze is taken into account, a freeze that has now been lifted, we can see that the advantage to country consumers is limited indeed.

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

Later:

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

Mr. GROOM (Morphett): I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

I join with His Excellency in expressing condolences to the family of the Hon. Frank Potter. Although I knew Frank Potter for only a few years, I am aware that he served this State with distinction. I also pay a tribute to His Excellency's continuing humanitarian involvement in the affairs of the State of South Australia, and to the information His Excellency has been able to give to us on this occasion.

Before the election of December 1975, Mr. Fraser was reported in the *Advertiser* as saying that the Liberal and National Country Parties had spent their time in Opposition preparing one of the most far-reaching, exciting, and progressive programmes ever attempted. At no time during the past two and a half years could anyone say that those policies, as they unfolded, were either exciting or progressive. They were certainly far reaching, and one would have to agree with his prophecy before December 1975 that his policies would be far reaching.

The Fraser Government is taking us back to 1972 socially, and back to the 1950's politically and industrially. It is clear that, in July 1978, the Fraser Liberal and National Country Party Government has lost control of the national economy. The nineteenth century simplistic policies of the Fraser Government have proved to be incompetent and disastrous to Australia. What Australia requires is a more mature and integrated approach to economic policy in which all aims have a place. Effective economic policies must aim not only at reducing inflation but also at reducing unemployment and increasing the rate of economic growth, reducing inequalities in income, and maintaining the balance of payments equilibrium. In all of these matters the Fraser Government has failed Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: Who started it?

Mr. GROOM: The Liberal Party commenced government in December 1949, and had a long time to stabilise the Australian economy. Perhaps the memory of the member for Glenelg is not as good as it should be. Inflation reached 22.5 per cent under the early Menzies Administration.

Let us look at how the Liberal and National Country Party Government is managing the economy. In the *Australian* of 8 July 1978, Mr. Howard stated that the projected deficit for this year was to be \$3 332 000 000. That is over-running by 50 per cent the estimate of \$2 217 000 000 made in the Budget speech last August. What did the managers of the Australian economy have to say about the projected deficit? Mr. Howard called it a matter of disappointment. It is more than that: it quite clearly shows that the Fraser Government is not in control of the situation.

In 1975-76 the Budget deficit was \$3 585 000, and we were under a Liberal-National Country Party Government for most of that year. In 2½ years the Fraser Government has managed to reduce that deficit by only about \$200 000 000. What a great achievement! During that time that Government has practically doubled unemployment.

What does Mr. Fraser say about this type of Budget deficit? In the *News* of 17 November 1975 he hit at what he called "big spending wreckers", and said that these deficits wrecked the economy. He claimed that the Whitlam Government went on a huge spending spree that almost wrecked Australia's economy.

In 2½ years, all he has been able to do is to reduce this huge spending spree that the Whitlam Government is alleged to have gone on by \$200 000 000. He has consistently described Treasurers who have reached deficits of about \$3 300 000 000 as being bad housekeepers and that it is economic foolishness. One might well ask whether he is in control of the national economy. Surely, if

he has a Treasurer now who can do nothing with a deficit of this size, the Treasurer should step aside. The difference, of course, is that the people of Australia got something out of the deficits that accumulated during the Whitlam era.

Mr. Mathwin: Yes, inflation.

Mr. GROOM: Other countries of the western world suffered from inflation. Let us consider Mr. Fraser's record. He has been able to reduce the deficit by about \$200 000 000 in 2½ years. What has he done with unemployment? In the *News* of 6 December 1977 (and this was before the most recent election) he said forecasts of unemployment peaks of 420 000 people were outdated and misleading. On 11 February 1978 what do we find? It was reported in the *Advertiser* that jobless figures soared to a new high of 7.2 per cent. That shows how much he knows and can prophesy about the unemployment situation. The number of people out of work in Australia during the preceding month of January had soared by more than 41 000, which was a post-depression record. Only before the election Mr. Fraser considered that any forecasts of that nature of 420 000 people being out of work were out of date.

We then move on to 14 March 1978 and start to find that unemployment was reaching that figure. The headline in the *News* on that day was that there were 425 000 people out of work. So much for the Prime Minister's ability to prophesy trends in the economy. On 17 March the *News* reported that 431 000 people were out of work, and these new figures were alleged to have shocked the Government. In South Australia there was a drop of 1 309 people who could not get work during that quarter. I will say something about the fine way in which the State Labor Party has managed the economy in South Australia in the comparable period a little later.

Finally, we turn the circle from Mr. Fraser saying these forecasts are out of date and that unemployment is being reduced, to Mr. Howard coming out in a headline in the *Australian* with a concession that there would be no early relief from the problem. The number of jobless people was down then, but it was still a record for April. The number of people registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service as looking for full time work was about 402 534. That figure compared with 323 189 at the end of April 1977 and 268 003 at the end of April 1976. One could hardly conclude that that was a good record for unemployment.

On 15 July 1978 we have another concession coming out of Canberra that there was no sign of the jobless figures improving. Early in July 1978, the Treasurer, Mr. Howard, is reported as backing away from the previous job forecast that unemployment would progressively decrease. He said in the *Australian* of 8 July 1978 that the unemployment situation remains uncertain. For someone in control of the national economy one would think he would have a far better grasp of the situation than he has obviously displayed. He refused to say how long it might take for the unemployment situation to improve.

That is the record of the Fraser Government. Only yesterday we had a projection that unemployment would reach 500 000 people before the end of this year, when school-leavers come on to the register without a job in sight. What has Mr. Fraser been able to achieve? Let us compare it to what he said he would do. In the *News* of 6 December 1975 (again before a Federal election) Mr. Fraser said that Australia's unemployment figure could be slashed by up to 200 000 under a Liberal-National Country Party Government. At the same time he said he was going to reduce inflation by 11 per cent.

On the unemployment situation, he conceded at that

time that the figure was about 300 000 people. His pre-election promise was that he would slash unemployment by 200 000 down to 100 000 people unemployed. That is some record in 2½ years, because we now find predictions that unemployment will reach the 500 000 mark, Mr. Howard saying that there is no relief in sight, and refusing to say how long it might take before the situation improves. What did Mr. Street say before the 1975 election? These are the people that the Australian electors put into Government in December 1975 to manage the economy.

Mr. Mathwin: What did Mr. Cameron say?

Mr. GROOM: Just listen to what Mr. Street said; let us see how much he knew about the economy. In the *News* of 4 December 1975 he issued a press release as follows:

Coalition to help jobless.

He did not say that that help was going to increase the number of people unemployed. The Minister for Labour and Immigration at that time was not democratically elected but he was appointed to the position. He said that unemployment would be one of the major problems of the Liberal-National Country Party if it won the election. Mr. Street also said:

We believe our plan will work, but it will probably take about six months for this to happen.

What an amazing prediction! He was able to predict that they knew what they were going to do and that it would take six months to improve the situation. About 2½ years later we find that we are no better off: the Budget deficit is only about \$200 000 000 less than it was in 1975-76, and unemployment is now predicted to reach 500 000 with no end in sight. Mr. Fraser is sure of the way ahead. In the *Advertiser* of 25 September 1976 he said he was confident that the measures his Government had taken had paved the way to economic recovery. He also said that good industrial relations were important, if not vital, to economic recovery. That shows how much Mr. Fraser knows about the Australian economy. In mid-1978 the Government is uncertain about the unemployment situation, and does not know what it is doing with the Budget deficit. The Government has said repeatedly that people who run up deficits of this magnitude are bad housekeepers and wreckers of the economy, but that is the Government's record in 2½ years. The Liberal and National Country Party Government does not know which way it is heading in relation to employment.

In paragraph 22 His Excellency said:

Education is a field in which the financial constraints imposed by the Commonwealth Government are having a heavy impact. Notwithstanding the severe reductions in Commonwealth funding, substantial progress has been made towards my Government's policy objective of providing universal pre-school education to children from the age of four years. In 1977-78 the Commonwealth provided \$44 000 000 nationally, but in 1978-79 it will provide only \$32 750 000.

His Excellency then referred to legislation that will be introduced in this session. What did the Liberal and National Country Party say about education before the 1975 election? Senator Margaret Guilfoyle, shadow Minister of Education at that time, said:

There will be no Liberal cut-backs on education.

She made that comment when speaking in Adelaide. She did not last long in that job. She was moved probably because there was some recognition that she did not know what she was talking about. A report in the *News* of 3 December 1975 stated:

But Senator Guilfoyle said she would hope a Liberal Government would get the momentum of education spending back after 1976 so all areas of education would see

real improvement. She said claims by the former Whitlam Government that a Liberal Government would cut education spending were distorted . . .

Senator Guilfoyle said, "Education is not a stop-go thing—you can't disband programmes from one Government to another and some costs are inescapable.

That was the Liberal and National Country Party's platform on education. I am pleased to see that the member for Torrens is now in the Chamber. I think for a dynamic Opposition they need more than two members sitting on the benches on the other side and I think probably three indicates the degree of dynamism that exists within the Liberal Party today in South Australia because they are not interested in these matters. They identify very closely with the Fraser Government and its policies, and no doubt what I am saying is distasteful to their ears. In the *News* on 1 May 1978, speaking about the Liberal Government policy on education, the Vice Chancellor of the Adelaide University said, "Fund cuts 'lay uni. bare'".

What happened to public schools? A report in the *National Times* on 27 June 1977 concerning the Fraser Government's decision involving the transfer of about \$13 000 000 from Government schools to private schools stated:

The guidelines announced by Senator Carrick on 3 June are quite significant because they display big cuts in real growth for education spending at both school and tertiary levels in 1978 compared with 1977. It tended to show that 1978 will be only the start of a major slowdown in education outlays.

I commend this article to members of the Opposition, because it indicates the value that Liberal and National Country Party members place on their promises after election time. In the 1976-77 Budget education expenditure was maintained in most areas, but it did not allow for any growth of the inflation rate. The net effect of that Budget was that university, colleges, and schools were to be maintained at their present levels for the next three years, but we have now seen a rapid deterioration in funding for education.

The Liberal Government made great play of the Whitlam Government's proposals to raise \$2 000 000 000 overseas to be used to buy back Australia's mineral resources from overseas companies. This was projected as being disastrous, because it would make Australia bankrupt. Now, we find that the Fraser Government has borrowed that amount from overseas. We started to hear reports of that on 9 February 1978 when the Treasurer announced there would be more foreign borrowings to prop up the Australian dollar. We all know the Australian dollar was devalued to a considerable extent after the change of Government. It was reported that Mr. Howard had said that the Government had borrowed \$1 700 000 000 abroad to support the dollar, and that the Government would extend the overseas borrowing programme should any additional supplementation of Australia's internal reserves be required. One would think that that was a difficult pill to swallow, having said previously that borrowing such an amount would ruin Australia. On 30 March 1978 a report in the *Advertiser* states:

Since September 1977 Australia has borrowed an estimated \$1 600 000 000 overseas to maintain foreign reserves and protect the exchange rate of the Australian dollar.

The value of the dollar has gone down since then. In March 1978 another \$300 000 000 was borrowed to back up the dollar. In the past 2½ years the Fraser Government has borrowed \$2 000 000 000 from overseas, and what

have we got for that money? We have a high interest bill we will be paying for the next decade or so, but those same people were hostile with the Whitlam Government for attempting to borrow \$2 000 000 000 from overseas to own our own mineral resources. That is the hypocrisy of the Fraser Government: that is what it does. It said one thing before the election and did the opposite after the election. One cannot rely on what comes out of Canberra. One might find Mr. Fraser and his Treasurer, and his other entourage, saying one thing on day one and another thing on day two. It is no wonder that Disraeli said in 1845 that a conservative Government is an organised hypocrisy. I think the last 2½ years have amply borne out that quotation.

What is Mr. Fraser doing to the housing industry and to young people wanting to buy houses? A grand scheme was announced before the 1975 election. The front page in the *News* on 28 November 1975 stated, "Libs home deal a 'vote catcher.'" It was to be a new era for young house owners. The article stated:

Senior Liberals believe the savings bonus will appeal to the thousands of young couples who are struggling to get a home of their own.

Under the scheme people would get \$1 for every \$3 saved over a period of three years. Mr. Fraser went on to say how difficult it was for young people to own their own houses, and that his Government would put an end to all that. That was its big election pledge. So it was. No doubt it influenced many young people to vote for that sort of policy. What did we get?

Two and half years later we find that the two house funds may be scrapped. In the *News* of 27 June 1978 it was quoted that the Federal Government was considering scrapping the home savings grants scheme and the housing loans interest tax deductibility scheme, in order to save the Government more than \$30 000 000 a year. These announcements were made before it had paid out one cent under the grand schemes announced on 28 November 1975. The Government did that with the deliberate intention of winning votes to encourage young people to save \$3 a week in the hope of getting a matching grant of \$1 from the Federal Government. Before any young person became eligible for one cent under that scheme we started getting reports that the scheme was to be scrapped as was the interest tax deductibility scheme. So much for the new era that was foreshadowed for young house owners under the Liberal and National Country Party Government.

On 28 June 1978 a report appeared in the *News*. I am pleased to say that I am quoting the member for Ross Smith, Mr. Bannon, who undoubtedly researched his figures, so I can quote them. He said that the cut-back in housing was 23 per cent in real terms of the funds available for public housing. It was estimated that 400 to 500 fewer houses would be built in South Australia this coming year as a result of Liberal Party policies. Aboriginal housing would be cut back to the 1972 level, and homes for the aged (another grand programme of the Fraser Government in 1976), to which the Fraser Government made a commitment to spend \$225 000 000 over three years, would now be abandoned after spending only \$95 000 000 in the first two years. So much for what the Fraser Government is doing for housing. As it is quite clear that that Government had no intention of keeping its word, I hope that many more young people will gradually become aware of the hypocrisy of the Fraser Government.

I now turn to inflation. In the *News* of 6 December 1975 Mr. Fraser said that he was going to cut the inflation rate by 11 per cent. By implication he was suggesting that the inflation rate at that time was about 15 per cent. In fact,

the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that it was probably around 13 to 14 per cent at that time. Nevertheless, let us work with Mr. Fraser's figure. If he was to cut inflation by 11 per cent, that meant that soon we would see it fall to 4 per cent. He did say he would need a full three years to be able to achieve his election strategy, but that the change in direction would be immediately shown. Under Mr. Fraser, inflation increased in December 1976 to about 14 per cent, so he did not achieve much in his first year. Unemployment was going up, so rather than reduce inflation he was tending to increase it.

In January 1978 it was reported that the inflation figure had started to fall below 10 per cent. The March figure showed that inflation was around 8.2 per cent. In 2½ years Mr. Fraser has been able to reduce the inflation rate, on his own figures, by about 6.8 per cent, but the actual figure for inflation was a little lower than the 15 per cent quoted when he made the statement. That drop is in line with the trend in other Western world countries, so he has not achieved much.

I think there is much truth in the statement that when the United States starts to control its inflation rate we start to control our inflation rate. In fact, that is what has occurred. The Australian inflation rate has slowed down, but not because of the policies of Mr. Fraser. One must remember that the deficit is only \$200 000 000 less than it was for the 1975-76 year and unemployment will reach half a million. There has been no marked reduction in Government spending, to which Mr. Fraser attributed the major cause of inflation. Therefore, it is hardly due to his policy that the inflation rate is slowing down, but rather to a trend in Western world countries. Mr. Fraser would do well to remember the words of Abraham Lincoln, who said:

I claim not to have controlled events, but confess plainly that events have controlled me.

That is what has happened to Mr. Fraser in relation to inflation; not so with some other aspects of his policies.

I now refer to the 1976-77 Fraser-Liberal Government Budget. That Budget had misplaced aims and a mistaken strategy. Mr. Lynch was, of course, full of admiration for it. He said that by prudently reining the rate of growth of Government spending it would become possible not only to avoid further increases in the tax burden but also to contemplate reducing it. They were grand words. What Mr. Lynch did, rather than reduce the tax burden on the Australian people, in the 1976-77 Budget was to increase deliberately the tax burden. It was expected that that Budget would increase receipts from personal income tax by 25 per cent, compared to a 12 per cent increase in average weekly earnings, so rather than reducing income tax the Fraser-Lynch Government of that time sharply set about to increase the proportion of income that people pay in tax.

Let us examine some of the significant features of that 1976-77 Budget. In that Budget funds for all capital works, such as schools, roads, hospitals, housing, and sewerage were reduced by \$127 000 000. Funds for health were reduced by \$126 000 000. There was no increase in funds to build hospitals. Funds for land development were reduced by \$29 000 000. Funds for sewerage were reduced by \$63 000 000. Some Budget strategy!

What happened to people on pensions? The supplementary pension benefits were effectively reduced by 15 per cent, because no increases were provided for in those benefits and inflation took care of the rest. Aged and disabled persons' homes funding was reduced by 45 per cent in real terms. During the 1976 Budget speech it was stated that the deficit for the 1976-77 year would be \$2 608 000 000. It was not far out: it was \$2 740 000 000,

compared to the \$3 585 000 000 deficit in 1975-76. In summary that Budget, as implemented, produced low economic activity, high inflation, and record unemployment. That is borne out by the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures.

Let us consider what the Opposition in South Australia said about that Budget. In the *Advertiser* of 18 August 1976 the Leader of the Opposition, Dr. Tonkin, now Mr. Tonkin, said that the Budget was realistic and restrained. The Premier was more accurate when he said that the State would be hard hit by that Budget, as indeed South Australia was. Mr. Fraser's comment was:

This is a Budget that provides jobs, restrains taxes, encourages enterprise, and helps those in need.

Some prophecy that was! That is what he said about his own Budget; he really knows what he is talking about!

Mr. Allison: Why did he get back a second time with a record majority?

Mr. GROOM: Because for two years, with the assistance of the media, he was able to hoodwink the Australian public, but the Australian public is slowly waking up to Fraser and his cohorts, and his lackeys here in South Australia. The Prime Minister does not really have a good understanding of economic matters. He argues that inflation leads to low investment, high personal savings, and therefore low spending and unemployment. That is an over-simplification, because it is also true that low investment is a result of low profits, and low profits result from inadequate demand and inadequate spending. High personal savings occur largely because of a fear of unemployment, as does low spending by householders. People's savings have been maintained throughout the period of the Fraser Government. The Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show quite clearly that the Australian public is not spending. This low spending arises from a fear of unemployment. In reality it is not a simplistic attack on inflation. The economic problems are complex and they have many causes. All the Prime Minister knows is how to manage his own household budget.

What about the 1977-78 Budget? This is the economic strategy of the Fraser Government that the Opposition in South Australia has upheld, applauded and commended, saying that the Fraser Government is doing the right thing by the Australian people.

I want to demonstrate to the Opposition that it ought to disaffiliate itself from the Federal Government in Canberra, but I do not think that it will do it. The 1977-78 Budget was supposed to cut taxes, but even in the Budget speech the figures indicated that the Federal Government expected to take an extra \$1 830 000 000 in personal income tax revenue, and it predicted a deficit as a result of its grand strategy of about \$2 200 000 000. What happened to South Australia in that Budget? We were down 4 per cent of funding for our schools, 17 per cent for Aboriginal advancement, 19 per cent in urban public transport, and 5 per cent on the school dental scheme. We received below the national average allocations. If I have the time I will be able to go through the South Australian Government's achievements and show how it has been able to cushion the blows.

The Premier's comment was that South Australia was being hard hit, because he had been able to negotiate such an excellent deal over the railways matter. The Opposition seems to forget that it opposed the railways deal in 1975, and went to an election on the matter, after which the Opposition said that the money should all be spent. If it had not been for the excellent economic management of the Treasury, led by our State Premier, South Australia would not have been able to cushion the repeated blows

we have received from the Fraser Government.

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

Mr. GROOM: Let us look at Mr. Lynch's attitude to Australians, particularly the young. In August 1977, he said:

The level of real wages paid to young people should be lowered to reduce youth unemployment. That is controversial, and there are people here who will disagree, but that is the conviction I do hold.

That is a clear indication of the idealistic aims of the Fraser Government: to reduce the real value of people's wages. This is its attitude to young people—get them into a home savings scheme for the purpose of an election and, before they get even one cent out of it, cancel it. Mr. Lynch, the then Treasurer, wanted to reduce the level of real wages paid to young people. Much play was made about reducing income tax, and the *Australian* of last June stated that most people had little to gain from the tax changes made by the Fraser Government in that Budget. The South Australian Premier had the following to say about the 1977-78 Budget (and one can see who knows what he is talking about):

The Budget was an admission of economic defeat and would bring about continuing inflation and higher unemployment.

He said that the State was down on 1976-77 levels by about \$9 000 000. If the Opposition wants to know where the railways money has gone, this is a clear indication of a shortfall we have had to make up from the Federal Government, and to offset this there would be a need for financial restraint in South Australia. South Australian cash reserves had accumulated as a result of the railways deal, and the Premier said that this money would be used up in meeting the blows delivered by the Federal Government. He said that the Budget would bring about higher unemployment and was an admission of economic defeat. We all know that the Budget calculations were out by \$1 000 000 000 and that unemployment is now predicted to reach 500 000.

What did the Leader of the Opposition say about the Budget, and let us see which Party is the lackey of which Party in Canberra? He said:

It is a satisfactory Budget and proves beyond doubt that the Federal Government aims to control inflation had largely been realised.

He thought that the Budget would stimulate the economy and help the unemployment problem. It has not done any of those things. It certainly has not stimulated the economy or helped the unemployment problem.

Mr. Mathwin: What's the inflation rate now?

Mr. GROOM: If the member for Glenelg had been present earlier he would have heard me mention that. I am pleased to see that there are six Opposition members in the Chamber—this new breed of Opposition members. Mr. Hawke described the 1977-78 Budget as the most dishonest that had been handed down since the Second World War. He said it was clear that the intention of Mr. Lynch and the Government was to increase unemployment significantly, but he was laughed at by Mr. Fraser and Mr. Lynch.

Who proved to be accurate and to know what they were talking about? The Premier, Mr. Hawke, Mr. Hayden and Mr. Hurford. Mr. Hurford predicted 430 000 jobless. Mr. Hayden said that the Budget strategy was wrongly conceived, and how right he was! He said that there would be a deeper excursion into recession and predicted another 50 000 unemployed by July, and that proved accurate. The Commonwealth employment figures bear that out. Who knows what he is talking about on economic matters? Not Messrs. Fraser, Lynch and Howard or the South

Australian Leader of the Opposition, but the Premier, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Hawke and Mr. Hurford, as spokesmen for the Australian Labor Parties. They are the people who know how to manage the economy and who know what is occurring. I hope that members can readily see the poor state of control over the national economy that exists in Canberra.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: They still think they're right.

Mr. GROOM: They do. They are not arguing against that. I think the Opposition believes that Mr. Fraser is right. Again, that reflects the knowledge within the Opposition Party. Regarding Telecom, in December 1975 a pledge was made for cheap post and mail. That pledge was made by the appointed post and telegraphs Minister (Mr. Nixon), who did not become the democratically elected Minister until after that election. In the *News* of 11 December 1975, Senator Bishop warned that this was a trick. We have hardly got cheap post and mail. The *Advertiser* of 4 November 1977 stated that Telecom's profits were soaring to \$164 000 000. Although some reduction will take place in telephone charges, what has happened to the pledge for cheap post and mail? It has gone up another 2c to 20c.

Child endowment was not mentioned before the election, but we now see reports in the press that there will be a means test for child endowment payments. It has been rumoured that television licence fees will be reintroduced. These things are not leaked for no purpose, but to test and condition people.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Whitten): Order!

Mr. GROOM: Let us have a look at who pays the most tax in Australia and where the tax burden is borne. In its first Budget, the Fraser Government made tax concessions of \$60 000 000 to mining companies, despite the fact that they made collectively \$500 000 000 profits for the previous year. The sum of \$40 000 000 was given to Utah to enable its profits to reach \$150 000 000. There was the 14 per cent investment allowance for industry; this did nothing for unemployment or the economy, and it cost \$480 000 000 in a full year. The Liberal Party purports to help the small business man, but it has done nothing for him. During the period it has been in office in Canberra, the Liberal Government introduced a provisional tax system, of which the member for Eyre is aware. Let us see who pays the taxes in Australia.

For the 1975-76 financial year—and it is a pity the media do not give publicity to these figures—the sum of \$7 000 000 000 was collected through income tax from wage-earners. Small business men, professionals, and partners paid \$2 200 000 000 of the tax collected, and companies, public and private, paid \$2 500 000 000. Wage-earners paid 60 per cent of tax collected in that financial year, small business people paid 19 per cent, and public and private companies combined paid 21 per cent. Who pays the tax in Australia? Where does the burden lie? It is on the small business men and wage-earners. Small businesses are paying the same as the public companies. So much for the record of the Liberal and Country Party's record regarding business people.

Mr. Gunn interjecting:

Mr. GROOM: The member for Eyre does not like this. He likes to parade in his district what the Liberals do for small self-employed people. The figures do not support what he says.

Mr. Gunn: I've got some good material.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre has been warned. He heard what I had to say earlier.

Mr. GROOM: Against this background, let us look at the record of the Labor Party in Government in South

Australia since 1975. We have developed the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, which provided jobs for about 1 100 people a month since it began in 1975. In addition, considerable sums have been spent on purchasing materials, thus assisting business. The Federal Liberal Government refused to assist this scheme, despite the fact that it collected \$6 000 000 in income tax as a result of it. If it was honest, one would think it would have made a special grant of an equivalent amount to South Australia, but it did nothing, and saved on unemployment benefits as well. That shows the hypocrisy of the Fraser Government.

What is our industrial record in South Australia? The Liberal Party claims that industry is leaving the State are patently false. It also claims that business is not expanding here. South Australia is rapidly developing as the centre of Australia's heavy transport manufacturing industry, serving the Eastern States, Western Australia, and other countries. Recently, the Penfold organisation announced that it was consolidating its Australian operations in Adelaide. Clyde Engineering recently won a multi-million dollar contract for the rebuilding of locomotives for the New Zealand Railways. The tyre manufacturing firm, Uniroyal, has shown its confidence in this State by increasing its capacity in a recent major extension to its Adelaide operations. Sola International is doing particularly well. Assisted by the State Government, the lens manufacturing company has expanded its work force from six, in the mid-1960's, to nearly 500 today. Simpson Pope is another example which, with excellent management and tight control, has been able to consolidate its position. A total of 98 new manufacturing establishments commenced operations in South Australia during 1975 and 1976. During 1977, the Small Business Advisory Unit assisted some 400 people.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport has been spoken to on several occasions, as has the honourable member for Eyre. I intend to carry out the warning I gave earlier if they continue in the same fashion.

Mr. GROOM: The Adelaide International Expo resulted in visitors spending about \$10 000 000 in South Australia, and an Adelaide firm also won orders for home building worth \$3 000 000 in the comparable period.

That is not all the State Labor Party has done whilst in Government during this time of havoc in Canberra. It has abolished petrol tax, rural land tax, and succession duties between spouses. It has reduced succession duty rates and land tax for many. It has absorbed cost increases, particularly in public transport, to counteract inflation. It has refused to cut public services, and it has kept construction expenditure high in public buildings and housing.

The greatest success story has been the State Government Insurance Commission, against which our opponents fought bitterly. It has generated more than \$130 000 000 in investment income for this State in less than five years. Many months ago, it announced that it was releasing an extra \$4 000 000 to \$5 000 000 in second mortgages. That is not all the Labor Government has done in South Australia against the background in Canberra.

I turn to some of the highlights of the record of our Government in office. In the Budget announced in September 1976, the Government cut stamp duties. It was announced that stamp duties would be reduced on land, housing, and small business transactions. The expected cost was some \$3 000 000. In that same Budget speech, it was announced that pay-roll tax reductions would be implemented, costing an extra \$1 000 000. The 1976-77 Budget provided \$11 500 000 for drought relief, and

\$1 500 000 of that was provided by the State Government. A special allocation of \$15 000 000 was made from revenue to ensure that the State construction programme, financed from Loan funds, was maintained. That money was used to build hospitals, schools, community welfare facilities, and other public works.

In the *Advertiser* in September 1976, speaking of the 1976 Budget, the Leader of the Opposition said that it must be interpreted as being a pre-election Budget. There was no State election in 1976; it did not take place until September 1977. The Budget was so good that that was what the Leader said. On 1 March 1976, when it was announced that the S.G.I.C. would move into bridging finance and provide \$20 000 000 for it, the Leader viewed the scheme with reserve. He did not appear happy about it. Had it not been for S.G.I.C. and the Housing Trust, the South Australian building industry would have been in a poor state.

Speaking of the 1976 Budget, an A.M.P. spokesman said that the South Australian Government's proposed cut in metropolitan land tax rates would save property investing life assurance companies about \$1 000 000 a year. Here we have the State Government giving a spurt to the economy. There was no recognition of the worth of the Budget by the member for Davenport: he said that metropolitan residents should not be deceived by the proposed land tax changes. The Leader of the Opposition said that the abolition of rural land tax was a hollow gesture. He did not applaud it. The effects of that Budget contrast quite markedly with those Budgets handed down by the Fraser Government.

The Leader of the Opposition described the State Unemployment Relief Scheme which South Australia was able to implement as a waste of money, showing how much he knew of the good work carried on under the scheme. The Premier announced that South Australian farmers would no longer have to pay land tax, and at the time of this announcement of a plan to abolish rural land tax the Premier foreshadowed significant cuts in metropolitan land tax. These promises were kept, in stark contrast to the promises made by Fraser, Lynch and Howard in Canberra. They did not keep one of their promises. These changes that benefited rural areas in South Australia were projected to cost about \$6 200 000 in revenue a year. If honourable members want to know what has happened to the railways money, here is one example, and the State Unemployment Relief Scheme is another.

On 21 September 1976 there was an announcement that the State Bank would buy into Beneficial Finance Corporation, paying \$2 360 000 for 9.09 per cent of the shares in that company. This provided a valuable expansion of services offered to the State Bank. Even as far back as December 1975, South Australian orders in Penang (and members opposite criticised our ventures into South-East Asia) were worth more than \$250 000 in South Australia. Small business was helped in September 1976 through the setting up of the special unit to give advice. The \$18 400 000 accumulated reserves that had built up from the railways agreement were used during these years to lessen the impact of the most ill-conceived and ill-directed policies that Australia has seen since the depression.

What was the State Liberal Party going to do during all this time? At the last election it made promises to the people of South Australia that were projected to cost about \$115 000 000. We would be in a nice situation if members opposite had been elected to Government at the last State election, because that sum of \$115 000 000 had to be raised somewhere. That is what members opposite

tried to put to the people of South Australia. They are some economic managers! They opposed the railways agreement, they said that the State Unemployment Relief Scheme was a waste of money, they criticised our budgets, and they said that people should not be deceived by the metropolitan land tax cuts. Mr. Tonkin said that the abolition of rural land tax was a hollow gesture. The people of South Australia can be thankful that we have in South Australia a capable Government that can manage the affairs of South Australia for the benefit of all South Australians.

Finally, I thank the member for Hanson for promoting me in his district. He has seen fit to quote an interjection which I made and which unfortunately was not recorded accurately in *Hansard*. The second interjection that appears on page 1993 of *Hansard* for 7 March 1978 should be prefaced by the words "That's European socialism; you were referring to Marxism." I mention that because I want to have it corrected in *Hansard*. The honourable member should know that it is quite dangerous to quote interjections. I am sure that his opponent in the next State election will only be too pleased to read some of the interjections made by the honourable member in this House, particularly on the Residential Tenancies Bill, because the honourable member's comments about children in relation to that Bill are printed in *Hansard*. If the honourable member has forgotten, I would suggest that he read them in *Hansard*. He suggested to me that I would not want children living next door to me. He should bear in mind that he believed in 1975 that the Liberal Party was becoming too progressive and that that was frightening him.

In conclusion, I hope that members opposite will take note of some of the things I have said during this debate and that they will take steps to disaffiliate themselves from the Fraser Liberal-National Country Party Government in Canberra. If they had the interests of South Australians at heart they would do just that.

Mr. DRURY (Mawson): I second the motion moved by the member for Morphett and echo his remarks about the late Frank Potter.

Unfortunately for South Australia, as for the rest of Australia, it was indeed a dismal day when Mr. Malcolm Fraser was elected Prime Minister. It was an even more dismal day when he recently announced Federal cut-backs. When the member for Morphett was speaking several rude interjections were made by the Opposition.

Mr. Groom: I didn't hear them.

Mr. DRURY: I did. One came from the member for Glenelg and another from the member for Mount Gambier. When the member for Morphett referred to inflation, the member for Glenelg asked the loaded question "Who started it?". Our inflationary spiral began with the export boom in 1971-72, when we had an enormous amount of goods exported from this country that were, consequently, paid for in various currencies. Because of the inaction of the then McMahon Liberal Government, no compensatory move was made to revalue the Australian currency and, therefore, more money flowed into this country than should have flowed in.

The first thing that the much maligned Whitlam Government did when it came into office was to revalue the Australian currency upwards by 7.1 per cent. It was too late; the inflationary pressures had already begun. In mid-1973 we had the infamous oil price rise. We got the blame for that, but the Labor Party would get the blame if the cat had kittens. When one adds the absolute disastrous currency debacle and the oil price pressures on the economy, one finds that prices begin to run away and that

wage pressures begin to increase. Chronologically, that is the third thing that happened because, in 1974, we had large wage rises, which were triggered off by the previous import price rises. There is no getting away from that.

The member for Mount Gambier, echoing his comrade's futile attempts to denigrate my colleague, asked which came first, the chicken or the egg. If both honourable members were here now, they would know which came first. It has always been a feature of capitalist society that wage rises follow price rises. If Opposition members want to stand here for the rest of the century saying, "What about the Whitlam Government?" and "What about the inflation rate?", let them, but they have already been told where it started.

We now come to the election of Mr. Malcolm Fraser to Government in Australia. As I said, it was a dismal day; nevertheless, we must accept it as reality. We then heard of the investment-led recovery, this much-vaunted recovery, heralded by the magnanimous opening of the purse strings of the Australian people, who would flock to the shops and buy goods in such quantities that unemployment would be decreased, the slack in employment would be taken up by demand, and we would be led into paradise. That did not happen.

What happened then was that a consumer-led recovery failed, and an investment-led recovery was tried. In the investment-led recovery we had such things as a 40 per cent investment allowance, which allowed firms to buy machinery much more cheaply than usual. However, I will mention the effects it had later.

In the 2½ years that Mr. Malcolm Fraser has been Prime Minister we have seen such things as bank deposits rise from \$1 150 a head of population in February-March 1977 to \$1 233 a head of population in March 1978. We have also seen the number of life assurance policies decrease by a discontinuance or reduction in premiums, consistently falling in 1974-75 and 1976-77 and increasingly in 1977-78.

I am using statistics issued by the Bureau of Statistics, the very figures Mr. Fraser and his Government rely on so heavily for their unemployment figures. Also from that source we find that retail sales have remained static for that period. That is also an indisputable fact. It is obvious that the Australian people are not spending their money and therefore are not creating a demand. Why should they, when unemployment is increasing, now having reached 6.1 per cent? In the *Advertiser* of 27 June 1978 the Chairman of Kelvinator Australia is reported as saying that inflation and lack of consumer confidence are the major reasons for the difficult economic climate. Of course there is a reason for this: people are not going to spend money when they do not know from this day to the next who is going to be unemployed.

Whilst my colleague was speaking, one of the Opposition members referred to rumours concerning T.V. licences and child endowment, etc. I think the rumours concerning T.V. licences have been quashed: according to the spokesman for the Federal Government, no such licences will be imposed on Australians. However, nothing has been said about child endowment. On 2 June, I sent the following telegram to the Federal Treasurer:

Deplore proposed cuts in child endowment as announced recently through the press. Child endowment is essential income for many families. Strongly urge you to reconsider this vital matter and retain child endowment.

Ominously, to this day I have not received a reply. In addition to my telegram, this matter was reported on twice in the press (on 30 May and again in June) in articles by Canberra correspondents of the *News* and *Advertiser*. All this points to one thing: for the last 2½ years Australia has been malfunctioning. It appears to me that Mr. Fraser is

using the unemployed as the anvil on which inflation will be beaten down to an acceptable level, but what would he mean by an acceptable level? Mr. Prowse of the Bank of New South Wales gave an indication on *Monday Conference* on 3 July when he said that the level of inflation must fall to below that of our major trading partners. Our major trading partner is Japan, which has an inflation rate of 5 per cent. If we take Mr. Prowse's words, it means inflation must fall to less than 5 per cent. What would then happen regarding employment? If the same pattern is to be repeated unemployment must rise, because that is what has been happening during the term of the Fraser Government. Ostensibly, inflation has been reduced but unemployment has risen to the horrific level of 6.1 per cent. Included in that 6.1 per cent is a certain amount of structural unemployment for the following reasons. We have seen the 40 per cent investment allowance in force for two years, reduced only this financial year to 20 per cent. The Federal Government has been encouraging employers to purchase machinery to replace people's services. In other words, people are expendable but machinery is not.

In the future we face tariff cuts of about 40 per cent which will have another horrific effect on our manufacturing industries. Import quotas are to be increased for foreign goods coming to this country, and in South Australia what affect will this have on our white goods industry which employs so many people, particularly a large proportion of women? What will happen to the large textile industry in Victoria if these measures are taken? Surely Victoria will have a greater structural unemployment problem than South Australia.

The first thing we ought to do is take the advice of the electors of Earlwood in New South Wales who last Saturday returned a Labor candidate at a by-election and who return Labor candidates at every Federal election. Obviously we could not do that in every Federal district, so a majority would be the next best thing. In the Earlwood by-election last Saturday the Labor candidate needed a swing of 4.6 per cent to win but he received a swing of nearly 10 per cent. The seat was held for 28 years by the former Liberal Party Premier, Sir Eric Willis. I am aware of the danger of making comparisons between Federal and State by-elections but one thing is certain: it has been traditional in Australian political history that in by-elections Governments (State or Federal) usually do not do very well. Last Saturday Mr. Wran's Labor Government in New South Wales did very well, and no doubt part of the 10 per cent swing was attributed to the Fraser Government's mishandling of the economy and also its deplorable treatment of the Australian people.

The second thing to do is take heed of a group of economists. The *Advertiser* on 17 July stated:

Melbourne University's seven economics professors and readers said moves to reduce the Budget deficit would mean higher unemployment . . . "Achieving a reduction in both inflation and unemployment would involve, at least temporarily, a substantial rise in the Budget deficit at present levels of activity," Professor Perkins said.

It is obvious what must be done: in all States of Australia there must be a mild stimulus in the Federal Budget instead of further cut-backs. One would have to be blind not to see that, or so religiously mesmerised by the desire to reduce inflation that one is incapable of feeling for people. We are dealing with people who have to sign up for mortgages for 25 years and guarantee 300 monthly payments. How can they do that when they cannot guarantee their income for 300 months? It is ridiculous. The State Government has already felt the chill wind of Fraser's new Federalism.

State Bank housing loans have suffered from two body blows by the Federal Government, one involving a cut from \$23 000 000 to \$18 900 000 this year, and the other involving higher interest rates, increasing by $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent each year until they reach $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent below the bond rate. What effect will that have? It will reduce people's spending power. It only reinforces the ridiculous attitude of the Fraser Government that we will have a consumer-led recovery. How can we have a consumer-led recovery if people have less money to spend on durables?

Only last week on the radio the Opposition Leader was speaking about taxes in this State. He is constantly knocking South Australia, attacking the State Government, claiming it is incompetent, and saying that our housing costs are higher than those in any other State. However, research shows that in 1968-70 the then Hall Liberal Government took the unusual step of removing from price control 37 categories of goods.

Of those categories 23 were building materials. By what logic can one remove components of housing, for which the demand is inelastic, from price control? In other words, the price of those materials is thrown to the wolves, and that must increase housing costs. I quote some of the items on the list: glass; bricks; building blocks; builders hardware; building boards; cast iron; porcelain; enamel ware; earthenware and stoneware; fibrous plaster sheets; fittings and equipment of a type used in the installation of water drainage or sewerage systems; joinery; roofing sheets; tiles of all kinds; thinners; all raw materials used in the manufacture of paints, colours, varnishes, enamels and lacquers; the building of dwellings; supply and fixing of fibrous plaster; and the list goes on. One of the favourite comments of the Liberal Party is that the Labor Government is increasing the cost of housing, and destroying the low-cost base prepared by the Playford Government. How hollow that claim sounds.

Public transport interests me greatly, because I represent a district that is 24 to 32 kilometres from the city, depending whether a person lives at the northern or the southern end of it. We find that the Federal Government has reduced public transport money by \$60 000 000. This will retard the provision of new buses, of which the State Government has ordered 377, and of which 197 have been delivered. It will retard the establishment of the Lonsdale bus depot, which would enhance the efficiency of the public transport system. In spite of that reduction, the State Government has, in my district and in the neighbouring District of Baudin, been able to reduce bus fares for the benefit of commuters. Obviously, the Fraser Government does not think much of the outlying residential areas of our capital cities that are suffering from rapid urbanisation. Mr. Fraser does not think much of providing facilities for these people, and as far as I can see he has no intention of providing them.

State taxes were referred to by the Leader in one of his talk-back radio shows (I will call it a "show" for want of a better word). The Premier spoke on radio the next day and told the people of South Australia what the correct situation was and we were told today what that was.

Mr. Mathwin: By the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. DRURY: The Leader is very nimble on his feet. He was like the man in the dock who was asked by a lawyer "Do you still beat your wife?"

We see in the Governor's Speech that public spending in South Australia will have to be reduced because we cannot possibly fund all of the Commonwealth reductions in loans and other necessary finance. Water filtration plants, which are so necessary in this State and will make life a bit easier

for the housewife, will have to be delayed. Again, Mr. Fraser has pointed out that life wasn't meant to be easy. I suppose he wants the housewives of today to go back to scrubbing boards.

Concerning education, in a Gallup poll published recently in the press it was indicated that 53 per cent of all people polled were satisfied with the level of primary school teaching; that 24 per cent were not satisfied; and that 58 per cent of all people polled believed that the Government should be spending more on primary education.

Mr. Venning: What about getting value for money?

Mr. DRURY: We are getting good value for money in this State, especially considering the Opposition that we have. I refer to my earlier comments that we will be in for a dismal time, and that opinion will be proved correct by the actions of the Fraser Government. Even more cruel is the Prime Minister's complete disregard for structural unemployment, because young people in Australia are facing a drawn-out period of unemployment. In my district there are two high schools with about 1 800 students between years 8 to 12. What will those students be doing in five years? If Mr. Fraser has his way with 40 per cent tariff cuts, his increases in import quotas, and increased investment allowances (and it must be remembered that, whilst investment allowances have been reduced from 40 per cent to 20 per cent, the damage has been done, machines having been purchased for use) the situation will be just as I have outlined.

Still referring to structural unemployment, I am sure that many honourable members, having watched the television programme *Four Corners*, are aware of the effect of computers and associated machinery on employment prospects in the life insurance industry, Telecom, and the banking industry. In the life insurance industry at least 10 000 jobs have disappeared. On that same programme Mr. Clive Jenkins, Secretary of Britain's largest white-collar union, stated that by 1990 more than 7 000 000 jobs in the United Kingdom would be lost.

Mr. Mathwin: He referred to 5 000 000 jobs when he spoke here at a conference.

Mr. DRURY: He spoke of 7 000 000 jobs on that programme.

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

Mr. DRURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but one would not think that was the case by the way members opposite are behaving. I refer to all the projects that the Government has tried to undertake, but the present situation means that we will be restricted in what we can supply to the people of South Australia. Our expectations will be less than earlier expectations and, of most importance, we will suffer, in this State of all States, from a lack of job opportunities.

Mr. Venning: Why don't you wake up to yourself?

Mr. DRURY: Why doesn't the honourable member stay where he is, and sleep.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DRURY: Therefore, in South Australia, as a result of tariff cuts, increased quotas, and all the other diabolical things that have descended upon us as a result of Mr. Fraser's actions, we should be getting increased Federal funding and increased loans, and not lesser sums.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the 5 per cent?

Mr. DRURY: The 5 per cent increase provided does not even match the inflation rate, and the honourable member knows that. I refer to the confidence trick used by the Fraser Government in allocating block grants rather than indexing grants to provide for inflation. People will believe that we are getting more funds but, in fact, that is not the

case, because the sums received at the beginning of any financial period are eaten into by inflation by half-way through that period. Inflation has already made inroads to the extent of 8 per cent.

Mr. Mathwin: Not now, inflation's coming down.

Mr. DRURY: It was 8 per cent earlier this year. Inflation is going down, but unemployment is rising. So far as I can see, all the Australian States and not just the Labor-governed States are in for a bad time. That is what Mr. Fraser thinks of members of his own Party: he would not even help his Liberal colleagues.

Mr. Venning: Western Australia and Queensland are doing all right.

Mr. DRURY: Queensland is going great, so let us hope it keeps going—right out of Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: That is where the Premier is going to retire.

Mr. DRURY: In reply to the member for Glenelg, the Premier explained that point on a radio talk-back programme the other day. He is not retiring to Queensland. He simply expressed a desire to purchase land there, because the climate is similar to that in South Australia. The honourable member should stop creating smoke screens, as he has been doing for the past year. The Opposition wants to speak about everything except the Fraser Government's cut-backs. It wants to create smoke screens regarding law and order or crime. The Opposition will go on about anything that does not cost money. The Opposition wants nothing to do with anything that costs money, and that is part of Fraser's gospel. It does not want to spend public money. It does not want to see the standard of living of Australians rise, or even remain as it is.

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Glenelg has been interjecting for some time. I hope he will cease doing so, or I will take action.

Mr. Venning: We must help him.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River must cease interjecting. The honourable member for Mawson has the floor.

Mr. DRURY: Because of the hiding my colleague the member for Morphett has given the Fraser Government (and I do not think I could do better), I will end with a statement with which the Opposition cannot disagree no matter how hard it tries. Since I was 19 years of age, it has been my great privilege to belong to the Australian Labor Party, and I support the political beliefs and social aspirations of that Party. We in the A.L.P. put Australians first, but the Liberal Party of Australia puts Australia last.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): In referring to the sackings at the Johns Perry Engineering group last Friday, I remind members of the heading of an article that appeared on the front page of the following day's *Advertiser*:

96 workers lose jobs: plants shut.

I refer members' attention to the fact that the report was not authorised by any writer. It is usual for industrial items to carry the by-line of Bill Rust, the industrial reporter, but the report in question seems to have been written by the editor and in such a way as to mislead South Australians. The report states:

Ninety-six metal-industry employees lost their jobs

yesterday when two Adelaide subsidiaries of the Johns Perry Engineering group were closed.

If we analyse it, it is not 96 workers who lost their jobs but 163. To explain that statement, 62 were employed at the Perry foundry, Kilkenny, and 34 at Gibb and Miller Limited, Port Adelaide, making 96, but 20 more employees at the Kilkenny foundry will go as soon as all the present castings are fettled and cleaned up. Another 47 employees at Gibb and Miller will go within the next month. Actually almost twice as many as stated were sacked last Friday. Let us examine the way in which they were sacked. No prior notice was given to them, but notice on the spot.

Unions over the past four months have been in constant contact with Johns Perry in order to ascertain what the company intended to do with its foundry but the company would not tell employees what it intended to do. Only last week, in a consultation with one of the leading people of the Johns Perry group, it was stated:

It will not be long. On 25 July we will tell you what is to happen to the foundry at Kilkenny.

We know what happened to the foundry at Kilkenny, but not on 25 July when the company told the unions it would tell them: it happened on 14 July.

I want to draw the attention of the House to some of the misreporting in the *Advertiser* of 15 July 1978, not from Bill Rust, the industrial roundsman, but it seems to be from the Editor. A sub-heading "Given loading" is used, and that means to me and to most people who read that that the company has given the employees something: it gave them nothing except their entitlement. The report states:

Spokesman for the two Johns Perry companies said yesterday the 62 men retrenched from Kilkenny and the 34 from Port Adelaide had been given redundancy pay of a 17½ per cent loading on their accrued leave payments . . .

That is not a redundancy payment; that is just an award provision for 17½ per cent on annual leave. The company has tried to lead people to believe that it has given the employees something; instead, it is trying to take away their right to work. The report continues:

. . . and one day's pay for each completed year of service.

It has been normal in redundancy payments for one week's pay for every completed year of service to be paid. There is one case at the foundry of an employee with 41 years service up to date; today he had 41 years service. What did the company do? It gave him 40 days pay because he had not completed the other year of service. The company made sure of that and saved itself a day's pay. That is how lousy and rotten some of these companies are. Let me remind members that one of the directors of this company is one of those august persons in the Legislative Council. Over the years that I have known that gentleman—

Mr. Goldsworthy: You said he was marvellous a while ago.

Mr. WHITTEN: Yes, and over the years I have had negotiations with Mr. Laidlaw; when he was at Perry Engineering, he was a man that you could talk to, but it seems that, since the takeover by the Johns Perry group, things have changed. Let us examine that group: there used to be three main engineering companies in South Australia: one was Forwood Downs, there was Perry Engineering and also Gibb & Miller. What has happened over the years? One of the overseas companies, Waygood Otis, bought into Forwood Downs and established Forwood Johns and Waygood.

It was not very long after that when they said, "This is not going so well; we will consolidate, and have only Perry Engineering and Gibb & Miller." They told boilermakers at Forwood Johns and Waygood, "We will give you a job

over there but, of course, you lose all your service and such like, and you will have a job at Perry Engineering." Then it went further with more consolidation. There is no longer a Waygood or an Otis of America. It is just the Johns Perry group.

I am sure that the Minister of Mines and Energy will be interested in the fact that the secretary of the moulders union and an organiser from the iron workers union tried to ascertain what was happening, and the only way they could do so was by telephoning a Mr. Kevin Ellis, who happened to be in Singapore looking at foundry operations, with the objective of transferring all casting operations to Singapore.

Let us go a little further with this matter. The Minister has just negotiated a contract for the Port Augusta powerhouse, at which it is estimated that 2 000 tonnes of castings will be used. In his efforts to look after South Australia, the Minister has written into the contracts a provision stating that, where possible, work that can be done in South Australia will be done here. However, I remind members that we have lost the capacity of the Johns Perry group, which has just closed down. It may operate at its other foundry in Tasmania, or in Singapore. However, I believe that negotiations are not going as well as they should be going in relation to Singapore.

I should like also to refer to the report on the front page of Saturday's *Advertiser*. I refer specifically to the comments made by the shadow Minister of Labour and Industry (Mr. Dean Brown). I know very well that members opposite are embarrassed by him; he should not be a shadow Minister. Perhaps a member of the Upper House who knows something about industry should be holding the reins. The shadow Minister said:

The State Government must wake up to what is happening and take positive action to support existing industry. What did the Government do? It tried to ensure that these castings were done in South Australia. But what do the Liberal friends of members opposite do? They uproot things and get out of the State so that there is no capacity here.

Mr. Venning: They brought it—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River must cease interjecting.

Mr. WHITTEN: I want to echo what Mr. Des Gray, an organiser of the Federated Ironworkers Association, said, as follows:

The men had been given virtually one minute's notice. I am utterly disgusted. It makes a complete mockery of the lipservice they pay to the idea of good industrial relations. Here was an opportunity for action to be taken, if the company was going as badly as it was supposed to be going. Why did it not take the unions into its confidence? The unions will do what they can to retain the jobs of their members. However, the Johns Perry engineering group did not consider industrial relations at all. That is why I say that, if one of the directors of this group, who sits up there in the other august Chamber, had taken some interest in the affairs of the workers (after all, he is a Liberal and members opposite could have consulted him), this sort of thing would not have happened.

There are many things that I should like to bring to members' attention, but I am unable to do so because I have not sufficient time. Last year, the Johns Perry group had a record profit, yet a couple of minutes later they sacked all their staff.

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

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): Normally, I do not reply to cheap smears or smug statements that are often banded about in this House or in my district. However, I feel

compelled this afternoon to reply to the statements made by the member for Morphett. I forwarded a Parliamentary report to a few people involved with my campaign committee, together with an extract from the *Hansard* report of a speech I made on 8 March 1978. It is interesting to note that that report was forwarded to a small number of selected people, and it would be even more interesting to know how it came into the possession of the member for Morphett.

One wonders whether the A.L.P., which has been running true to form ever since I have been a member, has planted a spy in my organisation, or whether my mail has been interfered with. However, the member for Morphett has a case to answer regarding how he got hold of a copy of that report, because it was sent to only a few people. It therefore seems that the member for Morphett has something to answer for. The honourable member can laugh as much as he likes.

Mr. Groom: A complimentary copy!

Mr. BECKER: The honourable member got more than that. There have been troubles with the mail ever since I was forced to move from one district to another. There have been problems with telephone calls, and no doubt those are the tactics the Government wants to continue. It does not worry me. The present member for Morphett is the worst candidate his Party has ever put against me. He got the biggest thrashing of any A.L.P. opponent I have had.

Mr. Groom interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: He makes inane interjections, as he did when he was goading the Opposition into explaining socialism. Now he adds that he was referring to European socialism. That is even better. I remind him of an article which appeared recently in the *Readers Digest* under the heading, "Class Struggle", as follows:

"Bedlam" has been the bitter one-word description used for too many Italian schools, especially in northern industrialised Italy. Extremist agitators, mostly of the communist-inspired far left, had carried "permissiveness" to a point where students did anything but learn. Strikes, picketing, shouting parades through corridors, walls covered with leftist and often obscene scrawls, filthy language in class, destruction of school property, teachers drowned out by mass jeering, hippie clothing, smoking in class and hours-long assemblies demanding "democratic rights" have too often made education a sad joke.

One day, Professor Francesco Garofalo, principal of the Edmondo de Amicis school in San Remo, presented an unusual code of rules for student conduct. Some of them: "Obey the teacher's orders without objection; come to school clean and neatly clothed; sit up straight in class; stand up respectfully when teachers enter the classroom; stand up when questioned and sit down only when the teacher gives permission; refrain from vulgar language, cursing, smoking, gambling in class or damaging school property; and when meeting a teacher in the street, greet him courteously." Before anybody could raise the customary cries about "authoritarian", "reactionary", and "fascist", Professor Garofalo said with a smile, "I have quoted these rules as a matter of interest. These are the rules in force today, and strictly obeyed, in the schools of the Soviet Union."

No doubt the member for Morphett is delighted. On the previous occasion, when I was quoting his Party's interpretation of democratic socialism, he insisted on interjecting, and he has now insisted on linking his remarks to European socialism. So be it. No doubt he has embarrassed his organisation, and he is trying to get out of it. He knows that a meeting will be held in the Morphett District tomorrow night when a decision will be made as to who will be his opponent. He can enjoy the next two years

in this House, because he will not be here after the next State election.

We are not frightened by any threats. The member for Henley Beach knows that plenty of threats have been made against me, but I keep bouncing back. His Party faces an embarrassing situation. The previous candidate who stood against me is now facing numerous charges in relation to Medibank. We will not go into that, but it shows the standard of the candidates the A.L.P. has seen fit to have representing it against me in the past. They are the people who now make threats about my right to inform people what is written in *Hansard*. I have the greatest respect, as I think every other member of this House has, for the creditability and the accuracy of *Hansard*. If the member for Morphett thought that the interjections were not correctly recorded, he did not approach *Hansard* to have the record altered.

Mr. Groom: I didn't see the proof.

Mr. BECKER: There you are. That is an admission of his own guilt, in that he does not check up on what is said in this House on a day-to-day basis. Each member checks his speeches and has 24 hours to correct them. Each member also checks to see whether any interjections have been made, regardless of whether the member is in the House or whether the member is interested in what is happening, it is every member's responsibility to correct the accuracy of the *Hansard* pull. Otherwise, when the printed version is published, the member has missed the bus. To reflect on *Hansard* as the honourable member has done this afternoon does him little credit indeed.

I would have thought that his so-called experience in the courts of this State would have taught him to be more careful. However, he still has a case to answer about how he got hold of a document that I have said has gone only to a confidential list of people, if he can answer the charge, or whether he is interfering with my mail. The member for Morphett may laugh. As he knows, he pushed hard to get me out of that electorate office as soon as he was elected to this House. He did not care about the inconvenience that he caused the member for Henley Beach. I could relate the discussions that took place with the Minister of Works about begging him to get out of that office. We know the reason why I was asked to get out of that office was that a Federal election was coming up and the Labor Party did not want that office used as a campaign centre for Steele Hall. We know the reason for it: it was used to back Jacobi in Hawker.

Members interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: The Minister can say what he likes; he knows I am a wake-up to his tactics as well.

Irrespective of what happened at that Federal election, the Liberal Party gained a tremendous vote in the State seat of Morphett, the true vote that should have been recorded will give us that seat quite handsomely at the next State election.

Mr. Groom: Why didn't you stand?

Mr. BECKER: The member for Morphett throws in the interjection "Why didn't you stand for Morphett?" There are some of us who are loyal to our own Party. The member for Morphett was worried prior to his Party preselection, because he contacted me on the telephone and asked me which seat I was going to stand for because he was not prepared to oppose me at the next State election. He also sent a journalist after me to ask me to hurry up and make up my mind which seat I was going to contest. The member for Morphett told me that he was not prepared to oppose me at the next State election. We will not go into that, nor will we go into what the person who stood against me said about how the Premier grovelled to our family doctor so that he would oppose me in the State

election. Dr. Jennings told me how the Premier grovelled to him to oppose me so that his friend could stand for the seat of Morphett. That is the credibility of the Labor Party in the western suburbs. That is the credibility it does not have, and it was further demonstrated this afternoon.

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

Mr. HARRISON (Albert Park): I want to discuss the seventh annual report of the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs, being that for the year ended December 1977. I am sure that all members have had an opportunity to peruse the report, which is a quite good report. I think I should do justice to the report by elaborating on some of the points contained in it. I fully support the opening remarks in the report, remarks that highlight the awareness of constituents to rights they have under legislation. The increased number of people seeking advice or raising complaints to be investigated totalled 102 100 for the year ended December 1977. No doubt this increase reflects the foresight of the branch in opening facilities at Port Augusta, Mount Gambier, and Berri, thus bringing the service of the branch to country centres. Subsidiary offices at Whyalla and Port Pirie are staffed by an investigation officer from Port Augusta a couple of days a week. The number of people bringing complaints was 300 in Port Augusta, 130 in Mount Gambier, and 120 in Berri.

In the Seaton and Findon areas (postcode 5023) 101 complaints were dealt with, and in the Hendon area (postcode 5014) 55 complaints were dealt with; many of these people were informed of their rights through the Albert Park electorate office. The literature circulated was of a high standard, much sought after, and greatly appreciated by my constituents. This method of distributing information should be continued, and the information should be brought up to date from time to time as advantageous amendments to the Acts are made. Reports reaching my office are very encouraging. My constituents appreciate the manner in which their complaints are heard and their problems investigated. Although not all problems can be solved, people appreciate being able to air their grievances. One thing is certain: people are more aware of the pitfalls associated with sales made in the home. Another interesting aspect of the report is the apparent need for further amendments to cover caravans, motor boats, and motor bikes. This need has no doubt been brought about by the number of constituents who have been advised to seek the branch's help and advice. Information has been compiled on cases where something should be done, although at the time the cases were not covered by the Act. Records have apparently been kept of complaints in this connection. The Act should be amended to cover the three items to which I have referred. I refer particularly to Part II, paragraphs 4 and 5, of the annual report, as follows:

More consumers than ever seem to be aware that there is legislation to protect them. Often, however, it is a case of "a little knowledge being dangerous". For example, many have the idea that there is a "cooling off" period applicable to all purchases, including second-hand cars. There is no such protection.

Those who change their minds about buying a car, after paying a deposit, and expect the deposit to be refunded, are also often disappointed. In general, the only time a deposit is refundable in full is when the sale was conditional on such things as a satisfactory independent mechanical report which does not eventuate. A "holding deposit" is normally not recoverable if the sale is cancelled, while a "part payment" deposit is usually only recoverable to the extent that it is in

excess of any loss suffered by the dealer because of cancellation.

I refer now to section 1 (a) on page 9 of the report, dealing with legislation, as follows:

The tasks facing investigating officers in dealing with consumer complaints do not become any easier. This is due to complainants becoming more demanding on the one hand and dealers becoming more resistant on the other. Although these attitudes apply only to a minority of consumers and dealers, it is still a matter of some significance. It certainly highlights the need for a number of amendments to the Secondhand Motor Vehicles Act, 1971, to make it more effective and efficient. First, there is no provision for the carrying out of unfulfilled warranty obligations if a dealer goes out of business and has no resources.

This is very important, because I have had to refer several cases to the branch under such conditions. The report continues:

Secondly, the present procedure for disputes over warranty obligations to be heard by a local court can be so time-consuming that justice to the consumer within a reasonable time becomes difficult to achieve. For example, one impatient consumer became so exasperated over delays that he spent \$450 on repairs by another firm, thereby

releasing the selling dealer from any legal obligations; only action by the branch and a moral obligation felt by the dealer resulted in a settlement contribution of \$300. Thirdly, dealers themselves complain that some dealers' premises are not readily recognisable as a used car outlet. This is said to enable too many "back yarders" to pose as private persons and evade their obligations to the consumer. All these matters were under review at the end of the year and suitable amendments to the legislation are being considered.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that these amendments are well warranted. I know that there is a need for them, because I have spoken to constituents in my district. I am sure the same situation applies in other districts.

I think it is proper to refer persons with complaints to the department so that their cases are kept in mind and so that, if that type of case becomes prevalent, it will show the need for changes or amendments to this Act. I am sure that, if members are cognisant of the report and study it, as they should with all reports, they will get something from it that is worthy of note. I commend the Commissioner for his report, which was brought before this House recently.

Motion carried.

At 5.43 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 19 July at 2 p.m.