

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 26 September 1978

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

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 407, 503, 504, 508-12, 515-8, 522, 523, 525, 529-31, 533, 536-8, 541, 542, 549, 553-6, 559-62, 564, 567, 568, 570, 571, 574, 577, 581, 584, 589, 595 and 598.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

407. Mr. **DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. How many Government employees were working with each department at 30 June 1977 and 30 June 1978, respectively?

2. For each department, how many of these employees were casual employees and how many were part-time employees?

3. What maximum employee numbers have been allocated to each department for 1978-79?

4. What is the anticipated growth rate in numbers of Government employees for 1978-79?

5. What was the growth rate for 1977-78?

6. Have maximum employee numbers or allocations been set for any statutory authorities for 1978-79 and, if so, what numbers have been set and how many persons were employed at 30 June 1977 and 30 June 1978 in each statutory authority?

7. For each such statutory authority, how many employees were casual employees and how many were part-time employees at 30 June 1977 and 1978, respectively?

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

1. The number of officers employed under the Public Service Act were 16 597 as at 30.6.77: 17 175 as at 30.6.78 (totals include part-time and casual officers). Details of the number of officers employed in each department under the Public Service Act as at 30 June of each of the two years are set out in table I attached.

2. Details of the number of casual and part-time officers employed in each department under the Public Service Act as at 30 June of each of the two years are set out in table II attached.

3. For 1978-79, having regard to a zero growth rate, most departments have a staff ceiling based on the number of staff employed as at the first pay period in July 1978. There are some departments where small increases will be offset by reductions in a few departments to achieve zero growth across the entire service.

4. Zero growth rate proposed for 1978-79.

5. The growth rate for 1977-78 in terms of equivalent full-time public servants was approximately 3.4 per cent. The growth in terms of total public servants was slightly higher at 3.5 per cent due to the increase in part-time employment.

6. and 7. This information is not readily available and it would be necessary to contact all statutory authorities to obtain it. To do so would be unreasonable. Much of the information would be available from authorities' annual reports as they are printed.

TABLE I

Department	Public Servants Employed as at 30 June	
	1977	1978
Agriculture and Fisheries	729	811
Art Gallery	23	23
Auditor-General's	100	97
Community Welfare	1 160	1 156
Corporate Affairs		43
Correctional Services	492	533
Economic Development	53	61
Education	937	1 013
Electoral	18	18
Engineering and Water Supply	1 657	1 746
Environment	285	196
Further Education	357	436
Highways	1 021	1 046
Hospitals	3 128	3 366
Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs	128	171
Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science	73	82
Labour and Industry	259	274
Lands	1 055	926
Law	458	454
Libraries	286	314
Marine and Harbors	286	293
Mines and Energy	269	277
Police	90	98
Premier's	192	195
Public and Consumer Affairs	387	400
Public Buildings	1 157	1 147
Public Service Board	196	197
Services and Supply	558	542
Supreme Court	63	64
Tourism, Recreation and Sport	139	152
Transport	573	567
Treasury	220	226
Woods and Forests	243	251
Total	16 597	17 175

TABLE II

Casual and Part-time Public Servants Employed as at 30 June

Department	1977		1978	
	Casual	Part-time (excl. casual)	Casual	Part-time (excl. casual)
Agriculture and Fisheries	1	4		
Art Gallery				
Auditor-General's				
Community Welfare	7	22	10	32
Corporate Affairs				
Correctional Services				
Economic Development		1		
Education	4	10		30
Electoral		2		
Engineering and Water Supply		8		4
Environment		2		2
Further Education	3	5	2	9
Highways		2		
Hospitals	14	50	32	71
Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs				
Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science				
Labour and Industry	1	4	1	4

Department	1977		1978	
	Casual	Part-time (excl. casual)	Casual	Part-time (excl. casual)
Lands	1	17		4
Law		6		11
Libraries	4	8	4	12
Marine and Harbors	1	1		
Mines and Energy	2	1	4	2
Police	1			
Premier's		2		2
Public and Consumer Affairs		4		
Public Buildings	1	5		1
Public Service Board				1
Services and Supply	1	1		5
Supreme Court		1		1
Tourism, Recreation and Sport				1
Transport	1	7		10
Treasury		2		
Woods and Forests		1		1
Total	42	166	53	205

Definitions

(1) Temporary Officers are defined in the Public Service Act as follows:

"Temporary Officer" means a person employed or deemed to be employed under Part IV of this Act:

Part IV of the Act enables the employment of temporary officers for the purposes of:

prompt dispatch of business of a department (section 108 (1)).

employment of persons who are 65 years or more, but less than 70 (section 112 (1)).

(2) Part-Time:

In September 1977, the Public Service Board adopted the following definition of part-time employment:

Persons engaged for less than 37½ to 40 hours per week, working 15 hours or more per week for a continuous period of one month or longer where the hours of work are fixed and constant. Part-time officers will be entitled to pro rata annual leave, sick leave and payment for public holidays in which they are rostered off duty, according to hours normally worked. In the case of permanent or temporary officers, the relevant provisions of the Public Service Act will apply.

Casuals were defined as:

A casual employee is one engaged and paid as such* in any of the following circumstances:

- (i) Working less than 15 hours per week, regardless of the length of time employment continues.
- (ii) When the duration of the engagement is less than one month.
- (iii) When the ordinary hours of work are not fixed and constant irrespective of the number of hours per week or the length of time employment continues.

*Casual employees would be paid a salary loading in lieu of sick leave, recreation leave and public holiday entitlements.

(3) "Employees with each department" means Government employees, or employees of the State, i.e. everybody who works for the State Government in each department.

(4) "Public Servants" includes all officers, temporary officers and casuals employed under the provisions of the Public Service Act on a full-time or part-time basis.

SALTIA CREEK

503. Mr. GUNN (on notice): Will the Minister and the Highways Department take urgent action to improve the Saltia Creek crossings on the Quorn to Port Augusta road to alleviate the problems that have been caused by severe flooding over the last few months?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is planned to construct concrete floodways at the two Saltia Creek crossings early in 1979 for which funds are available. It is not possible to carry out any work at present due to the wet conditions.

DENTAL DEPARTMENT

504. Mr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What was the total cost of the consultant's report into the Dental Department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and when was it completed?

2. Is it proposed to release the report and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

3. What were the principal findings and recommendations of the report and on which, if any, has action been taken?

4. What improvements in the service provided to the public by the Dental Department have there been as a result of the consultant's report?

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

1. Total cost \$30 120. Completed March 1975.

2. No. The report was prepared for internal use by Management.

3. and 4. (a) A system of managerial controls was developed and instituted.

(b) The overall objectives of the department were set.

(c) Internal structure re-organisation was recommended and implemented with minor modifications.

(d) Increases in productivity were achieved in some areas.

(e) Job descriptions were developed.

(f) Increased professional staff was recommended and partially achieved.

(g) Additional space requirements were quantified and a brief prepared for architectural action.

ROAD CLOSURES

508. Mr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What decisions were finally reached by the Burnside City council and conveyed to the Minister or the Road Traffic Board regarding each of the road closures in the Rose Park Toorak Gardens area and when were they made?

2. Does the Minister and/or the Road Traffic Board support the decisions of the council in each instance and, if not, why not?

3. Does the Minister and/or the Road Traffic Board intend actively to oppose the implementation of the council's decisions in any specific instance and, if so, in which?

4. When is it expected work will be completed on the removal of barriers and the construction of alternative traffic control measures?

5. What have been the reasons for the long delay in implementing the council's decisions?

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

1. On 19/5/78, Burnside city council submitted to the Road Traffic Board for approval an alternative scheme in which the number of closures was to be reduced from twelve to eight. The four closures to be removed are:

- (i) In Grant Avenue at its intersection with Webb Street.
 - (ii) In Hewitt Avenue at its intersection with Prescott Terrace.
 - (iii) In Prescott Terrace at its intersection with Grant Avenue.
 - (iv) In Barker Grove at its intersection with Cudmore Avenue.
2. Yes.
 3. No.
 4. 30 October 1978.
 5. It is not considered that a long delay has occurred in implementing the council's decisions.

FURNITURE

509. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):
1. Has the Government considered the introduction of furniture labelling regulations which specify the origin of manufacture and/or the name of the importer and, if so, what is the current policy on this subject?
 2. Has the subject been discussed at a meeting of Commonwealth Ministers and, if so, when and with what result?
 3. Is the Government aware of such legislation (regulation) now applying in Western Australia and is such legislation proposed for South Australia and, if so, when?
- The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** The replies are as follows:
1. Yes. The Government has introduced a new Trade Standards Bill. After the passage and proclamation of this Act, Furniture Trade Regulations will be made.
 2. Yes, at the Seventh Meeting of Ministers of Consumer Affairs held on 26 May 1978, when the proposal was agreed to.
 3. Yes. See question No. 1.

STEEL

510. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):
1. Was any steel purchased for the provisions of staunchions for the electrification of a suburban railway and, if so, when, what was the cost and to where was it delivered?
 2. Was any such steel fabricated into staunchions and, if so, where, when and at what cost?
 3. For what subsequent purpose has any unfabricated steel been used, when, where, and at what cost?
 4. Have any fabricated staunchions been used for any other purpose either as staunchions or by reworking and what are the details?
 5. Who authorised the purchase of the material, when, and on what firm commitment of use for the electrification of a suburban line?
- The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The replies are as follows:
1. Steel was purchased in October 1974 at a cost of \$137 000 and delivered to the Islington Workshops.
 2. The steel was not fabricated.
 3. Steel has been used for the construction of bridges and building works, as follows:
 - (i) September 1976—Christie Downs Passenger Terminal for bridging and canopy at a cost of \$4 808.
 - (ii) May 1978—Callington for bridge works at a cost of \$592.
 4. No staunchions were fabricated.
 5. The Railways Commissioner authorised the purchase on 11 July 1974 to obtain steel for overhead catenary structures for electrification of the Christie Downs Line.

SWANPORT BRIDGE

511. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):
1. Did the Highways Department contemplate building the Swanport Bridge, or any part of it, with its own work force and, if so, what are the details.
 2. Did the Highways Department or any other Government Department or agency purchase steel for the construction of the Swanport Bridge and, if so, what are the details including expenditure?
 3. What amount of steel originally destined to be used on the Swanport Bridge was delivered, what were its specifications, where was it delivered, what was the invoiced cost and when was it delivered?
 4. If any of this steel has been used, on what project or projects has it been used and what is the balance held and where?
 5. What is the condition of the remaining steel and for what purpose will it be used?
 6. What is the estimated financial loss to the State of the purchase and on whose authority was the original purchase made and also the subsequent decision not to proceed?
- The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The replies are as follows:
1. No.
 2. Yes. 2 177 tonnes was purchased by the Highways Department at a cost of \$520 000.
 3. 2 177 tonnes of ordinary weldable grade 250 notch ductile steel plate was delivered to the Highways Department Depot at Northfield during 1973-74 at a total cost of \$520 000.
 4. 452 tonnes was used on the modified foundations of the Swanport Bridge leaving 1 725 tonnes surplus. This steel has been allocated as follows:
 - (a) Issued or reserved for Departmental Projects.

	Tonnes
Brinkley Road overpass . . .	190
Paradise Bridge	102
Regency Road overpass . . .	164
Workshop manufacturers . .	49
 - (b) Sales to other organizations . . 142
 - The balance held at Northfield Store 1 078 tonnes
 5. The remaining steel is in sound condition and will be used on future departmental works, or sold on the open market.
 6. No financial loss has been incurred by the State. An estimated saving of over \$1 000 000 was achieved by adopting an alternative design for the Swanport Bridge. The original purchase of the steel was authorised by the Minister of Transport, through the Supply and Tender Board.

BUS AND TRAM DIVISION

512. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):
1. Are motormen and conductors of the State Transport Authority of South Australian Bus and Tram Division required to agree to rostering which may call for commencement of shift at 5 a.m. and for clock-off at 1 a.m. and what are the specific employment requirements?
 2. Are the motormen and conductors required to sign an application for appointment and what does that document state?
 3. What, if any, provision is made for employees who are unable to offer for roster as early as 5 a.m. or as late as 1 a.m.?
- The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The replies are as follows:
1. Motormen and conductors employed by the authority are required to agree to rostering arrangements. The subsequent employment requirements are set out in

the South Australian Tramway and Omnibus Award 1977.

2. On appointment all traffic personnel are required to sign the following acknowledgement which is set out on the back of the Application for Employment form.

'I acknowledge that:—

1. My conditions of employment after qualification as a conductor/bus operator will be those prescribed by the S.A. Tramway and Omnibus Award and that the commencing rate when qualified will be . . .
 2. I may be transferred to other employment within the authority subject to appropriate notice being given.
 3. I must observe the rules and regulations prescribed by the authority from time to time.
 4. I am to notify the authority of any change of address.
 5. That this contract shall be void if I do not report for duty at the due time and date of starting.
 6. The provisions of the State Transport Authority's Retiring and Death Gratuity—Employees Scheme do not form part of my conditions of employment. I understand that in accordance with the procedures of the S.A. Superannuation Fund Board I am eligible for consideration to enter the S.A. Superannuation Fund should I desire to join the Fund.'
3. Employees not wishing to work before about 6.00 a.m. or after about 8.00 p.m. may apply for work on the broken shift roster at Hackney, City, Port or Morphettville Depots.

DINGOES

515. Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. Have dingo pups been bred at Cleland Conservation Park and, if so:

- (a) when was each litter born;
- (b) how many were in each litter; and
- (c) how many died of natural causes and what was the natural cause in each case?

2. Have dingoes from Cleland Conservation Park been destroyed deliberately and, if so:

- (a) by whom;
- (b) what were the ages of each case;
- (c) what methods were used to kill the animals;
- (d) why were they destroyed;
- (e) is it intended to continue breeding from the dingoes so more killings can take place; and
- (f) has consideration been given to desexing the adult dingoes and, if so, what was the result of those considerations?

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

1. Yes.

- (a) July each year.
- (b) 5-6 pups per litter.
- (c) Nil.

2. Yes.

- (a) The last pups were destroyed by a Veterinary Surgeon. Previously destroyed by the Ranger-in-Charge, Cleland Conservation Park.
- (b) A few days old.
- (c) The Veterinary Surgeon now destroys by injection. Previously by shooting.
- (d) Insufficient area to keep additional animals.
- (e) No. It was never intended to breed dingoes so that they could be destroyed.
- (f) Yes. It was considered inappropriate as replacement animals may be needed in the future.

HOUSE BUILDING

516. Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. At what rate are new houses, units, and flats being commenced in South Australia?

2. What is the desired rate the Government wishes to achieve?

3. If the present backlog is eliminated, what is the projected annual rate of house building required from 1982 to 1990?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. For the year ended 30 June 1978, the Australian Bureau of Statistics' provisional figures for dwelling commencements are 7 686 houses and 1 786 other dwellings (no further breakdown is available), making total of 9 472 dwellings (1 952 of them Government ones). This compares with 11 117 houses and 3 145 other dwellings, a total of 14 262 dwellings (2 191 of them Government ones) in 1976/77. For the latest quarter, ended June 1978, provisional figures are 1 740 houses and 555 other dwellings, a total of 2 295 dwellings.

2. The Indicative Planning Council's mid 1978 report states that South Australian dwelling commencements and completions in 1978/79 are not expected to exceed 9 200 even though it had earlier said 13 500 completions would be desirable. Important factors in the expected lack of increase in construction were the backlog of unsold dwellings, lower predicted growth of population and house holds, and difficulties of potential buyers meeting deposit and repayment requirements. The Government would wish to achieve a commencement rate consistent with the needs of the community, and this would clearly be somewhat lower than the rate the Indicative Planning Council originally thought desirable.

3. In the long term, the Household Formation Working Party has estimated based on demographic trends, that dwelling completions for the metropolitan area will fall gradually averaging about 7 300 in 1981/86 and about 6 300 in 1986/91. These figures are obviously extremely tentative and rely on a number of significant assumptions, for example, with regard to level of migrant intake. These forecasts do not allow for any demand backlog. Such a backlog is thought to be sizeable, but cannot be estimated. Allowing for it and for non-metropolitan demand, a minimum completion rate of 10 000 per annum for the 1980's could well be a conservative estimate.

F.I.L.E.F.

517. Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What moneys has the Government made available to F.I.L.E.F. of Ebor Avenue, Mile End, in each fiscal year since its formation?

2. What are the aims and objectives of F.I.L.E.F.?

3. What are the names of the office holders of F.I.L.E.F.?

4. Is the building occupied by F.I.L.E.F. owned or rented by the Government and, if so, by which department?

5. How many of the persons involved in F.I.L.E.F. are known by the Government to be active Communists and what are their names?

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

1. From the Community Welfare Grants Fund, in 1977, \$8 750 and in 1978, \$6 500.

2. The stated aims and objectives of F.I.L.E.F. are:

- (a) Assist Italian migrant workers and their families in settling in their new countries of residence.

- (b) Provide community and welfare services and facilities for Italians.
 - (c) Help Italians participate more fully in all aspects of life in their new country of residence (socially, economically, culturally and politically).
 - (d) Help defend all their rights as citizens and oppose all injustices and discriminations.
3. Inquiries should be made of this organisation.
 4. The building is not owned or rented by a Government department. A grant for rent was not approved for 1978, but was approved for the establishment of the service.
 5. The Government has no such knowledge.

LAND COMMISSION

518. **Mr. EVANS** (on notice):

1. Has a plan to bring the South Australian Land Commission under another statutory body of department been considered and, if so, is action to be taken in relation to such proposals and, if so, why and what are the actions to be taken?
2. How many allotments sold to private buyers by the commission were returned to the commission from 30 June 1977 to 31 August 1978 and:
 - (a) what was the address of each such allotment;
 - (b) what were the reasons given for the return of each allotment; and
 - (c) does the four years compulsory period of commencement of home building cause reduced sales opportunity or undue hardship to buyers?
3. How many other clients failed to take up their options for allotments or returned allotments to the commission and:
 - (a) what was the address and number of allotments involved with each client;
 - (b) who were the clients; and
 - (c) what reasons were given for the failure to proceed with ownership in each case?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. The total number of allotments sold to individuals and returned to the commission from 30 June 1977 to 31 August 1978 was 17. With regard to the building period encumbrance on allotments, the commission has adopted a flexible approach in adjusting the period in accordance with changes in the supply/demand situation and the economic outlook. A 7-year building period now applies. It is not considered appropriate to give details of individual cases.
3. With regard to other clients, that is, building companies, purchase arrangements for allotments were adjusted for a total of 7 companies during the period 30 June 1977 to 31 August, 1978. The general reason for failure to proceed with ownership relates to the financial difficulties facing builders in today's economic climate. It is not considered appropriate to give details of individual cases.

DINGOES

522. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. How long have dingoes been kept under captivity at Cleland Conservation Park?
2. How many dingoes are currently being held under captivity at Cleland?

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

1. Eleven years.
2. Two pairs of adult dingoes and four pups.

REGENCY PARK BUILDING

523. **Mr. EVANS** (on notice):

1. Have tenders been called for the supply of steel sections for the State Transport Authority building at Regency Park and, if so, how many tenders were received and which company was successful?
2. Is it intended that all prefabrication of steel work for the building will be done by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and, if so—
 - (a) at what price;
 - (b) what proportion of the price allows for other than actual production cost; and
 - (c) what are the costs other than production costs?
3. Were tenders called for from the private sector for the prefabrication of the steel work and, if not, why not?

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

1. For the structural steel sections for the Regency Park workshops public registrations for tenders were called and nine registrations were received, of which six were eligible to tender. Scarfe Steel Supplies Pty. Ltd. was the lowest tenderer and was awarded the contract. Submissions were invited for the circular hollow section steel work for the workshop from the only two tube manufacturers and the lowest tenderer, Tubemakers of Australia, was awarded the contract.
2. The Engineering and Water Supply Department will be fabricating all structural steel work.
 - (a) \$635 800.
 - (b) The cost is a representative estimate of market cost prepared by the consulting engineers for the project.
 - (c) None.
3. Tenders were not called from the private sector because it was proposed to have the work undertaken by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. In view of the temporary availability of surplus labour in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, this course was considered to represent the lowest cost (overall) to the Government.

CHILDREN

525. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. How many children, who were placed on bonds under supervision of the Minister or his officers, died whilst under that supervision from the year 1971 to 1977?
2. How many children sustained serious injury whilst under such care and control or supervision from the year 1971 to 1977?

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

1. Statistics are not kept relating to deaths of children placed on bonds under the supervision of the Minister.
2. Statistics are not kept of children sustaining serious injury whilst on bonds under the supervision of the Minister.

Bonds under supervision are not guardianship orders but are specifically related to anti-social behaviour. Serious injury to a child in this situation directly involves the parent or guardian. The community welfare worker supports and advises the parent or guardian on these matters but it is not necessary to be a matter of public record.

CHOWILLA DAM

529. Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it still the aim of the Government to have the Chowilla dam built and, if so, why and when is it expected that that aim will be attained and, if not, why not and when was the aim of having the dam built abandoned and has a public announcement of its abandonment been made and when?

2. Have the buildings near the site for the workshop, laboratories, and store been retained up to now and, if so, why?

3. Have any materials been retained as well and, if so:

(a) what are they;

(b) at what cost annually; and

(c) are they to be retained indefinitely and why?

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

1. The possibility of construction of the Chowilla Dam is still under consideration. The dam is included as an option in the development scheme of River Murray Commission storages.

2. No.

3. Yes.

(a) A length of mild steel concrete lined pipeline.

(b) Nil.

(c) Yes. The cost of retrieval of the pipeline would outweigh its salvage value.

RAILWAYS HOUSING

530. Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What does the State Transport Authority intend to do with housing or other property which was formerly owned by the South Australian Railways; in particular, housing which was owned at Peterborough?

2. Has the State Transport Authority and the Australian National Railways reached agreement in relation to property settlements and, if not, what are the reasons for the delays and when is it anticipated that agreement could be reached?

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

1. The State Transport Authority intends to dispose of surplus non-metropolitan property formerly owned by the South Australian Railways. A schedule of all surplus houses is being prepared for circulation to Government departments and instrumentalities. Surplus houses at Peterborough were inspected on 22 and 23 August 1978 and a detailed report on their condition is being prepared. If the houses are not required for Government purposes then they will be sold. In keeping with established practice long-standing tenants will be given the option to purchase.

2. Agreement between the Australian National Railways Commission and the State Transport Authority was reached on 29 November 1977 in respect of the separation of land and approximately 1 380 houses in the non-metropolitan areas which vested in the commission pursuant to the transfer agreement. In accordance with the terms of the transfer agreement the authority retained approximately 350 houses in the non-metropolitan area. Many of these houses are in poor condition and are considered surplus to the requirements of the non-metropolitan railways. However, the commission has requested that it be given the opportunity to review its housing requirements before the authority commenced disposals. Consequently, the commission was given until 1 November 1978 to determine its requirements. It is anticipated that final agreement will be reached by that date.

HOSPITALS

531. Mr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many beds were there at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, respectively, for each of the years, 1968 to 1978?

2. How many in-patients were treated at each hospital in each of those years?

3. What were the numbers of all staff employed at each hospital in each of those years?

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

Years	Beds		In-patients
	Q.E.H.	R.A.H.	Treated Q.E.H.
1968.....	529	1 280	16 955
1969.....	539	1 270	17 788
1970.....	536	1 226	18 582
1971.....	532	1 298	18 744
1972.....	572	1 325	19 448
1973.....	666	1 304	20 469
1974.....	666	1 281	21 609
1975.....	670	1 258	22 423
1976.....	699	1 273	26 258
1977.....	731	1 273	28 052
1978.....	754	1 280	29 880
In-patients Treated	Staff Employed		Staff Employed
R.A.H.	Q.E.H.		R.A.H.
25 364	1 378		2 536
26 307	1 419		2 832
27 350	1 586		3 421
28 530	1 777		3 747
30 481	1 933		4 480
32 661	2 135		4 470
32 496	2 215		4 696
33 445	2 430		4 676
34 053	2 520		4 726
32 781	2 744		4 769
33 890	2 817		4 729

FROZEN FOOD

533. Mr. WILSON (on notice): What is the projected cost of construction of receiving facilities for frozen food at Enfield Hospital, Hillcrest Hospital, Glenside Hospital, Northfield Wards, R.A.H., St. Anthony's Hospital, Osmond Terrace Clinic, mental health clinics, Windana Geriatric Accommodation, Para District Hospital, Ru Rua, Morris Hospital, Regency Park Crippled Children's Association, Meals on Wheels Incorporated, and Wattle Park Teachers Centre—Cafeteria, respectively?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The estimated costs for the construction of receiving facilities for frozen food are as follows:

	\$
Enfield Hospital	82 400
Hillcrest Hospital	340 000
Glenside Hospital	275 000
Royal Adelaide Hospital—	
Northfield Wards	90 000
Morris Hospital	
St. Anthony's Hospital	10 500
Osmond Terrace Clinic	46 000
Mental Health Clinics	18 000
Windana Geriatric Accommodation	35 000
Ru Rua	21 000
Wattle Park Teachers Centre—Cafeteria .	8 000

The Para District Hospital project has been deferred and there has been no specific Government involvement in

the provision of receiving facilities for frozen food at either the Regency Park Crippled Children's Association or Meals on Wheels Incorporated.

CORPORATE AFFAIRS

536. **Mrs. ADAMSON** (on notice):

1. When was the Department of Corporate Affairs established?
2. On its establishment, how many staff members were:
 - (a) transferred from other departments; and
 - (b) recruited as additional staff?
3. What was the total salaries bill of the department:
 - (a) at its inception;
 - (b) six months later; and
 - (c) at present?
4. What are the functions of the six additional company inspectors appointed to the department in May 1978 to assist the Government in its campaign against white collar crime?
5. What illegal practices, if any, by companies have been discovered as a result of these appointments?
6. If any crime has been discovered what action has been taken as a result of the discovery?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Department for Corporate Affairs was established on 24 November 1977 (see *G.G.* 24/11/77—1509).
2. On its establishment:—
 - (a) Seven (7) staff members were transferred from the Department of Legal Services and twenty-eight (28) staff members were transferred from the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs.
 - (b) No additional staff were recruited as at 24 November 1977 but 13 new positions were created of which 12 have now been filled.
3. (a) Nil.
(b) \$254 876.
(c) The total salaries bill of the department for the period 24 November 1977, to 8 September 1978, was \$394 775.
4. The functions of the additional company inspectors, as with any company inspector, are to carry out investigations into the affairs of companies and to enforce compliance by companies and their officers with the relevant legislation including the criminal law.
5. and 6. As the additional company inspectors commenced their duties at varying times during the period 17 July 1978 to 14 August 1978 it is not possible at this stage to assess or determine any specific "illegal practices" which they may have discovered. However, it can be said that since their commencement the additional inspectors have undertaken and completed a number of investigations and are assisting in the reduction of the backlog of investigations which could not have been carried out for sometime. They are also contributing to the increased efficiency and output of the Investigation Branch of the department.

JUDICIARY

537. **Mrs. ADAMSON** (on notice): How many persons have been appointed to any of the South Australian courts as judges and magistrates, respectively, who have no experience as legal practitioners and what is the name, date of appointment, and position of each?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Four, as follows:

W. C. Langcake; appointed on 24/3/77, retired on 30/6/78; Licensing Court Magistrate.

C. S. Chislett; appointed on 27/6/74; Industrial Magistrate.

B. V. Shillabeer; appointed on 8/7/76; Industrial Magistrate.

J. D. Claessen, LL.B., LL.M.; appointed 6/7/78; Acting Licensing Court Magistrate.

CLASS ACTIONS

538. **Mrs. ADAMSON** (on notice):

1. Has the Parliamentary Counsel completed a further draft of the Bill providing for class actions, as requested by the Government in May 1978 and, if so, when will the draft be made available for public discussion and, if not, when will the Bill be completed?
2. What is the Government's intention regarding legislation to provide for class actions?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. No. A Bill may be available later this year.
2. As previously announced, the Government will consider its attitude once the Bill is available from Parliamentary Counsel.

COURTS

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

1. Does the Government view with any concern the "increasing presence within our community of Commonwealth Courts working in parallel to a greater or less extent with State courts", a matter recently raised publicly by Sir Laurence Street, Chief Justice of New South Wales, and what is that concern?
2. What action, if any, has the Government taken or does it intend to take to raise issue with the Commonwealth on the subject of its concern?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government does view with some concern the increasing potential for courts of the State and the Australian Government to exercise parallel jurisdiction.
2. The matter has been raised at Standing Committee of Attorneys-General.

RAILWAY INCIDENT

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

1. Was there an incident in the Upper Sturt area involving train No. 218 on 10 December 1977, and what are the full details of that incident?
2. Did the action taken by railway staff cause any danger and/or inconvenience to railway patrons and, if so, what are the details?
3. Has any person involved in this incident been, either previously or subsequently, involved in any incident relating to the railways and what are the details?
4. What action, if any, has been taken against the person or persons involved in the incident on 10 December?

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

1. Yes. At approximately 7.56 a.m. on 10 December 1977, shortly after train No. 218 had departed from Upper Sturt, the motorman observed a number of persons on the rail track. At this time these persons commenced to cross over a culvert a short distance in front of the train. The motorman observed that one of the persons was having difficulty negotiating the sleepers above the culvert and, as a consequence, a warning was sounded on the rail car

hooter and, at the same time, the train's emergency air brakes were applied as the motorman was uncertain as to whether the person could cross the culvert in safety. The train came to a standstill with the baggage car above the culvert. The person had safely crossed over the culvert.

2. The unscheduled stop caused the train to arrive at Adelaide slightly behind schedule.

3. The only person recognised in this group was Mr. R. Millhouse, M.P., who came under notice on 20 August 1977, as shown in reply to Question on Notice No. 412 in the House on Tuesday 22 August 1978.

4. Mr. Millhouse was spoken to by a railway detective.

LANCELOT

549. Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What action has the Government taken in relation to the township of Lancelot?

2. Is it intended to dispose of the land and, if so, what method will be used and will adjoining landholders be given any preference?

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

1. Cabinet has approved that the town of Lancelot be closed under the provisions of section 261 of the Crown Lands Act.

2. The land is to be reallocated by the Land Board under provisions of the Crown Lands Act and the District Council of Peterborough and all adjoining landholders have been advised of this intention. No decision has been made to date in allocating the land.

PRISONERS

553. Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Have the services of prisoners from any of South Australia's prison establishments been utilised as "markers" for any rifle shooting match in this State and, if so, what are the details?

2. What are the costs, actual or estimated, for providing such a service and what reimbursement, if any, has been obtained?

3. Is the practice to continue and, if so, when and on what conditions?

4. On what basis are the costs in 2 (above) estimated?

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

1. Prisoners from South Australia's prison establishments have acted as markers for the South Australian Rifle Association during its annual "Queen's" prize meeting at Dean Range, Port Adelaide, since about 1961. Each year the association has lodged a request with the various Governments and approval has been granted.

2. The cost for provision of the service for 1978 is \$2 963. No reimbursement has ever been paid by the association, but each year they have presented an article for use by prisoners, e.g., colour television sets.

3. The continuation of the practice is subject to application by the South Australian Rifle Association and consideration by Cabinet on a year to year basis. Approval was recently granted for "markers" to be provided for the annual State rifle shooting championships to be held from Wednesday 27 September to Sunday 1 October. There are no conditions attached.

4. The cost estimates are based on salaries for four general duty officers, one assistant chief prison officer and one prison industry officer cook which this year amounts to \$2 457, together with the cost of payment to prisoners based on normal pay plus bonus amounting to \$506.

ABORIGINAL YOUTH

554. Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What action, if any, has been taken to set up Aboriginal youth support units, when was it taken, what has been the cost, and what has been the result and, if no action has been taken, why not?

2. What recommendations for such action were made, when, and by whom?

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

1. None. The recommendations made in the department's internal working document are still being considered.

2. In the internal working document that was compiled by departmental staff in August 1978, it was proposed that Aboriginal Youth Support Units be established in three locations.

SCHOOL-BASED FUNDING

555. Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What were the unsatisfactory features of school-based funding?

2. What are the recommendations of the private consultants to improve the scheme?

3. What alternatives will be introduced and when?

4. Who were the private consultants, how much were they paid, and how long did it take for them to investigate and report?

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

1. I point out that the Auditor-General, in his report, did not indicate any unsatisfactory features of school-based funding.

2. The consultants have recommended as follows:

1. Supplies grants to schools to be in cash and paid by a series of five progress payments.

2. All schools need to adopt a minimum financial reporting standard.

3. Attention is to be given to the effectiveness of local audit in schools.

These recommendations are consistent with those made by the Education Department in November 1976.

3. It is intended that the recommendations of the consultants, as detailed above, be implemented for the 1979 school year. Implementation is subject to the comments of the Under-Treasurer, the Auditor-General and the Chairman of the Public Service Board, which were sought on 14 August 1978.

4. The firm of W. D. Scott and Co. Pty. Ltd., Adelaide, was engaged after a detailed selection process. A fixed fee of \$23 010 was approved by the Treasurer on 2 February 1978 for the consultancy, and of this amount a total of \$17 110 has been paid for the completion of all but the implementation stage of the consultancy. The balance of \$5 900 is payable in return for consultancy assistance with the implementation of recommendations. The consultancy commenced on 3 March 1978 and the consultants presented their recommendations on 4 August 1978.

SCHOOL FUNDS

556. Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Will regulations be amended concerning auditing the records of school councils and parent bodies and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

2. Will the Auditor-General's Report on audit of school funds etc. be acted upon in full and, if not, why not?

3. What is the total amount of moneys held by school

councils, canteens, parent bodies etc?

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

1. There are no plans to amend Education Regulations concerning auditing the records of school councils and parent bodies. It is assumed that the question is directed to page 96 of the Auditor-General's Report concerning school fund and other school accounts which states: "A committee was formed to consider amendments to the regulations which would require audited statements of all accounts associated with schools to be forwarded to the department". As mentioned in the next paragraph of the Auditor-General's Report, the requirement for schools to forward accounts has been taken care of by administrative action and accordingly there is no need to amend the regulations. In respect of providing a common financial year for schools, the Education Department has gathered statistics of existing financial years in schools, and a draft amendment to the regulations is presently under consideration by the Regulations Committee.

2. The comments made in the Auditor-General's Report on audit of school funds, etc., are being acted upon in full.

3. It will not be possible to give an answer to this question until all information has been received from schools and has been collated. As mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report: "Schools were requested to forward audited statements of all accounts whose financial years ended on or after 31 December 1977. The accounts are being received and collated by the department". As the existing financial years for schools finish at varying intervals throughout the year, financial statements are not yet due to be forwarded for those schools which have a financial year closing at the end of September, October and November of this year. Therefore, it will not be possible to provide this information until after the close of the 1978 calendar year.

SALARIES AND WAGES

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

1. When will the system for debiting salaries and wages be rectified to prevent a repetition of the statement by the Auditor-General?

2. What were the contributing factors to such errors in the past?

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

1. The system for debiting salaries and wages is being rectified in the following ways:

(a) Over the next few months the personnel/salaries stage of the new management information system will be phased in and with its inbuilt controls and checks should alleviate the problems with misdebiting. The personnel/salaries stage covers the entire department and is scheduled to be fully operational by April 1979.

(b) An investigation is also currently being carried out by departmental officers into the administrative procedures used in the secondment of officers to perform other duties, both within the department and to outside organisations such as the Australian Government and private schools. This investigation should result in better control over movements of staff and the consequent effect on debiting of salaries and wages.

(c) Up-to-date staff lists will also be obtained from the various branches of the department to enable regular checks on the validity of charges

being accumulated against the various debit codes.

2. The contributing factors to such errors in the past were the movement of staff from one location within the department to another, thereby transferring their activities to fall within another existing segment of the accounting system, sometimes without immediate formal notification of the change, and thus without the necessary amendments to debit codes being effected. Occasional clerical errors have also occurred in the past when debit codes were being allocated.

ROAD CHARGES

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

1. When exactly will legislation be introduced into Parliament to improve collection of road charges?

2. What is the reason for delay as implied in the Auditor-General's Report of 30 June 1978?

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

1. Subject to acceptance of a current report by Cabinet, legislation will be drafted and submitted to Parliament.

2. See 1.

ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

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

1. Why were key personnel changed who were appointed to develop, implement, and install the Financial and Management Accounting System?

2. Who were the personnel involved and what new positions or appointments were made, were such changes necessary at the time and could not changes have been delayed so that the new system could have been proceeded with as promised?

3. What information was provided to the Auditor-General to satisfy him that the completion date of December 1977 could be met instead of April 1979 as now indicated?

4. Will the current timetable be strictly adhered to and, if not, why not?

5. Does the Minister consider such a system is of top priority and, if not, why not?

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

1. Key personnel were changed as a result of resignations and promotions within the Public Service.

2. The changes were: Mr. Kelley, Management Services Officer, promoted to auditor in Auditor-General's Department; Mr. Taylor, Clerk CO2, appointed to Clerk CO3, Lands Department; Mr. Wade, Computer Systems Officer II, resigned from the service; Mr. Higginbottom, assistant accountant, promoted to accountant, Education Department; and Mr. Ngo, Computer Systems Officer II, resigned from the service.

3. The initial estimate for a completion date of December 1977 was based on the assumption that suitable staff for the project would be immediately available. This did not prove to be the case, and the Public Service Board was unable to assist in the secondments of suitable qualified and experienced people. The basis for the estimate was printed in a report on "Management Information System Development. Phase I—Redevelopment of the Financial and Management Accounting System", published in August 1976, a copy of which was forwarded to the Auditor-General.

4. The current timetable is the best estimate the Highways Department can make at this time and, excluding any unforeseen circumstances, the new financial

and management accounting system will be installed in April 1979.

5. Of all computer system development in the Highways Department, the financial and management accounting system is being given the highest priority.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

562. Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Who were the consultants appointed and how much were they paid to undertake a review of the accounting and budgeting control procedures of Public and Consumer Affairs Department?

2. What were the recommendations of the consultants?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Fell and Starkey, \$10 450.

2. The consultants recommended that a centralised accounting function be established to control and co-ordinate the principle accounting functions of the department under the direct responsibility of the Senior Administrative and Finance Officer.

SERVICES AND SUPPLY

564. Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What problems existed, and do they still exist, in the reconciliation of sundry debtors in the Services and Supply Department?

2. When will a satisfactory solution to the problem be reached?

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

1. Difficulty was experienced with the correct matching of credits input against debits on the sundry debtor file following the introduction of a computer-based stock inventory and sundry debtors system. This difficulty with the system caused problems in reconciliation of the computer file for sundry debtors with the manually prepared ledger. The cause of the problem has now been isolated, and all current transactions are being processed correctly.

2. The State Supply Division is progressively reconciling sundry debtor statements produced since the implementation of the system. Because of the large volume of transactions involved, these reconciliations will take some time.

GOVERNOR'S PENSION

567. Mr. BECKER (on notice): To whom is the payment of the Governor's pensions made and what is the annual remuneration?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Sir Mark Oliphant, \$11 111.50 a year, and Sir Douglas Nicholls, \$10 370.50 a year.

GRANTS

568. Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Have any investigations been carried out by the Attorney-General's Department of organisations which have received Government grants and, if so, what were the results of these investigations?

2. Which organisations were investigated and what is the amount of grant made in each case?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. No comprehensive list of such investigations is kept and therefore it is not possible to give a

comprehensive answer. To my knowledge, however, no such investigations have been conducted.

REPUBLICAN SYSTEM

570. Mr. GUNN (on notice): Is it the policy of the Government to change South Australia to a republican system of government and, if so, does the Government intend to proceed with legislation or other actions to implement the republican system?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has no plans to alter the *status quo*.

PARACHILNA

571. Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Is the Highway Department aware that concern has been expressed in relation to the possibility that the town of Parachilna may be bypassed when the new highway is constructed?

2. Can the Minister give an undertaking that the new highway will not be situated in a manner which would be detrimental to the businesses in the town?

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

1. No.

2. A precise location for the new highway has not yet been selected but it will probably be very close to the Parachilna township. While Blinman traffic would no longer pass through the township, access for low-grade traffic, which would no longer be separated from the township by the railway, would be improved. It is not considered desirable to route through traffic via the main street of Parachilna as this action would present hazards to pedestrian traffic in the town.

POLICE FORCE

574. Mrs. ADAMSON (on notice):

1. How many members of the Police Force have

(a) retired;

(b) retired prematurely; and

(c) resigned, during the 12 months ended 30 June 1978?

2. What are the comparative figures for the three years 1974-75 to 1976-77?

3. Has each position made vacant by the retirement or resignation of an officer been filled?

4. What is the rate of recruitment in the Police Force for the current year?

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

1. Separations for the financial year ended 30 June 1978:

(a) Retired (age)	30
(b) Retired (invalidity)	12
(c) Resigned	42

Total

84

2. Comparative figures for the three preceding years are:

	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
(a) Retired (age)	7	16	20
(b) Retired (invalidity)	1	3	15
(c) Resigned	36	57	49
Total	44	76	84

3. Yes.
4. Recruitment for the current financial year to date is eight adults and 12 cadets.

In accordance with the Government's zero growth policy for the current financial year, recruiting is being undertaken to replace wastage only. On this basis, the total intake for the year is expected to be approximately 80.

COUNCILS

577. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice):

1. Why is there a delay by the Highways Department in officially notifying district councils who received grants to carry out debit order work or other work on behalf of the department?

2. When will the District Council of Burra be notified of the actual land that they will receive for the Spalding/Burra/Morgan Road?

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

1. The usual procedure to advise councils has been followed and I am not aware of any delays as suggested.

2. Allocation of funds is currently being discussed with the District Council of Burra.

WILMINGTON KINDERGARTEN

581. **Mr. VENNING** (on notice):

1. What was the total cost of the Wilmington kindergarten building?

2. What is the breakdown of that cost figure?

3. Who was the contractor and builder of it?

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

1. \$32 500.

2. The building is a transportable package home. The purchase, erection, transport and site preparation cost \$31 500. The equipping of the centre cost \$1 000.

3. Jennings Industries.

VAUGHAN HOUSE

584. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. Were any inmates or R.C. W's injured in an incident at Vaughan House on Sunday 17 September?

2. How many R.C. W's were on duty in that unit at the time of the incident and what sex were they?

3. What sex were the inmates responsible for the incident?

4. Had any of these inmates been transferred from the McNally Training Centre or Brookway Park and, if so, how many, respectively?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: There was no incident on Sunday 17 September 1978 at Vaughan House.

MINISTER'S OFFICE

589. **Mrs. ADAMSON** (on notice):

1. Apart from toilet facilities, what other facilities are being provided in alterations to the Minister's office to the total cost of \$49 000?

2. When did the department first occupy its present premises?

3. What have been the increases in the Minister's staff since that time to justify the provision of additional facilities?

4. How many—

(a) women; and

(b) men,

work on the 15th floor?

5. How many toilets were there for—

(a) women; and

(b) men,

before provision of the new facilities?

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

1. The relocation of the Minister's office and offices of the press secretary, personal secretary and Ministerial assistant, as well as relocation of the conference rooms, the Research and Planning Branch and the departmental library have all been undertaken to provide some much needed additional accommodation. There has also been a general upgrading of the reception and waiting areas for visitors to the 15th level, as well as other minor alterations for steno-secretaries.

2. May 1972.

3. A Ministerial assistant has been appointed to the Minister's personal staff. That appointment alone has not been used to justify the provision of additional facilities. Since the department occupied Adelaide House, several additional positions have been created on the recommendation of the Public Service Board to provide for additional responsibilities incurred by the department, e.g. new positions of Deputy Director, an Assistant Director and project officers in the Research and Planning Branch have been created, all of whom are accommodated on the 15th level.

4. (a) eight;

(b) 14.

5. (a) three cubicles;

(b) two cubicles.

RESERVOIRS

595. **Mr. WILSON** (on notice):

1. What is the quantity of water presently held in the State's reservoirs?

2. When is it estimated that they will be filled?

3. When is it estimated that pumping will commence?

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

1. 177 864 megalitres.

2. Unless further substantial natural intakes occur, it is not anticipated that all reservoirs will fill.

3. Pumping from Mannum commenced in July. Pumping from Murray Bridge and Swan Reach is not expected to commence until December 1978.

SPEECH PATHOLOGISTS

598. **Mr. ALLISON** (on notice):

1. How many speech pathologists are expected to be available to South Australia from graduates emerging:

(a) from Sturt College at the end of 1978; and

(b) from interstate colleges?

2. Is the Minister aware of the greatly increased concern at the absence of permanently appointed speech pathologists from the South-East region, such concern having been previously expressed to the Minister by the member for Mount Gambier, by parent organisations, and by the Mount Gambier Principal's Association, among others?

3. Will the Minister appoint permanent speech pathologists to Mount Gambier and Naracoorte to serve the upper and lower South-East as from January 1979?

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

1. (a) Seven Education Department scholarship holders are expected to graduate from the Sturt College of Advanced Education programme at the end of the 1979 internship (possibly in June 1979).

(b) One cadet will return from Victoria.

2. There have been a number of requests for permanent resident staff in the South-East region and from other country regions, also.

3. It is planned to appoint one speech therapist to the South-East region in 1979. That person may not, however, move into the region until the end of the internship period which is expected to be June of next year.

The appointment of additional speech therapists to the region will depend on the availability of staff in the future.

FROZEN FOOD FACTORY

In reply to Mr. **GOLDSWORTHY** (12 September).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The original planning of the Frozen Food Factory included the Government metropolitan hospitals as participants in the Frozen Food Service. As a result conventional kitchens were not built at the Strathmont Centre and the Flinders Medical Centre and the planning included the conversion of the existing facilities at the other hospitals for the changeover to a Frozen Food Service. This conversion work is well advanced, and the hospitals are coming into the service as the work is completed. As a result of this policy, the hospitals will not have the capacity to revert to full hospital cooking and kitchens. It is the Government's policy for Government hospitals to use the services of the Frozen Food Factory. Few complaints have been received from participating hospitals, but there have been some criticisms of certain types of dishes, particularly with the former pre-plated system. The Frozen Food Factory uses raw materials and foodstuffs purchased to strict specifications, and standard recipes have been developed. The other essential and critical element to the success of the whole concept is the proper reconstitution of the frozen food and, necessarily, this must be in the hands and under the control of the hospital.

SCHOOL LOSSES

In reply to Mr. **BECKER** (12 September).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: In relation to the Auditor-General's Report regarding school losses, I would point out to the honourable member that the amounts quoted include both theft and replacement of equipment damaged by vandalism. Also, due to an error in the Auditor-General's Report, the figure of \$36 848 for 1976-77 should have been \$64 617.

Following upon the appointment of a security officer, the Education Department introduced a number of security protection measures during 1977-78 to combat the increasing incidence of thefts, vandalism and arson at schools. The measures introduced include pilot schemes at selected schools of security lighting, engagement of patrolling services and installation of detection devices in school buildings. Although the schemes have not yet been in operation for the full period considered necessary to enable their effectiveness to be conclusively demonstrated, no major incidents have occurred at the schools concerned, and action is currently being taken to introduce these measures to other schools.

Further proposals are also under consideration by the department which include upgrading of existing school buildings to provided secured storage areas, modifications

to locking systems on doors and windows, introduction of key control systems, and installation of burglar proof meshing in certain areas. In an endeavour to reduce the high incidence of theft and to enable positive identification of recovered stolen items engraving equipment has been introduced to schools. The department, through its internal audit operation, is continuously monitoring schools to ensure that equipment is properly branded, recorded and subject to regular inventories. The security section, in addition to providing patrol coverage of metropolitan schools and advice on security aspects, conducts regular training programmes for personnel on security arrangements in schools. The security measures currently being introduced by the department are expected to reduce the cost of replacing equipment stolen and damaged by vandalism.

AMPHOMETERS

In reply to Hon. **G. R. BROOMHILL** (22 August).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The amphotometer units used by the South Australian Police Department are considered to be accurate instruments for timing speeds of vehicles. These instruments are tested regularly at speed increments of 10 km/h ranging from 60 km/h to 180 km/h, using an amphotometer testing calibrator which has been certified for accuracy by the Department of Electrical Engineering of the University of Adelaide. All such tests and servicing of the equipment are conducted by a qualified technician employed by the Police Department. The comments of the special justice in the case quoted by the honourable member highlighted a deficiency in the presentation of the Police evidence and should not cast doubts on the reliability of the amphotometer as a speed measuring device.

GOLDEN GROVE TRAFFIC LIGHTS

In reply to Mr. **KLUNDER** (12 September).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Work on the installation of traffic signals at the intersection of Golden Grove Road and North-East Road will commence shortly. It is anticipated that the lights will be in operation early in the new year.

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN presented a petition signed by 230 residents of South Australia praying that the House would pass legislation to provide for Ministerial responsibility adequately to control pornographic material.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO presented a similar petition signed by 20 residents of South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT presented a similar petition signed by 91 residents of South Australia.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL presented a similar petition signed by 48 residents of South Australia.

Mr. TONKIN presented a similar petition signed by 119 residents of South Australia.

Mr. WHITTEN presented a similar petition signed by 11 residents of South Australia.

Mr. DRURY presented a similar petition signed by 118 residents of South Australia.

Mr. RUSSACK presented a similar petition signed by 73 residents of South Australia.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE presented a similar petition signed by 151 residents of South Australia.

Mr. BECKER presented a similar petition signed by nine residents of South Australia.

Mr. SLATER presented a similar petition signed by 238 residents of South Australia.

Mr. OLSON presented a similar petition signed by 84 residents of South Australia.

Dr. EASTICK presented a similar petition signed by 46 residents of South Australia.

Mr. WOTTON presented a similar petition signed by 214 residents of South Australia.

Mr. DEAN BROWN presented a similar petition signed by 250 residents of South Australia.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY presented a similar petition signed by 213 residents of South Australia.

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

Mr. KLUNDER presented a similar petition signed by 35 residents of South Australia.

Mr. McRAE presented a similar petition signed by 40 residents of South Australia.

Mr. BANNON presented a similar petition signed by 159 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: VIOLENT OFFENCES

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN presented a petition signed by 417 residents of South Australia praying that the House would support proposed amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to increase maximum penalties for violent offences.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT presented a similar petition signed by 907 residents of South Australia.

Mr. TONKIN presented a similar petition signed by 295 residents of South Australia.

Mr. WOTTON presented a similar petition signed by 617 residents of South Australia.

Mr. CHAPMAN presented a similar petition signed by 230 residents of South Australia.

Mr. SLATER presented a similar petition signed by 124 residents of South Australia.

Mr. RODDA presented a similar petition signed by 92 residents of South Australia.

Mr. WHITTEN presented a similar petition signed by 12 residents of South Australia.

Mr. BANNON presented a similar petition signed by 84 residents of South Australia.

Mrs. ADAMSON presented a similar petition signed by 350 residents of South Australia.

Mr. DRURY presented a similar petition signed by 42 residents of South Australia.

Mr. HARRISON presented a similar petition signed by 188 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITION: VOLUNTARY WORKERS

Mr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 1 664 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to take action to protect and preserve the status of voluntary workers in the community.

Petition received.

PETITION: MASSAGE

Mrs. BYRNE presented a petition signed by 98 residents of South Australia praying that the House would pass legislation to restrict the use of the words "massage", "masseur", and "masseuse" to those who genuinely practice the art of massage within the provisions of the Physiotherapists Act, 1945-1973.

Petition received.

PLYMPTON PRIMARY SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Plympton Primary School Redevelopment.

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CITRUS INDUSTRY

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Last week in the House the member for Chaffey, as a matter of urgency, raised the matter of the South Australian Agriculture and Fisheries Department's submission to the Industries Assistance Commission of October 1977. When some aspects of that report were drawn to my attention they caused me some concern, so a full investigation has since been made of the submission. Upon the full examination by Government, the plain fact is that the submission that was made by the South Australian Government was sound and properly based for full and effective protection of the Riverland fruitgrowing industry. The figures used by the member for Chaffey were not taken from the submission: the honourable member referred to figures that were in the I.A.C. report (I will deal with the honourable member's figures in detail) as a preliminary report, which recommended a reduction in the present *ad valorem* duty across the board of 65 per cent to 20 per cent. The honourable member then suggested that that was what the South Australian Government had supported. That is quite clear from his speech, and it is quite untrue. The South Australian Government did not support a reduction of 65 per cent *ad valorem* to 20 per cent. He then made the following statement:

The Government's recommendations put forward in its submission to the I.A.C. would result in a return to growers of about \$60 a tonne. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics calculates the cost of production in Australia at \$100 a tonne. Both of those figures are incorrect. The honourable member could only have arrived at the figure of \$60 a tonne by taking a reduction in the present duty of 65 per cent *ad valorem* across the board, deducting 40 per cent from it to arrive at a 25 per cent duty, which was part of the South Australian Government's submission, and saying, "We will deduct that amount from the \$100 a tonne that the growers are now receiving." If that is his understanding of the basis on which the submission was made, his understanding is gravely defective.

The South Australian Government's submission to the I.A.C. was that there should be, instead of the present 65 per cent *ad valorem* duty across the board, a duty of 25 per cent or 6c a litre of single strength orange juice, whichever was the higher. An amount of 6c a litre of orange juice at an import price of, say, 10c a litre (the import price at the

moment is much higher, but the honourable member has forecast a reduction) is a 60 per cent duty.

In fact, what we are faced with is that the present 65 per cent *ad valorem* duty across the board is simply not maintainable. The reason should be clear to the honourable member, if he has any knowledge of the industry. The present import duty means that if, in fact, at the present import price of orange juice import parity prices were paid in Australia, the price to growers would be \$180 a tonne. Import parity prices are not being paid in Australia, and the reason is quite simple. If the price of orange juice goes higher in Australia, people immediately start substituting something else. One cannot press the market price higher, and the 65 per cent *ad valorem* duty is, in fact, only a 20 per cent protection at the present import price rate. There is no way that an Industries Assistance Commission will report in favour of maintaining a 65 per cent *ad valorem* duty across the board that is obviously not necessary.

The other factor about a 65 per cent duty is that, at the lower end of import prices, it is not as effective as a flat rate tariff, and that was what was proposed by the South Australian Government. The South Australian Government, in its submission (and I point out that this submission has been public for nearly a year: it was made public in October of last year), set out to provide full and effective protection for growers at present prices to them. We have examined that position in detail, taking cases in particular.

We are satisfied that there should be some marginal alteration in that submission at present, but that the basis of the submission, that there should be a flat rate tariff and an *ad valorem* duty covering the higher rates of import prices, is sound and that 65 per cent across the board is simply not arguable. As a result, the Government has amended its submission to I.A.C. to a flat rate of 8c a litre instead of 6c, and 35 per cent *ad valorem* instead of 25 per cent.

The reason is that the figures were compiled originally in October of last year. Since then there have been three changes in the position: first, there have been some increases in costs; secondly, the economics of mixed farms in the Riverland have been gravely and adversely affected by the brandy excise imposed by the Federal Government; and, thirdly, since October of last year there has been significant devaluation of currencies of competing countries and, in consequence, a possibility of lower prices in respect of imported orange juice concentrate.

In those circumstances, an 8c and 35 per cent duty, whichever is the higher, will give full protection to growers and ensure the present return to growers of \$100 a tonne without difficulty. It is an arguable and sustainable tariff base, which the 65 per cent *ad valorem* duty is not. The honourable member did not say in this House what was the position that he was supporting.

Mr. Arnold: The industry's submission.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The industry's submission by C.O.C. and Murray Citrus Growers is a submission for quotas, not for an *ad valorem* duty but for a quantitative control over entry. That position in respect of long-term tariff protection has never been supported by any Federal Government, even those of the honourable member's political persuasion, and how the honourable member proposes to persuade a Federal Government and his Federal colleagues to that position, I am blessed if I know. It is not a sustainable proposition.

Mr. Dean Brown: It is for the car industry.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is not a long-term proposition in the car industry either, and the honourable

member knows it. The position is that the I.A.C. is required to report on long-term tariff protection. The tariff protection proposed by the South Australian Government will in fact give full protection to growers for their present returns, and far better protection than the present *ad valorem* duty gives them. If the honourable member believes that he can persuade either the Federal Government or the I.A.C. to recommend to the Federal Government the institution of a quantitative control, it will be interesting for him to explain exactly how, in the light of international arrangements about tariffs.

Moreover, quantitative control of that kind is certainly not supported by the whole industry. It is opposed by a significant portion of the growers, and there is every reason why it should be opposed. If quota controls are introduced, that proceeds to solidify the present structure of the industry and militate against the smaller, newer and ethnic growers, particularly, in the industry, because it will mean that they will have quotas allotted to them, and that there is no way that they will be able to expand.

That is not the view of the Citrus Action Group in the honourable member's own district. If the honourable member suggests Mr. Krix, or people like that, support a quota system, he had better talk to them because they certainly do not. The only way in which there can be proper protection for growers is a tariff protection which is flexible and which gives them across the board the present protection for the price they are presently getting. That is the submission that the Government has put forward.

The South Australian Government has given very significant assistance to the growers in the Riverland over a period of years, assistance which has been denied to them by the Liberal Government in Canberra. We have repeatedly helped the growers in the citrus industry and in the canning fruits industry. In this industry the last specific crush of fruit for juice was financed by the South Australian Government to maintain the returns to growers, and this has been constantly the aim of the South Australian Government. This was achieved in this submission. The case put to this House last week by the member for Chaffey (and supported by the utterings of the Leader of the Opposition, who followed him) was without basis. I have little doubt that this was designed to take attention of Riverland growers away from the protests that growers are properly making about the brandy excise.

QUESTION TIME

CITRUS INDUSTRY

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Premier say whether he understands what is meant by a tariff quota system, and why there was no consultation between the Government and the citrus industry prior to the submission's being made to the I.A.C.? The Premier has stated that the quota refers to a quota that will be placed on the growers. If that is his interpretation of what is meant by a quota, he has absolutely no knowledge whatever of the subject.

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

Mr. ARNOLD: I refer once again to the letter written on 31 July 1978 by the Chairman of the C.O.C., and no-one in this House would suggest that he is not an honourable man. I shall quote a paragraph from the letter to the Minister for Primary Industry referring to a meeting held with the Minister of Agriculture. The meeting was representative of the statutory citrus organisation, the Murray Citrus Growers Association, the co-operative, and private processors. The letter states:

The deputation sought to persuade the Minister that the tenor of his Government's submission spelt complete disaster to the citrus industry throughout Australia. It was clearly demonstrated to him that the industry of this State were wholeheartedly and unanimously behind the submission by the Australian Citrus Growers Federation calling for nothing less than the establishment by your Government of a tariff quota system on imports of citrus juice concentrates.

Once again, because of the statement just made by the Premier, I ask whether he understands what a tariff quota system is.

Mr. Wells: Do you understand what he said?

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course I understand what a tariff quota system is. I suggest to the honourable member that he pays a little attention to what the South Australian Government's submission is, because quite obviously, from his remarks, he does not understand it. As to the statement by Mr. Morphett, I appreciate that that is Mr. Morphett's view.

Mr. Arnold: The C.O.C.'s view.

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not believe (and this is a view which I have communicated to Mr. Morphett) that the Citrus Organisation Committee is fully representative of the citrus industry in South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Does the honourable member believe it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I would be very surprised if the honourable member did. From the views expressed within his own district, he must know that a very high proportion of citrus growers in South Australia has expressed considerable disaffection with the whole of the C.O.C.'s operation.

Mr. Mathwin: Who appoints it?

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He was originally appointed by this Government in fact; we set up the C.O.C. under the Walsh Government. Mr. Morphett was nominated as Chairman by the Labor Government. The honourable member asked why there had been no consultation with the citrus industry. Let me detail what was the consultation.

A submission prepared by Mr. Harvey and Mr. Gallasch of the department was made to the Industries Assistance Commission in Sydney on 16 November 1976. A meeting of officers of the South Australian Agriculture and Fisheries Department, the C.O.C., the Australian Citrus Growers Federation, horticulture officers, and economists was held in September 1976, and it prepared the basis for the departmental submission. Copies of all background papers prepared by the A.C.G.F. were received. On 14 October there was a meeting with the Secretary of the A.C.G.F., Mr. King. Mr. Harvey was in constant consultation with industry personnel, and Mr. Gallasch, the Senior Resident Officer (Horticulture) in relation to citrus in the Riverland, was in constant contact with citrus growers in the Riverland and Berri Fruit Juices. Mr. Harvey and Mr. Gallasch attended the I.A.C. hearing in Sydney on 16 to 18 November, and they were present when all submissions were made by all groups at that time.

The report of the inquiry into the marketing of fresh fruit and vegetables in South Australia was prepared by Mr. Harvey and Mr. Tugwell, the Senior Resident Officer (Horticulture) in relation to post-harvest handling. Work on this report went on from March 1976 to August 1977. A survey was made of 771 growers in South Australia,

including about 400 growers in the Riverland. Most Riverland growers surveyed were on mixed farms and included citrus as part of their enterprise mix. There was direct contact between departmental officers and the growers on the subject of the future of the industry, tariffs, and the like.

The second submission, which was made on 18 October last year at Berri, was prepared by a departmental study group, which included Mr. Harvey, Mr. Miller, Mr. Gallasch, Mr. Tugwell, Mr. Wishart, who is Principal Extension Officer (Horticulture), and Mr. Hanna, who is Marketing Economist. Mr. Hanna, who prepared the submission with the assistance of the other officers, had previously been involved in preparation of the Victorian Department of Agriculture's submission for the first hearing. Mr. Tugwell and Mr. Harvey are both on the citrus handling subcommittee of the C.O.C. Consultation with the industry was by personal contact. In particular, Mr. Gallasch was in contact with citrus growers and Berri Fruit Juices at all stages of the submission. Mr. Harvey and Mr. Hanna had informal discussions with Mr. Cope, Secretary of the A.C.G.F., and C.O.C. officers, Mr. McKinnon and Mr. Pettman. Discussions were also held, on the problems of Riverland growers, with the Premier's Department officer who is responsible for servicing, at the request of Riverland growers, the ethnic growers in the area.

As to the South Australian Citrus Marketing Inquiry in May 1978, the submission was prepared by the Riverland marketing study group and included the citrus packaging shed study by Mr. Pike. Work on this submission commenced after the hearings in Berri in October 1977. There has been constant contact with the industry, and constant interchange in relation to this submission.

REDCLIFF PROJECT

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether recent exploration of the Cooper Basin supports the conservative view taken by I.C.I. as to the amount of feedstock available in the basin for a petro-chemical plant? When I.C.I. withdrew from the Redcliff petro-chemical proposal in 1975, one reason given was that the feedstock available was insufficient for requirements.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think it should first be made clear that the Dow proposal with respect to the establishment of a petro-chemical plant at Redcliff automatically involves a considerable increase in the amount of feedstock available because the Dow process, unlike that of I.C.I., involves using not only ethane but also the propanes and butanes as part of the feedstock for the petro-chemical plant. The change in process involved with Dow thus makes a substantial difference to the amount of feedstock available.

However, since additional exploration has been undertaken in the Cooper Basin over the past 12 to 18 months, some significant results have been obtained that also alter the picture regarding the future prospects of the Cooper Basin. As a result of the exploration agreement between the Government and the Cooper Basin producers, the following wells have been drilled: Namur, which was discovered as a gas producer; Kidman, which also was a gas producer; and Narcoonowie and Woolloo, which were dry holes.

While that programme has been going on, there has been a separate South Australian Government-financed exploration programme under which the three wells have so far been drilled: Munkarie, which was the first well and

which was a gas producer; Coochelara, which was a dry hole; and Kirby, which is not completed at present and in which gas was also discovered. In addition, Western Mining Corporation in the Pedirka Basin drilled two wells in Poolawanna, where an oil show was discovered, and in Macumba, which was a dry hole. I have to report to members that yesterday the Strzelecki No. 3 well came in, with an interesting report. The following telex has been submitted to the Stock Exchange and the media this morning:

Delhi International Oil Corporation, as operator on behalf of Pursuit Oil N. L., Santos Limited, Delhi International Oil Corporation, Vamgas Limited and South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation Proprietary Limited, report as follows:

Strzelecki No. 3, a Cooper Basin exploration well situated approximately 32 miles south-east of Moomba, flowed 44 degrees API gravity oil at a rate of approx. 2 400 barrels per day from drill stem test No. 3 over the interval 5 515 to 5 539 feet in the Hutton sandstone of jurassic age. The flow was for a duration of 93 minutes through a $\frac{7}{16}$ inch choke. The well will be deepened and further evaluation carried out to determine the extent of the discovery.

I think most members would appreciate that the only other oil discovery in the Cooper Basin has been the Tirrawarra oil field. Following the Poolawanna discovery in the jurassic age rocks last year by Western Mining Corporation, the oil flow achieved in Strzelecki No. 3 in rocks of a similar age is very encouraging. It demonstrates the fact that the South Australian Government, the Cooper Basin producers and Dow have every right to be confident about the ability of the liquids available in the Cooper Basin to support a petro-chemical scheme.

CITRUS INDUSTRY

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Premier now table all submissions made on behalf of the South Australian Government by the Minister of Agriculture to the I.A.C., and outline what steps will be taken to ensure that in future all submissions to the I.A.C. will be considered by Cabinet and tabled in the House? Last week it was revealed in the House that submissions to the I.A.C. by the Minister of Agriculture had not been approved by Cabinet. In today's Ministerial statement this situation was neither denied nor explained. The original submission to the I.A.C. included the recommendation that the tariff protection for citrus juice should be as follows:

The level of assistance to the orange sector be a tariff of either 6c per single strength litre of orange juice or 25 per cent *ad valorem*, whichever is the higher.

That reduction is a level that the citrus organisations have said could mean disaster for the Riverland. Events last week revealed that the South Australian Cabinet had no idea of the Minister's submission, and the result was a repudiation by the Premier of his Minister's action at that time. Today's Ministerial statement supports the Minister's action at that time. However, having supported it today, the Premier has said that, as a result of fresh evidence, a revised submission is necessary and that that submission quotes 8c a litre or 35 per cent, whichever is the higher. In other words, the Ministerial statement today states tacitly that the Minister was wrong, in spite of the Premier's defence.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is commenting.

Mr. TONKIN: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Agriculture's action in this instance was revealed only just in time to correct the Federal Government's understanding of South Australia's attitude. I presume that the

Premier in his statement indicates that that revised submission will now be sent to the Federal Government. Will the Premier therefore take the action that I have outlined to prevent the recurrence of any similar potentially disastrous situation, and will he explain to the House how he can justify his continual change of position and the contradictions he has come up with to date?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Last week a matter was raised in this House by the member for Chaffey. It was not something of which I had been apprised. The position about I.A.C. submissions (and this Government has made far more submissions to the commission in support of industry than has any other State Government in Australia) has been that an industries inquiry steering committee was established at my direction to ensure that all submissions from any section of Government to the I.A.C. were consistent with Government policy. Specific terms of reference were given to that committee. I expected members of my department who saw any language in the submission that would flag any cause for concern to inform me; otherwise, if there was no disagreement about the submission, it went forward from each department.

It has not been the case that I, for instance, have taken the submission on the car industry to Cabinet. I did not do so, as that was in accordance with our general basic policy, and I took Ministerial responsibility for it as the Minister in charge of development. This submission did go to the steering committee. The officers of my department did not flag me about some of the language which was contained in the submission and which caused me the concern that I expressed in this House on Thursday.

Mr. Tonkin: What about the figures?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The figures were different. The member for Chaffey quoted selectively from some of the language, for instance, to suggest that the South Australian Government supported a simple reduction from 65 per cent *ad valorem* duty to 20 per cent.

Mr. Arnold: 25 per cent.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, the honourable member referred specifically to the I.A.C.'s proposal.

Mr. Arnold: No.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member was heard in silence.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I quoted what the honourable member had to say.

Mr. Arnold: Selectively.

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member carefully did not make calculations on the basis of the 6c flat tariff rate, nor apparently did the industry representatives who had spoken to him.

The matter had not come to Cabinet. I expressed concern to my officers that I had not been flagged about it, and that will be rectified in future. On investigation of the submission it was quite plain that the submission to the Industries Assistance Commission's from the South Australian Agriculture and Fisheries Department was soundly based to protect the industry in South Australia and to protect the growers' returns.

Mr. Tonkin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader's question was heard in silence.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The submission was made in October of last year. During the period since then a number of facts have arisen. I have discussed those factors with the department, and the department made a submission to say that, because of those factors, the

figures should be revised to 8c and 35 per cent.

Mr. Tonkin: You're running scared of the Riverland.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable Leader to order. He has interjected on three occasions. He knows better than that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If anyone in this House is running scared of the Riverland it is honourable members opposite. The people in the Riverland are justly incensed at the way in which they have been treated by a Liberal Government in Canberra. They have been shockingly treated by the Liberal Governments. The only Government which has given help to the Riverland, through the Riverland Development Fund, through converting the loans to grants, through the restructuring of industry in the Riverland and through the deal it made with Henry Jones to increase the viability of growers and industry in the Riverland, is this Government.

We supported from our funds the crushing of grape surpluses and the crushing of citrus surpluses. It was paid for by the South Australian Government. We have supported growers in the Riverland as no other Government has done in the history of this State, and we have supported them in this submission: that is the position. If anybody is running frightened of the Riverland it is the honourable member, who gets up in this House and in public and says, after the years during which the Government has made submissions to Canberra about brandy excise, and despite my personal submissions that have been made to the Treasurer and the thanks I have been publicly given by industry, that at last the South Australian Government has agreed with the Opposition about the brandy industry. If the honourable member continues with that kind of statement it will account for some of the poll figures we have recently seen about his credibility.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

Mr. OLSON: Will the Attorney-General consider establishing branches of the Consumer Affairs Department and the legal aid section in Port Adelaide? At present a large number of constituents are having difficulty meeting their financial commitments due to being unemployed. Finance companies are harassing their clients by threatening, because of delays in repayments, to repossess articles purchased or to seize household effects outlined in bills of sale. The establishment of branches of both departments would greatly assist those people, who unfortunately are in circumstances over which they have no control.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member has raised some important matters dealing with a number of topics, and I will deal with them individually. At the recent State election it was a policy undertaking of this Government that offices of the Consumer Affairs Branch would be established at various centres within the metropolitan area and at Murray Bridge to complement the offices which have already been opened at Berri, Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, Whyalla, and Port Pirie. The Government intends to do that as part of its three-year programme.

Regrettably, however, because of the financial difficulties in which the Government and the nation find themselves, it has not been possible to plan for any of those new offices of the Consumer Affairs Branch to be opened during the current financial year. However, the preliminary planning for offices such as the office proposed for Port Adelaide is proceeding. As soon as funds are available, action will be taken to open that office

at the earliest possible time.

In relation to legal aid services in Port Adelaide, the Legal Services Commission which has been established (but which is not at present providing legal aid because final agreement has still not been reached with the Commonwealth concerning the financial agreement) has preliminary proposals to establish a number of offices in metropolitan and country areas. I do not know the details of those plans. Indeed, I doubt whether the plans have reached the stage where even the Director of the commission could give any firm indication of where priorities in relation to the establishment of such offices are likely to lie.

Nonetheless the honourable member in the interim might like to inform his constituents that legal aid is still available, for matters such as those he has raised, either from the Law Society or, in a limited number of cases, from the Australian Legal Aid Office. I suggest that he might recommend to his constituents that they contact the Law Society to seek legal assistance in these matters.

In passing, in reference to the matters that he raised concerning the problems of persons who find themselves in financial difficulties because of the Fraser Government's economic policies, I suggest that, if those financial difficulties involve matters such as consumer mortgage repayments and the like, or repayments on consumer goods, they might consider availing themselves of the opportunity of applying under section 38 of the Consumer Transactions Act, which provides that persons who find themselves in temporary financial difficulties can apply to the Credit Tribunal, or to the Registrar of that tribunal, for temporary relief from the obligations under their consumer mortgages.

In certain instances this power has been found to be quite useful in ensuring that people who are in temporary financial difficulties through sickness, unemployment and the like are able to obtain temporary relief, and thereby avoid getting into the sort of financial difficulties that lead on to bankruptcy and the like. I recommend that the honourable member might make that suggestion to his constituents. I point out to him and to any other member of the House the existence of section 38, because there does seem to be a need in the community for greater awareness of the existence of that section and for the exercise of its provisions.

CITRUS INDUSTRY

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I ask the Premier whether Cabinet or the Caucus has discussed the latest blunder by the Minister of Agriculture, and whether the Premier intends to take any action to discipline him? With your concurrence, Mr. Speaker, and that of the House, I would like to explain the question. The Premier has today changed his stance somewhat from that on Thursday when there was an urgency motion before the House. If the subject matter had been carried to a vote, it would have amounted to a vote of no confidence in the Minister of Agriculture. The Premier admitted that he knew little of the matter, but he comes before the House today indicating that he thinks he is a little better informed. He stated that the member for Chaffey in fact was not quoting from the Government's submission, but I refer the Premier to—

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot remember the honourable member seeking leave to explain his question.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek leave of the House to explain the question. The member for Chaffey said in the House, when the Premier said that he was not quoting the

South Australian Government's submission—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I have been asked whether the Cabinet has discussed what the honourable member chooses to call the latest blunder by the Minister of Agriculture. I cannot see what his present explanation has got to do with that topic at all.

Mr. Chapman: The blunder after the blunder he made before.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Alexandra to order. I uphold the point of order. I should like the honourable Deputy Leader to start his question again, if he does not mind.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The question is whether Cabinet or Caucus discussed—

The SPEAKER: Order! I want the honourable member to start again.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am starting again, Sir.

The SPEAKER: "My question is directed to the Premier"—that is how we usually start, is it not?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I should like to direct a question to the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I asked the honourable member to start again.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think I said, "I should like to ask the Premier a question." My question is to the Premier: has Cabinet or the Caucus discussed the latest blunder by the Minister of Agriculture, and does the Premier intend to take any action to discipline the Minister? With your leave, Sir, and that of the House, I seek leave to explain the question. In defence of the Minister today, the Premier has changed his stance from that which he adopted on Thursday last when an urgency motion was before the House. If that motion had been carried to a vote, it would have amounted to a vote of no confidence in the Minister. The Premier, in seeking to defend the Minister (and this is implicit in the question), accused the member for Chaffey of misquoting from the Government's submission. I am pointing out to the House that in fact the member for Chaffey quoted directly from the Government's submission to the effect that—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: the honourable member has asked me whether Cabinet has discussed the matter of the Minister of Agriculture. What was said in this House has nothing to do with that topic. He must explain his question in relation to that question alone.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The honourable Deputy Leader is getting back to a question similar to the one he was asking when I called him to order. I upheld the point of order a few minutes ago. I ask him to explain his question, and not comment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am indicating the nature of the blunder of the Minister of Agriculture, and stating that the Premier is still not apprised of the facts in view of what he has said here this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is getting back to what I first called him to order about. I uphold the Premier's point of order. I hope he will finish his question, otherwise I shall withdraw his leave.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is difficult to explain the nature of the Minister's blunder if the Premier is so sensitive about the matter that he will not—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting. I hope he will get on with his question.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister of Agriculture has made a thorough blunder with his activities in relation to

prawn fishermen. The Premier had to spring to his defence in this House. The Government has had to change its submission to the I.A.C. from 25 per cent tariff, as quoted by the member for Chaffey in this House. The Premier quoted 20 per cent today, but a direct quote from the Government's submission is 25 per cent (as quoted by the member for Chaffey), or 6c a litre. The figure was changed to 35 per cent or 8c a litre. That is a significant change. Although the Premier indicated that there had been a slight change to the submission to the I.A.C., it was a significant change, indicating that the Minister has again blundered. A few other things, I should have thought, would be pertinent to the question, but you do not think so, Sir, so I shall leave it at that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member's question is inapplicable. Cabinet and Caucus do not believe there is any blunder, as the honourable member puts it, by the Minister of Agriculture.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mount Gambier is out of order, and I call him to order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position quite clearly is that in October of last year a submission was made which, on the then prices which were evident in imports, gave complete and effective protection to the industry for existing rates of return.

Since that time there have been some changes, which I outlined to the House, and the department and that Minister put forward that there should be a marginal adjustment to the previous submission, the basis and nature of which, however, were correct, that is, that there should be a tariff base which had a flat rate applicable to the lower levels of import price and an *ad valorem* duty applicable to the higher levels. The Government believes that that is entirely the correct approach. The Minister did not blunder in that at all, and the honourable member, if he had bothered to do any sums, ought to know that.

CONVENTION CENTRE

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Premier inform the House of the Government's proposal to establish a convention centre at Wayville and state why the Wayville showgrounds site was selected in preference to other sites? The question is prompted by a press report yesterday, which, among other things, stated that more than \$12 000 000 would be spent at Wayville and that it would make Adelaide the Australian leader in relation to convention facilities.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The House was told originally of our appointment of consultants to recommend on the development of convention, entertainment and exhibition facilities for Adelaide. The convention facilities study, after examining many sites, recommended the Wayville showgrounds site. It reached the conclusion that that was the outstanding site, as it was centrally located and good traffic and parking provisions could easily be made available and it could get a full range of activities which would enable the best possible return in relation to capital outlay.

One of the problems which has occurred with convention facilities developed elsewhere in the world is that they are not fully occupied. Some of the major convention facilities in the world, some of which are very beautiful, in fact are dark and empty for a significant part of the time. It was a brief to the consultants that they should get as full a range of activities to spread the activities as fully as possible, and quite clearly the best

place to do that was in the establishment of exhibition and entertainment facilities in addition to the convention facilities, using the same facilities in a flexible way.

The outstanding site, according to the consultants' report, was the Wayville showgrounds. There had been negotiations over a considerable time, and the planning has been done by the consultants in conjunction and consultation with the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society. I believe that the programme which they have put forward is extremely sensible. We have acceded to a revised programme from the original consultants' report of stage I, which was to provide exhibition facilities originally. Stage II would provide the convention facilities, and stage III would provide a sports and entertainment centre with a large auditorium for 8 000 people. The whole of that project would have cost about \$47 000 000, which would have had too heavy an impact by far upon the Loan Funds of the State in the foreseeable future.

A revised stage I can give us flexible convention facilities together with exhibition and entertainment facilities allowing for large banquets, dances, and large public meetings as well as conventions and exhibitions in a way which can give us the maximum usage and return for the outlay, which is estimated at \$12 000 000. That could have a minimal impact upon the Loan Fund, because \$6 000 000 could be raised by an independent statutory authority recommended by the consultants and of course on which the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society would have representation during the period of the building.

Over the period of the building and subsequent to the building's being completed, money could be raised at \$1 000 000 each year to repay the advance of \$6 000 000 from the capital funds of the State. In these circumstances, the impact on the Loan Fund would be minimal, and a very valuable facility, which I am pleased to see has been hailed by the Director of the South Australian Convention Bureau as a great advance for South Australia, could be established for the State.

Mr. WILSON: Is the Mr. Keith Neighbour, principal of the firm Neighbour & Lapsys, which took over the feasibility study of the convention and sports complex at Wayville from Cheesman, Doley, Neighbour & Raffin when that firm dissolved, the same Mr. Neighbour who ran a series of advertisements on behalf of the Premier and the Australian Labor Party prior to the last State election under the name of the Committee for Good Government, and actively raised money to pay into the Premier's personal promotion fund?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer is "No".

Mr. Chapman: A different Mr. Neighbour?

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already called the honourable member for Alexandra to order. I will warn him if he continues in that vein.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Neighbour did not run advertisements on behalf of me and the A.L.P. Mr. Neighbour was a member of the Committee for Good Government in South Australia. He is a concerned South Australian citizen, and he raised money in order to pursue that campaign. There is no personal promotion fund for me of which I am aware. It is not a question of a personal promotion fund.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It's something raised by the Opposition.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Davenport and the honourable Deputy Leader are out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know nothing of Mr.

Neighbour's being involved in any such activity. I doubt that Mr. Neighbour has contributed to it but, given the activities of the Opposition, I rather think that the moneys presently raised by the Opposition in South Australia are the best promotion fund I have.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

Mr. HEMMINGS: Can the Attorney-General say whether it is against any law in South Australia for a meeting to be advertised as a public meeting and for members of the public to be refused admission? This morning, I was approached by four constituents who gave me a copy of a church newsletter in which the following appears:

A public meeting at the Smithfield Hotel tomorrow Monday 25 September at 7.30 p.m. Mr. John Burdett, M.L.C., shadow Attorney-General for South Australia, will speak on the private member's Bill he has introduced to State Parliament to control child pornography and associated matters in this State. You are urged to show your concern in this matter by attending the meeting. Further information available from Esmond McKeown, 254 8271.

Mr. CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I believe that the question being asked is a direct request for a legal opinion. I understand that to be clearly out of order during Question Time or during any other time within the sittings of the Parliament. The honourable member is asking, first, for an opinion on a legal matter.

Mr. Wells: He asked—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Florey is out of order. I ask the honourable member to repeat his question.

Mr. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I have already called the honourable member for Davenport to order once. If he continues in that vein, I will name him.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Can the Attorney-General say whether it is proper, and against any law in South Australia, for a meeting to be advertised as a public meeting and for members of the public to be refused admission?

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. The honourable member for Napier may continue to ask his question.

Mr. HEMMINGS: My constituents were concerned that, although they wanted to attend the public meeting, on arrival there they were told that the meeting was not a public meeting but a private meeting. They were told by the hotel manager that the private meeting had been organised by the Liberal Party. I have checked with the manager of the Smithfield Hotel, who confirmed that the room had been booked in the name of the Liberal Party by Mr. Esmond McKeown, a paid-up member of the Liberal Party in my district.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In accordance with the long-standing practice of Attorneys, it is not my practice to provide legal—

Mrs. Adamson: Since when have you observed the practice of Attorneys?

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

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I do not intend to break that long-standing practice now. I point out for the honourable member's benefit that it is not a breach of Standing Orders to ask such questions. However, I think it only proper to indicate that, regardless of the legal situation, to distribute pamphlets in this State indicating that a meeting is a public meeting when, in fact, it is a

private meeting, and when members of the public seek admission to it they are refused admission, seems to be entirely improper but not, one might say, out of line with the normal practices of the Party which members opposite represent. In this case, it seems that what the Hon. Mr. Burdett and his cohorts are apparently up to is that they are advertising public meetings, which are meetings of the Liberal Party, presumably with the intention of supporting the bogus campaign they are running at the moment so that they can say subsequently, "We had a public meeting at Elizabeth, and the citizens of Elizabeth demanded support for the Bill I have introduced in another place." That seems to be the sort of campaign the honourable member is running.

Government members with long memories will hardly be surprised to find a member of the Liberal Party in the other place acting in that sort of fashion. Those of us who can recall the activities of the Hon. Mr. Hill, when a Minister in the Hall Government, will be aware of the tactics he used when trying to drum up support for the MATS campaign, I think it was, at that stage. He proceeded to buy many copies of the *Sunday Mail*, and filled them in in an attempt, as he saw it, to influence public opinion. Apparently, we are in a similar situation now, with a bogus campaign being run and bogus attempts being made to influence the public of South Australia in it. That is entirely despicable, and the Opposition, Mr. Burdett, and their Party ought to be roundly condemned for undertaking such activities.

CONVENTION CENTRE

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier make available to Parliament full details of the Government's studies into the need, likely viability, cost, design, management and plans in connection with the proposed exhibition, trade, convention and sports centre at Wayville? About five years ago, the proposal for such a centre was first mooted with any real strength, and about three years ago I recommended the site the Government has chosen for such a centre. I am pleased to see that the Government now believes that the site is a correct one, whereas it then believed that it was the wrong site. Within the concept site will have to be taken into consideration every sporting interest right down to (if I may use the term) ice skating, together with the possible viability of such a centre.

Because of such a massive expenditure, which will be an on-going expense, and because it may not be a viable proposition, unless designed and constructed properly in the first place, it is only fair that the community, Parliament, and those interested in sports, conventions, exhibitions and trade marts should be able to look at the proposal before it goes too far. I ask the Premier whether, bearing in mind his own statement about open Government, he will make all that material on the cost of the project available to Parliament before any further work is carried out.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I shall be pleased to do that. The honourable member has talked about an indoor sports and entertainment centre. The proposals in the CESE study, which would incorporate facilities of that kind, are for the large-scale 8 000-seat sports and entertainment auditorium. The studies do not show that that could operate without a very heavy subsidy. The studies of available sports activity to be performed in it do not show a heavy demand. A centre of that kind, therefore, is a good deal down the line. There is some demand, and there is, within the study, a submission from Mr. Kym Bonython, an entrepreneur with great

experience in this area both in presenting sports activity and large audience entertainment. However, I do not believe that, at this stage, the State can commit itself to that further stage. In consequence, stage I does not provide for a large-scale sports oriented auditorium. It would be possible to run such functions as table tennis and basketball in the exhibition hall areas that will be part of stage I. The degree of demand in this area for a sports oriented basis is not something that will at this stage give us a satisfactory return. A number of the large auditoria established overseas for this purpose have lost money heavily. We need to be careful about that development. The Perth Entertainment Centre was considered closely before the recommendations in the study were made. I shall be pleased to provide the honourable member with the consultants' original report and the revised report (giving a revised stage I with costing), which the Government has accepted.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether anything ever came of the discussions with the Federal Government on the creation of an emergency fund to assist unemployed people who found themselves in grave financial hardship whilst awaiting the payment of unemployment benefits? In February this year the Minister reported on his representations to the Minister for Social Security. At that time there still seemed a possibility that a fund would be created. The emergency fund concept was aimed at alleviating the many cases of hardship that were the result of a Commonwealth decision to pay unemployment benefits in arrears. It was pointed out at that time that the burden of alleviating this hardship was falling on State Governments and voluntary agencies, and that their resources were being strained to the utmost.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I regret to say that there is still no emergency fund to enable State Governments and voluntary agencies to meet the needs of people suffering hardship through unemployment. Since I last reported to the House in February a great deal of investigation has been carried out into the amounts and kinds of emergency assistance provided by State Governments and voluntary agencies. There has been a dearth of action on the part of the Commonwealth.

South Australia was one of three States that took part, in April this year with the Department of Social Security, in a co-operative exercise to do a two-week survey on emergency assistance. The exercise was intended to give an accurate indication of the demands being made on State agencies. I have not given up the struggle with the Commonwealth Minister. It is apparent to all members, as it is to every citizen in Australia, that the Commonwealth Government has publicly admitted its responsibility for this hardship in recent statements by Mr. Street and Mr. Fraser in relation to their policies. When I have further contact with the Federal Minister I will continue by whatever means I need to get justice for the people in this State.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CITRUS INDUSTRY

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: I remind the honourable member that

he may explain matters of a personal nature but that he may not debate the matter.

Leave granted.

Mr. ARNOLD: The Premier has deliberately misrepresented what I said in the House on Tuesday and Thursday of last week. What he has said is a blatant untruth. To prove that to the House I will again relate to the Premier word for word what I said in the House. On Tuesday, I asked the following question:

Can the Premier say whether the Government will dissociate itself from the submission made on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture to the Industries Assistance Commission inquiry into the citrus industry, calling for a reduction in the tariff protection from 65 per cent to either 6 cents per single strength litre of orange juice or 25 per cent *ad valorem*, whichever is the higher?

I do not know how many times I need to repeat those words or whether the Premier just does not believe what is written in *Hansard*, but that is as clear as crystal to me and, I believe, to every other member in the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! I want the honourable member not to debate the question. He was doing very well.

Mr. ARNOLD: In that question I referred to the South Australian Government's recommendation, as follows:

- (i) that the major form of protection to the citrus industry be tariffs;
- (ii) that the level of assistance to the orange sector be a tariff of either 6c per single strength litre of orange juice or 25 per cent *ad valorem*, whichever is the higher.

Both those quotes come from the question I asked on Tuesday of last week. On Thursday of last week I stated, in reply to the Premier, that there was absolutely nothing selective in what I quoted. I continued:

I quoted the precise words of the recommendations of the South Australian Government to the I.A.C. I now repeat those words, direct from the submission made by the Government to the Commission, as follows . . .

Again I quoted those exact words. Yet this afternoon the Premier said that I was quoting the I.A.C. report, so I do not know how many times I must refer to this. The statement made by the Premier this afternoon was blatantly untrue.

At 3.19 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1975. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

In his election policy speech given on 29 August 1977, the Premier foreshadowed that the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act would be amended "to improve its operation and to maintain the favourable and co-operative industrial situation in this State". The preparation of those measures is well in hand, but circumstances have made it necessary for an amendment to be introduced without

delay to facilitate the reregistration of the Public Service Association of South Australia.

Honourable members will be aware that the Public Service Association has recently been deregistered by the Industrial Court because of a defect in its rules. It is anticipated that an application to the Industrial Court for reregistration will be made in due course. However, prior to an application being made, and in view of the difficulties which culminated in the Full Supreme Court decision of *R. v. Cawthorne, ex parte Public Service Association of South Australia Inc.* (75 LSJS 245), it is appropriate for the situation to be clarified to remove any undesirable element from the established procedure.

Part IX of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act deals with associations, and section 116 vests the registration authority in the Industrial Registrar or the Deputy Industrial Registrars appointed under the Act. However, this registration procedure may be complicated where a technical bias on the part of the industrial registrars could be alleged, in particular, where each of the registrars has an interest in an association being a party to the application. In the circumstances surrounding the above case, each of the industrial registrars were members of the Public Service Association, and in two instances there was a direct financial interest in that Association.

Despite the decision of the Full Supreme Court that the operation of the doctrine of necessity made it inappropriate in such circumstances for a temporary industrial registrar to be appointed, the Crown Solicitor has indicated that, in his opinion, the fact of membership of the Public Service Association alone is enough to make it undesirable for any of the present registrars to hear the matter.

In the light of this opinion, and to clarify the position in future, this Bill seeks to amend section 114 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to enable the President of the Industrial Court to direct a judge of the Industrial Court or an industrial magistrate to carry out the functions of an industrial registrar in circumstances where it is inappropriate for a registrar to hear any particular case.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 114 of the principal Act in the manner outlined above. Where a judge or industrial magistrate exercises powers or functions of the registrar in pursuance of a direction of the President, there will be the same rights of appeal in relation to his decisions as if those decisions had been made by the registrar.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SEEDS BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill is designed to ensure that transactions involving the sale of seed will take place on a fair and informed basis. The Bill replaces the Agricultural Seeds Act, which dates from 1938. Since that time, a far wider range of seeds has come into common use and the production of seed has developed into a specialist

industry. The lack of adequate descriptive requirements in the marketing of seed has permitted a certain volume of trade in substandard seed, which, in some cases, would be regarded as unmarketable in other States which have more rigid controls.

In addition to these factors, it has been found that the terms of the present Act make it difficult in practice to detect and prosecute persons who sell substandard seed. This is partly due to the fact that the present legislation permits vendors to declare substandard features of seed in any one of three ways—on an invoice relating to the transaction, on a tag attached to a parcel, or on the parcel itself. Such a practice readily leads to confusion and uncertainty. Moreover, as the law stands it is difficult for inspectors to determine whether a particular sample of seed in, say, a warehouse, is in fact intended for sale or, indeed, whether it is owned by the person who owns the warehouse.

Furthermore, the present requirements to declare substandard characteristics do not apply to transactions between seed growers and merchants. All of these factors have resulted in a situation where little has been, or can be, done to enforce the provisions of an Act, which is, in any event, out of touch with modern developments in the seed producing industry.

Under the proposed legislation, any person who sells or offers or exposes for sale any prescribed seeds in the course of business will be obliged to furnish the purchaser with a statement setting out the species of the plant from which the seeds have been obtained, the proportion of those seeds which have been found to germinate under a prescribed test, the mass of the seeds contained in any parcel, the proportion by mass of any extraneous matter mixed with the seeds, and details of any treatment to which the seeds have been subjected.

The new Act will also make it an offence to sell seeds of pest plants or other prescribed noxious seeds or seeds contaminated by noxious material. The legislation will further stipulate that any information offered voluntarily must be truthfully labelled. To ensure the effective enforcement of the Act, officers of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department will be empowered to enter premises where seeds are kept for sale and take samples of seeds for analysis.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 repeals the Agricultural Seeds Act, 1938-1975. Clause 4 defines certain expressions used in the Bill. Clause 5 makes it an offence for any person to sell noxious or contaminated seeds, and clause 6 empowers an authorised officer to order the cleaning or destruction of such seeds.

Clause 7 sets out the particulars relating to seeds which must be furnished to purchasers, and provides that it shall be an offence for a seller not to comply with the requirements of the clause or to furnish false information in relation to seeds offered for sale. Clause 8 sets out a number of general defences to charges for offences under the new Act.

Clause 9 empowers authorised officers to enter premises where seeds are kept for sale and to remove samples for analysis on tender of the market price. Any person who hinders an authorised officer in the exercise of these powers commits an offence.

Clause 10 provides that, in any proceedings for an offence against the proposed Act, a certificate relating to the analysis of seeds under the hand of a person with prescribed qualifications shall be accepted, in the absence of proof to the contrary, as proof of any statement contained therein relating to the identity of the seeds and the result of the analysis. Clause 11 provides that any

proceedings under the Act may be disposed of summarily, and Clause 12 empowers the Governor to make regulations for the purposes of the Act.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2) AND PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 Sept. Page 1106.)

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): When I sought leave to continue my remarks I had just concluded a summary of the current situation in the citrus industry. This afternoon we have heard a reply from the Premier, which, once again, is blatantly untrue in many aspects. It is high time that the Premier started to do his own research work instead of relying on others to do it for him, because they are totally misleading him.

Many of the statements he has made this afternoon clearly indicate that he has little understanding of what the tariff quota system is all about. I will now refer briefly to two statistical tables dealing with tariffs and bounties and the various levels of *ad valorem* percentages which would be required on the imported juice price to bring it up to a figure comparable to the \$100 a tonne presently being received by South Australian growers.

If there is an f.o.b. price of 11c a litre and if, for the purpose of this statistical information, we work on the I.A.C. recommendation (which is slightly lower than the South Australian submission) of 20 per cent tariff protection the figure totals 16.2 per cent a litre, which includes additional costs incurred on imported juices. The figure of 16.2c a litre is the equivalent of a return to the grower of \$73.71 a tonne, less the processing cost that the grower in Australia would have to pay of \$36.40 a tonne, which would leave a return to the grower of \$37.31 a tonne. The reason why I used the figure of 11c is that the expected price range for imported juice during 1979 is between 11c and 14c a litre.

If we go to the other end of the scale and take the 14c per litre and add the 20 per cent tariff protection recommended by the I.A.C. that brings the figure to 16.8c, plus import costs of 3c a litre, making a total of 19.8c a litre for imported juice. This would provide an equivalent return to a grower of \$90.09 a tonne, less the processing cost that the Australian grower must pay of \$36.40 a tonne, which leaves a net return to the grower of \$53.69 a tonne. Once again, the quotations and explanations given to the House this afternoon by the Premier in his statement are without foundation. To claim that he is protecting the South Australian and Australian citrus industries at the level of protection recommended by the South Australian Government in its submission to the I.A.C. is quite ludicrous.

I turn now to a further statistical table showing the *ad valorem* tariffs required to provided growers' price for Valencia oranges of \$100 a tonne. The Premier referred at length to *ad valorem* tariff and claimed that no-one knew anything about it, or that I did not know what it was all about. Once again, if we start at an average import f.o.b. price of 12c a litre, to have an equivalent price in Australia of \$100 a tonne, we need an equivalent *ad valorem* tariff of 125 per cent on the imported price.

The Premier, in his statement this afternoon, claimed that in no way could the Government support an *ad valorem* tariff of 65 per cent. Just whose interests are the Premier and the Government of South Australia looking after? Certainly they are not looking after the citrus-

growing industry. As I said earlier, the probable price range for imported citrus juice for 1979 is between 11c and 14c a litre. Let us look at the *ad valorem* tariff percentage on juice if it were imported at 14c a litre to bring that amount up to the equivalent of \$100 a tonne, which is what the growers in Australia are receiving at the moment and which is the cost of production. We are looking at an equivalent *ad valorem* tariff of 92.8 per cent to bring that

14c a litre f.o.b. price in Australia up to the equivalent of \$100 a tonne.

I seek leave to have the two tables, one dealing with import f.o.b. prices and equated returns to growers and the other with *ad valorem* tariff required to provide growers' price for Valencia oranges of \$100 a tonne, incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

IMPORT F.O.B. PRICES AND EQUATED RETURNS TO GROWERS APPENDIX "A"

	Average Mar/Apr 1976	Probable range ex BRAZIL 1979						
F.o.b. per litre (c Aust) (Brazil)	8.80	11.0	12.0	13.0	14.0	16.0	20.0	22.5
Add tariff at 20 per cent	1.76	2.2	2.4	2.6	2.8	3.2	4.0	4.5
Total f.o.b. + tariff	10.56	13.2	14.4	15.6	16.8	19.2	24.0	27.0
Add other import costs	2.75	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Total C.I.F. + tariff	13.31	16.2	17.4	18.6	19.8	22.2	27.0	30.0
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Equivalent return to grower per tonne	60.52	73.71	79.17	84.63	90.09	101.01	122.85	136.50
Less processing cost	36.40	36.40	36.40	36.40	36.40	36.40	36.40	36.40
Growers' equated return	24.12	37.31	42.77	48.23	53.69	64.61	86.45	100.10
EFFECT OF BOUNTY								
1st year 5c/litre = \$22.75 t.	46.87	60.06	65.52	70.98	76.44	87.36	109.20	122.85
2nd year 3c/litre = \$13.65 t.	37.77	50.96	56.42	61.88	67.34	78.26	100.10	113.75
3rd year 1c/litre = \$ 4.55 t.	28.67	41.86	47.32	52.78	58.24	69.16	91.00	104.65

ASSUMPTIONS: (a) 455 litres = 1 tonne of fruit
(b) Import costs = 3c per litre
(c) Processing costs = 8c per litre or \$36.40 per tonne

AD VALOREM TARIFF REQUIRED TO PROVIDE GROWERS' PRICE FOR VALENCIA ORANGES OF \$100 PER TONNE

Average Import f.o.b. price c/litre	12	13	14	16	18	20	22	24
Required growers' price \$100 per tonne = c/litre	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Add processing cost per litre	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Sub-total	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Deduct other import costs per litre	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
Tariff required (c per litre)	15	14	13	11	9	7	5	3
Equivalent <i>ad valorem</i> tariff (per cent)	125	107.7	92.8	68.7	50	35	22.7	12.5

Mr. ARNOLD: Those two tables clearly demonstrate to any person wishing to study them that what the Premier has said this afternoon in his statement is quite unfounded, baseless and, in fact, if the Government of South Australia intends to insist on its former representations to the I.A.C. and its recommendations, it still spells disaster for the citrus industry not only in South Australia but also in the whole of Australia.

I do not intend to speak further about the citrus industry. I believe that the statistical information that I have inserted in *Hansard* will prove once and for all the claim that I made in the House last week. It will be there for everyone to see. I only trust that the Premier will himself closely examine the statistical information and that, instead of relying on others to prepare his answers for him and totally misguide him in what he says in this House, he will take advantage of those figures and again

reconsider the stand adopted by the Government and the position put forward in this House this afternoon.

In the few minutes that I have left I turn to another very important matter that I have raised in this House on many occasions; it is particularly important to South Australia—the position of South Australia's water resources. I refer to this subject on numerous occasions because it involves the future of South Australia. We are totally dependent on our very limited water resources, particularly the water resources of the Murray River. Interest is now being shown in Victoria and New South Wales by organisations, shire councils and so forth, relating to the pollution of the Murray River system in their States. I refer to the total river system, including all the tributaries that make up the Murray River.

Recently, councils along the Murray River in South Australia received a letter from the Berrigan Shire Council

expressing concern about pollution of the Murray River system, and making a suggestion for this river's future protection and management. It is very encouraging that such representation is coming from New South Wales and Victoria. Recently, when I went to Victoria to speak with the Federal Treasurer about the brandy situation, I spoke to the Victorian Minister for Water Supply about the need for a central body, one authority with power to control and manage the Murray River system adequately. I refer to the letter that was forwarded from the Berrigan Shire Council to councils in the Riverland of South Australia. It is headed "River Murray Control," and reads:

My council has for some time been advocating the development and appointment of an overall authority for the Murray River, such authority to have overall control of the storage of water, its distribution, pollution, flood mitigation and drainage. It would ask that your council give consideration to such a proposal, evaluate its advantages and make representations to your State and Federal Governments to institute such an authority.

This council has, and it is known that other organisations have, approached both Federal and State authorities only to receive the reply in the first instance that such would be impossible. On no issue would you get agreement from three States and the second, the State Commission, would in no way be prepared to surrender to an overall authority the power and authority it has at present, or be prepared to become subservient to a Federal body. Perhaps an initial investigation could be commenced and an examination of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States of America may provide guidelines for such an authority. The Murray River Valley is probably the greatest food-producing area in Australia. Surely, then, it is imperative to the economy of our country that Government give the proposal a very high priority on its development programme.

Many people and organisations along the length of the Murray River Valley in the three States of Australia recognise that, until the Murray River and its total system comes under the complete control of one authority, the problems that we have, particularly in the pollution field, will continue indefinitely. The letter from the Berrigan Shire Council referred to the Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States. When I visited the United States last year to look specifically at salinity control measures being adopted in the Colorado River system, it became very apparent to me that, with any river system traversing a number of States, each with its own Government, and where the Colorado River crosses the United States border and enters Mexico (and there one is dealing with a foreign country), an overall management agreement and authority was needed for that body to have complete control and power to control pollution effectively throughout the length and breadth of that river system.

I have related the measures that are being adopted at present in the United States to overcome the salinity problems; many of the salinity problems of the Colorado system are very similar to those in the Murray system, and many of the ideas that are currently being put into effect in that country can be put into effect in this land as well. A considerable sum of money will be required to carry out the necessary works. In the United States about \$300 000 000 to \$400 000 000 will be required to combat salinity effectively in the Colorado River system. I believe in Australia we are looking at a similar figure. The Federal Government has provided a National Water Resources Fund for which some \$200 000 000 will be available over the next five years. It is not as though the resources are not available in this country to carry out the necessary works; they have been made available, and the three States and the Commonwealth must agree on effective management

through one single authority to be able to put the necessary works into operation effectively to solve our problems. I support the second reading of the Bills.

Mr. WOTTON (Murray): I support the second reading of the Bills. In his Financial Statement in this House on 12 September, the Premier made the following statement:

The Budget has been framed against one of the most difficult financial and economic backgrounds this State has seen for many years.

He went on to say:

It is a background which has seen the favourable financial position of the Government accounts built up through our careful and sound management eroded as a direct result of recent Commonwealth policies.

That statement takes me and many other members in this House back a few years, to the time when a very disgruntled Premier came back almost empty-handed from the then Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam. At that time, there had been a wild spending spree in South Australia to the extent, as we all appreciate, that the Premier had to sell off a capital asset in the country railways in order to keep South Australia smiling at him, as Premier.

This useful sale, I suppose, kept the wolf from the door for some time, but recently that wolf has had pups, which are continuing to bark at the heels of the Premier and of the Government: pups in the form of increased costs and charges which were laid down by this Government which are still rising in many areas, and in areas where no blame at all can be laid at the Federal doorstep. The Premier's memory is conveniently short. He said:

The only good news on the national front has been the falling inflation rate.

That was precisely the reason why the Fraser Government went into office: it promised to bring down the inflation rate, and that is what it has done. It went in, at its first election, on the promise that it would decrease inflation, and no-one in this House can say that that has not happened. Inflation, according to all polls conducted at that time, was the greatest concern of the greatest number of Australians. The Labor Government proved, under Whitlam, that it could never bring down inflation, and in fact it had tended to put it up *ad infinitum*.

The Premier's Financial Statement was similar to that of last year. There were the same attacks on the Federal Government, and it never ceases to amaze me that this Government appears to think that the people of South Australia are so stupid as to accept so much of what was said in that statement. The people of South Australia are fed up to the back teeth with the irresponsible attitude of the Premier. More than ever before, they are looking now for Governments to pull together. They are looking for a responsible attitude on the part of the Government of this State. We have continually seen the Fraser Government blamed by this State Government for his own mismanagement. The sooner members opposite start to accept that many problems in this State are a direct result of their own mismanagement, the better it will be for the people of South Australia. I do not care about the comments of members opposite on this matter: I am concerned with the future of every person in South Australia, and that obviously is not what the Government is concerned about.

The South Australian Government, in refusing to adopt the responsible attitude shown in other States, is showing how irresponsible it is prepared to be. We are continually reminded that South Australia is the leading State, and so far it is quite obvious that in many cases this State is leading, but from the wrong end.

Recently, we have heard a great deal about open government in South Australia. This is a matter of great

importance to me, and I believe the South Australian people see it in the same way. We are being told continually that the State Government is an open Government for the people of South Australia. How many times do we find in this place that reports are released by the Government but that in many cases it is almost impossible for Opposition members to see them? In many cases, it is virtually impossible for the people of South Australia to look through them. For some unknown reason, which is quite a mystery, the press often seems to be able to get copies of reports for the media, to tell the people of South Australia what the Government would have them know about those reports. I refer to questions asked by Opposition members in this House, and to letters written by Opposition members to Ministers, seeking information. How often do we get a straight answer to a straight question?

Mr. Slater: Every time.

Mr. WOTTON: It is not every time. Seldom do we receive the information we are trying to gain from the present Government. When I came into this House some three years ago, I was told that the best way to get detailed information from the Government was to place a Question on Notice. Now, we are told frequently, in connection with answers to Questions on Notice and replies to letters, that the Minister is unable to obtain the information or that it would cost too much to supply it, so we have to take second best and take what the Government is prepared to hand out. That is not good enough.

Last week in this House, we had a classic example of how, on every occasion, whenever possible, Ministers in this place will blame the Federal Government for their own mismanagement. The Minister of Transport had the gall, because he did not know what else to say, to blame the inflation rate under the present Federal Government for the problems associated with the subject matter of a question asked. The Minister, with the people of South Australia and of Australia generally, knows what the Fraser Government has done to the inflation rate.

We are continually told that no increases are being made in State and Government charges in South Australia. What a load of poppycock! If any member on the other side can tell me where charges have not increased, I shall be extremely gratified. In his Financial Statement, the Premier talked of the Federal Budget's attack on the underprivileged, but I ask members opposite what this Government is doing to assist the underprivileged, and what it is doing in relation to increased costs for water, public transport, registration and insurance, building costs—and so we could go on. Those are the basic needs of all people, and I do not believe that the South Australian Government has any right or any reason to blame the Federal Government for its own mismanagement.

A matter of concern to all members in this House, and one which has been touched on by the majority of members who have spoken in this debate, is the serious problem of unemployment. It has been said that unemployment, like love, sex, and inflation, is a subject about which it is almost impossible to write in an original way.

Dr. Eastick: Who gave that definition?

Mr. WOTTON: Mr. Yves Lulan in *Newsweek* of 1 August 1977 said that. I believe that unemployment is of particular concern to every genuine Australian. I do not want to be political about it, because I do not believe it is a political subject.

Mr. Groom interjecting:

Mr. WOTTON: If the member for Morphett wants to be political about it, I shall be happy for him to make any

political mileage he can from it. I believe the matter is too serious for it to be kicked around this House like a football. Naturally, I am concerned about the young people who are unemployed, and I am also concerned about those unemployed people aged 50 and over. I believe that age bracket is often overlooked when we refer to the problems associated with unemployment. There is no doubt that the effect of unemployment on young people is detrimental to the individual, and I believe that eventually it will also be detrimental to the community.

I also believe that to be too old at 50 is in itself a tragedy. For energetic and efficient men and women to have to be pensioned off at the age of 50, and in some cases between the ages of 45 and 50, because they are too old to be part of the work force, is a calamity. We all know people who for one reason or another are unable to gain paid employment, and for some of us I suggest it is close to home. We realise it is essential that ample opportunity be given to young people to become involved in activities which provide a feeling of self-worth and which lead to recognition and acceptance by the community.

I am sure many of us have dealt with young people who are in the grip of unemployment, and I think we would all realise the immense problem that most of these young people have in losing self-confidence after a prolonged period of unemployment. I am concerned about the future within the community of those people. I commend most young people who are out of work at this time for one reason or another on the way in which they are handling the situation. I particularly want to commend the young people who are actively involved in trying to help themselves and others through various self-help schemes.

I do not wish to be political about youth unemployment. I believe many things aggravate the present unemployment position amongst youth, a position of little demand for a resource that is in abundance. First, I refer to the narrowing gap between adult and youth wages. I would suggest that, if any guilt is to be laid at anyone's feet, that particular factor should be laid at the feet of politicians. I believe that as politicians we have encouraged the narrowing of that gap between adult and youth wages.

Another matter of concern (and anyone who has had any involvement in these matters would appreciate this) is that so often young people are the first to be retrenched. I do not believe there is enough training through education for the jobs which are in demand, and I do not believe that young job seekers always get sufficient information about the employment that is available. Many matters should be looked into in regard to unemployment. For instance, whether existing junior wage relativities are appropriate should be investigated. We should look more closely at reductions in and exemptions from pay-roll tax, the use of subsidies by Government for training and manpower policies, and certain trade union practices which, because most unionists are adults, encourage hiring and firing policies which discriminate against young employees. Reforms of and changes to the education system need to be looked into generally throughout Australia.

Unemployment has become a universal phenomenon affecting all industrialised countries to a greater or lesser extent. An obvious truth is that everyone now agrees that unemployment will be around for some time.

Mr. Max Brown: Even Fraser.

Mr. WOTTON: Even Fraser, and all credit to him and all credit to the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations (Mr. Street) for having the guts to come out and say it. I believe there would be few people in this State and in this Government who would condemn the Prime Minister for coming out and stating the facts as he has done.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Why didn't he say it last December?

Mr. WOTTON: I suggest that, when he made the statements he made last year, the Prime Minister was unaware of the situation that we would find at this stage—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Come on!

Mr. WOTTON: The Minister might not agree with that, but I would like to see what the Government of this State would do in that situation. For some time we have seen how this Government is prepared to hoodwink the people of this State, and at least it cannot accuse the Prime Minister of doing that at this time. Historically, right up to the last world war and particularly today, with the exception of some communist countries where unemployment is said to be unknown but where conditions of work, income incentives and productivity are abysmally bad, there have never been more incentives and productivity, and there has never been full employment in the Third World or even in the countries on the fringes of industrialised Europe such as Spain, Portugal, Greece and Turkey. In fact only a handful of privileged countries have ever experienced full employment, and then only for a period of 20 or 30 years. Perhaps it was over-hasty of us to make full employment the norm for all societies.

In reality, I suggest that it is clear that unemployment will never disappear completely, and a study made by the International Labour Organisation suggests that to solve unemployment in the Third World we would have to create one billion jobs between now and the year 2000, and that is a target beyond human reach. If industrial countries alone are considered, however, the problem is not an insuperable one, especially for white male adults. However, it is a trickier question for women and young people, where taboos and psychological barriers and hangovers from our recent past tend to prevail.

For example, it is an obvious, if disagreeable, fact that there could be conflict in certain situations (and we are seeing this at present) between the rights of women, especially married women, to jobs and the rights of young people entering the labour market for the first time. There are other equally knotty areas of potential conflict, such as the one between the right to work and the rules of the labour unions or, put another way, between the need to create new jobs and the determination of the unions to preserve existing jobs at increased rates of pay.

Also, deep conflict exists between the right to work and the right to learn. In every country, including the United States of America, unemployment and over-employment co-exist. In other words, in many areas of the economy would-be workers outnumber the jobs available, but other sectors suffer from a perennial shortage of workers. This simply means, I guess, that there are some jobs, particularly manual jobs, that no-one wants to do. This, it would seem, is clearly a consequence of the prevalence of education (I suggest, especially higher education). In the industrial world, with higher education open to almost everyone, there is a universal rule that, once a person has achieved a certain educational level, he will consider some jobs to be beneath him, regardless of his economic circumstances. This means that many vacancies remain unfilled and that many potential workers prefer to remain unemployed.

What about the alternatives? There remains, as far as I can see, only one alternative (it is scarcely a cheerful one), namely, to adopt the practice followed in communist countries and withdraw the individual's freedom of choice—first, as to his own education, and subsequently as to his trade or profession. That is obviously not an acceptable solution in Australia today, and I hope that it is

not an acceptable solution in South Australia. I suggest that those who criticise Governments for the unemployment problem we have at present are only burying their head in the sand if they believe that any Government at this time can solve the unemployment problem altogether. I believe that incentives are needed, particularly in this State at present, to ensure job opportunities, so that the unemployment problem can at least be alleviated in certain areas. In all fairness, I believe that SURS, which was adopted by this Government, has helped temporarily, and I think that most people appreciate that.

In the few minutes left to me, I will refer to another matter that has been discussed in the House on a number of occasions, namely, problems affecting those who are forced to pay succession and death duties by the South Australian Government. A report in the *Stock Journal* of 14 September, under the heading "U.F.G. hits lack of Budget action on death duties", states:

The United Farmers and Graziers was "bitterly disappointed" the State Budget did not indicate any intentions to moderate or abolish succession duties. This was the comment yesterday from an executive officer of the U.F.G., Mr. Denys Slee, who added: "We realise that the State Government has budgetary problems, but it could have done as the other State Governments have done—make some adjustments this financial year and give a statement of intent that it is going to fall in line with the other States."

Tasmania announced on Tuesday its intention to abolish succession duties by 1980, which left South Australia as the only State which had not announced what it was going to do over the issue.

"We are left holding the baby," he added. Negotiations with the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, on the duties went back to May 1977. In recent months a three-man committee set up by Mr. Dunstan asked the U.F.G. to submit information concerning hardship from succession duties (which the U.F.G. put forward on 29 June).

"We have told the Premier, and the committee, that one of the major problems arising from inaction on succession duties is the removal of capital and expertise from this State to other States. While they continue to prevaricate, this will increase. The State just can't afford it."

Taking that a little further, I quote from a letter that was written recently to the Ombudsman by a constituent of mine. This matter of problems associated with succession and death duties has been in the minds of these people since the writer's husband died in 1976. The letter states:

I have been advised to write to you and ask your assistance with my problem. However, I find it difficult to write briefly about the matter and I would prefer to discuss this with you personally. My husband, a victim of leukaemia, passed away 24 March 1976 at 60 years of age, prior to the abolition of death duties between spouses which was passed in July 1976.

We have four children, three daughters now married, and our youngest, a son aged 21 years. We were married in 1946. I joined my husband in partnership with stock and plant a few years later. Our son was also taken into partnership with stock and plant at the age of 16 years, and seeing that our son wanted to make farming his career my husband was in the process of arranging to give him a portion of land when he reached the age of 18 years, but fate chose otherwise.

My husband left an estate valued at over \$200 000. The home property is the main asset of the estate; it was purchased at the end of 1943 at £45 (\$90) per acre and is now valued at over \$1 600 per acre.

Hobby farmers who moved into the hills on small properties, but derive their income from sources other than primary production, contributed to valuation being excessive. However, properties are no longer allowed to be subdivided into 20 to 30 acre lots. Although I contributed

equally to the partnership in most of the improvements, such as bore, dam, shed, home, etc., the property has always remained in my husband's name.

In mentioning this to the solicitor, he said it was most unfortunate that my husband didn't have the home property in partnership with me, and that the Commissioner of Succession Duties may require evidence of such expenditure. For the accountant to check back on all those years it would cost more than it was worth with inflation. As I am a keen gardener and take pride in the home and its surroundings, I did little to minimise the valuation and the only evidence I have are facts, not figures, and photos of what the place looked like 30 years ago and what it is today. We have had our good years, but have had to pay our taxes accordingly. My problem is this, it is one thing having to pay succession duties; but another iniquitous injustice if duty has to be paid on the combined effort of wife and family over a period of 30 years.

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

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I will refer to unemployment matters in a way similar to that in which the member for Murray has referred to them. What we must get across to all Australians is that they belong to a club, and the club is Australia.

Mr. Slater interjecting:

Mr. EVANS: As the honourable member lives here, he should recognise that he belongs to Australia, and we can refer to the country as a club. That club has been running at a deficit of between \$2 500 000 000 and \$5 000 000 000 for several years. The State branch of that club to which we belong, the South Australian branch, has been running at a deficit of \$26 000 000. Our local branches, councils, have also been saying that they are struggling to survive, that they need more money, and that they do not have enough money to supply the services that they believe people are demanding.

One of two things must be done: either our membership to the club, which is our taxation, should go up and we should pay more (an increase in the productivity of the country would tie in with that increased taxation), or we should decrease the number of demands on the three organisations to which I have referred—the Federal Government, the State Government and local government. Unless we do that we will never be able to balance the budget, no matter how we attack the problem.

Tied up in that must be a desire to decrease the inflation rate in our community, a decrease that has been achieved by the Fraser Government, whether or not we like it. We are now in a position in which we can trade more favourably with other countries than we could trade with them perhaps two years ago. If, for a time, we can cut down our wage demands and continual striving for better conditions until we can really compete on an overall basis with other countries, especially our near neighbours, we may get back on our feet and have a stable economy.

We all talk about youth unemployment. I think it was Frank Crean, the Australian Labor Party Federal member, who said, "One man's wage increase is another man's job." That is exactly what has happened. Young people are out of work because we cannot create job opportunities and because what we are trying to produce is too expensive or is inferior in quality.

Let us realise that everyone living in Australia should understand that he must front up to the problem. I am positive that people will have to accept a lower standard of living or work a lot harder. We cannot continue to demand the standard of living we have and expect our near neighbours, who are perhaps in some cases third world

nations (as we refer to them), to live at a much lower standard. We cannot go on expecting them to subsidise our high standard of living by buying products that are too expensive when they are produced in this country.

When we talk about equality, are we talking about equality in our country or world wide? Do we want a standard of living here where labourers and seamen are earning anything up to \$30 000 a year, which is more than our teachers, top public servants, lecturers, engineers, surveyors and people of that calibre are being paid? Is that the standard of living that we believe these third world countries must sustain for us? That is what this small country of 14 000 000 people is saying to the world. We are saying, "We want to live at the highest possible standard with as little effort as possible (in many cases) towards the work ethic." I believe that we should realise that that is what has happened.

Within our community many of those unemployed are not in a different position from what occurred when we thought we had full employment. I can give examples of this in my own district, and I do not denigrate the people concerned for it. They desire to work. An instance is where both the husband and wife are working and, in one case, two sons are working but a daughter is not. She is at home doing housework and seeks work.

Fifteen or 20 years ago one of the spouses, in all probability the wife (and I am not saying that should be the case), would have been home, and we could say she was unemployed, but there was no complaint at that time because then she was not classified as being unemployed. That is the sort of move we have had in our society. Now we have 200 000 married women in the work force that were not there in 1955. That is roughly equal to the number of females under the age of 20 now out of work.

I am not advocating that married women should move out of the work force, but what has happened is part of the problem. If we could conduct a proper survey and compare what the situation is now with the mid-1950's we would possibly find that as big a percentage of people is in the work force today as there was in 1955, but that there is a different group in the work force. Those who have suffered are the young.

Part of the problem is also fear. When the Labor Government brought on an inflationary trend that society could not keep up with by its savings, people became frightened and tried to save for the time when they could make real use of their money if there was a decrease in the inflation rate. In doing so, people who could afford to move out of the work force and perhaps live on one salary wondered what would happen if their partner got sick or maybe lost a job because of automation or an improvement in technology. In their own minds, they did not believe they could afford to give up their jobs, so they hung on to them where, in many cases, they did not need them for the purpose of living a reasonable life with a reasonable standard of living.

I was interested to read in the *News* of 22 September, under the headline "New home loan saves \$5 a week", that the Savings Bank of South Australia was offering different terms for people buying houses. I am not condemning that, but we need to be conscious, when talking about that matter, of what we are really saying. Sure, there is to be a decrease of about \$5 a week. Previously, for a housing loan over 20 years of \$20 000 at the normal rate of bank interest of 9% per cent, the old repayment was \$43.90 a week. Under the new proposal, extending the period of the loan to 30 years at the same interest rate of 9% per cent, the weekly repayments become \$39.70 a week. In the first example, the total repayment is \$45 656. The repayments in the second

example are \$61 932. People are now being asked to pay, for the extra 10-year period, an extra \$16 000.

The killer in that example is not the principal but the interest. That is the very thing that the Fraser Government is attacking by trying to decrease (and successfully achieving that objective) inflation. If we can get the interest rate down, we are really going to save young people a lot of money.

Where the loan is for \$25 000 for 20 years at 10 per cent, the weekly repayment is \$55.90 a week and the total repayments are \$58 136. Over a 30-year term, the weekly payment is \$50.70, and the total repayment is \$79 092. In that case, the person is paying about an extra \$20 000 for his house. I am not saying that the banks should not have taken this action. It will help in the initial weekly repayments but, in the end result, the Savings Bank is operating on the same basis as any other financial institution—making money out of interest. That is exactly the sort of thing for which this Government at times has attacked private enterprise.

I turn now to the Auditor-General's Report which, at page 438, states:

The South Australian Housing Trust Act provides that an investigation into the operations and administration of the trust is to be made every three years. The investigation due in 1977-78 was not made.

One must ask why that investigation was not made. The trust knows about that responsibility, and the Minister surely knows that that investigation should be carried out, and the report compiled and made available. Why was that not done? At page 432, the report states:

A general rent increase was approved by the Government effective from 29 October 1977 with increases ranging up to \$4 per week. The rentals of many houses are still low, some only \$19 per week even for "full income" families. Certain rentals are increased on reallocation following vacancies. During the year these "vacancy rents" were also increased and are substantially higher than the rents being paid by long-standing tenants for similar accommodation.

I want to know why, when we recognise through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement the necessity to increase loans as people's financial position and income improve, we do not make the people who are long-term tenants in these houses, and who have a stable full income, at least pay a rent somewhere near the market value. The Minister, in answer to a question, stated:

Trust rents are based on what is known as an economic rent calculation which allows for amortisation and repayment of principal and interest, maintenance costs, rates and taxes, insurance, etc. The trust, in line with other housing authorities throughout Australia, is endeavouring to adjust its rentals to a situation that they are market-related rents.

Surely the amount of rent it should be trying to get for those properties from people on a full income is the amount those properties would bring on the private market. If the trust charged those rents it would have more money with which to build houses for those who are disadvantaged and to whom rental accommodation is not available at the moment at a reasonable rent.

The Auditor-General is telling us, as Parliamentarians, and people in the community that the trust, in the case of long-standing tenants, is not charging market rents. I believe that it should charge market rents. If a new tenant moves into a Housing Trust home the rent is automatically increased. Surely the situation regarding market rent does not change because a new tenant moves into or out of rental accommodation. I believe the Minister should look at the matter, as he did when I made suggestions about this matter in another area.

Mr. Keneally: Old Stan made a suggestion.

Mr. EVANS: I will come back to that when I deal with the Land Commission. There is much worry in the building industry about the number of houses needed and the slump in the industry at the moment. State Government action has contributed substantially to the many houses built in 1975, 1976 and 1977. The Indicative Planning Council said that 12 500 houses was about the correct number of houses to be built in South Australia to meet demand, having regard to money, material and labour supply. The State Government encouraged excessive house building by saying to people that if they bought a block of land from the Land Commission they must build on it within two years. It encouraged that excessive building by getting the State Government Insurance Commission to supply bridging finance to encourage people to build before State Bank loans became available. It encouraged excessive building by allowing people to enter into deferred third mortgage payments, accruing interest until the end of the third mortgage. The Government did not say that it would not be able to meet all the obligations through the State Bank if this practice was continued.

The Minister is aware that I mentioned the problem confronting the industry if that continued. That year 15 000 houses were built. The Minister said today, in reply to a question:

In the long term, the Household Formation Working Party has estimated, based on demographic trends, that dwelling completions for the metropolitan area will fall gradually averaging about 7 300 in 1981-86 and about 6 300 in 1986-91.

Including building in country areas, the figure for 1981-86 could be 10 000. In other words, the Minister is telling us we can expect to build half as many homes in country areas during the 1980's as in the metropolitan area. I would like to know where they will be built, unless they are to be built at Redcliff or for use in conjunction with a uranium enrichment plant, or whatever it may be. He is saying that the building industry must not expect to build many more houses a year than it is presently building until 1990, unless there is a massive immigration intake.

The prediction for this year is that 9 200 houses will be built. On present indications, the number of homes required, when we catch up with the small back-log at the moment (and the Minister admits that it is difficult to forecast that figure), will not be many more than are being built at present. We need to be frank about this matter and not play politics about it, because that is the position the industry faces at the moment.

At the same time, there are persons in the community who are prepared to work to improve their accommodation. When I wrote to Samcor on 27 January this year and asked why it was demolishing a number of cottages, I received the following reply:

In response to the question on the Samcor cottages, we have at present 43 of these homes, of which 20 have tenants.

Of the remainder, 10 have been condemned by the local board of health and are being demolished as spare labour becomes available . . .

They went on to say how they were using the material. I looked at the homes, and it was possible to repair them. Samcor informed me in a subsequent letter on 14 August this year that it would have cost about \$20 000 to repair each cottage. I believe that estimate is much higher than it would cost to repair those cottages to make them liveable. I put to Samcor, in a letter I wrote to it that there were young people in the community who, if given an opportunity to rent the houses at a peppercorn rental for 10 years or so, would be prepared to renovate them. After that period Samcor could charge them some moderate rent. This would have saved that resource instead of

demolishing it. Those cottages were built of brick, and money has been wasted in knocking them down. The Housing Trust was asked to buy those cottages but the Minister, in reply to a Question on Notice, said the trust did not have the money to buy them, yet it regularly buys homes around Adelaide in the inner metropolitan area.

I refer now to the Government's intention to run, through the Lotteries Commission, instant lotteries. The Premier knows that they are going to be conducted, yet not one Government member has realised the adverse effect they will have on many voluntary organisations. The Multiple Sclerosis Society wrote to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport (in whose Ministerial area this matter falls), pointing out the serious effect such lotteries will have on that society. I hope that the Government will think twice about it. I oppose them on two grounds: first, they will destroy the opportunity for many voluntary organisations to raise money through instant lotteries, whether they be in the form of machines, with goods being taken from the store where they are installed, or whether they are in some other form. We should protect these groups. Secondly, it is so close to being a poker machine with a cash prize. It involves impulse action gambling, and people who have a weakness for that sort of operation and who may never have participated in it if such machines were not introduced, might find it impossible to stop until they run out of a dollar to fill the hungry animal. In this case it will be someone filling out an application and getting a ticket across a counter to see whether he has won a \$10 000 prize (the ticket will go into a hat to qualify for a \$50 000 prize later) or a \$1 000 prize. There is no difference in principle. The impulse method of gambling has a straight out cash return. The voluntary organisations do not have that. They usually have prizes of goods.

I now refer briefly to tourism. For some time I have advocated that we in this State should have full regionalisation of tourism. Others have supported me quite strongly. We need not kid ourselves that we have all the greatest attractions for tourism in this State, nor should the Government kid itself that, because there is a convention centre here, it will be first off the ground and that we will have the highest standard facilities.

Mr. Wran, the Premier of New South Wales, announced on 19 June that he was going ahead with a \$40 000 000 entertainment and convention centre at the Sydney Showground, so that New South Wales will enter that field as quickly as we will. Victoria will do the same. We are in a competitive market. Victoria raced us by setting up a tourist authority in Melbourne. A report in the *News*, dated 8 August this year, states:

The concept of private enterprise and Government working together to promote tourism has proved a spectacular success in just 12 months in Victoria.

That refers to the Melbourne Tourist Authority, which has 300-odd contributors from the private sector, with a budget of \$134 000 for the first year, and with 12 tourism regions that have a budget of \$25 000 a year each with government, local government and private enterprise contributing equally. Their tourism industry is off the ground, but we have a Government here that is not prepared to co-operate with private enterprise in trying to create job opportunities and tourist potential within our State, because it wants to knock private enterprise at every opportunity.

An example of that was the Beaut Tours that were announced by the Government. A magnificent pamphlet was produced. I congratulate Mr. Parks. It is well known that he came down from Macao after running the ferry boats there. This was all Government promotion; there

was no recognition of the private sector that had tours in the same direction, on the same routes in many cases, and had established the tourist market before the Government moved in. When the Minister was asked a question in the Upper House about it he had this to say:

I assure the honourable member that the Beaut Tours organisation, as depicted in the brochure, has been operating for many years. Two Beaut Tours are outlined in the brochure.

I point out to the honourable Minister that eight Beaut Tours are depicted in the brochure, not two, yet he said, "Don't worry about it. It is nothing new. It has been going on for years."

Dr. Eastick: Did he remember the bloke's name?

Mr. EVANS: He had trouble twice with Mr. Joselin's name. The first time was when he announced the Clare festival. He said, "I wish to refer to my Director, Geoff, what is your name." The Director said, "I am not commenting, Mr. Minister." Recently he called him "Jocelyn!"

Mr. Tonkin: Who is the Minister?

Mr. EVANS: I think it is the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport. I come back to the tours, and the Governments leasing of a ski lodge in the Falls Creek area in another State. Why is the Government so apt at kicking private enterprise, the area where most job opportunities are created? Why does it do that? Beaut Tours represents the only action that has been taken of any significance in the 12 months since Mr. Joselin has been Director. We had all this build up and promotion. I am not condemning Mr. Joselin. I believe he has the ability if the Government will give him the opportunities, even though he did say, in effect, that he did not care what happened to private enterprise: he said his job was to get people here, and he did not care how he did it.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: That is not quite what he was saying.

Mr. EVANS: That is exactly what he said. The Government has got him hamstrung. He has been there for 12 months; the only new thing that has come out is this new brochure on some old tours. What has been going on in tourism in this State? There has been nothing. Ten years ago the Premier said that we might have horses carting people around from Ayers House, as is done in Rome. When I asked him a question about it a fortnight ago he said he had never heard of it. Then he said we would have aeroplanes flying people around Kangaroo Island and the Southern Vales area, but later he said he had never heard about it. In other words, the 10-year plan he was talking about in 1970 in a document put out through his department has not come to fruition.

Mr. Tonkin: Other than Ayers House.

Mr. EVANS: I do not know whether that is very fruitful. We do not know how much rent the man is paying for Ayers House. We know that the Premier is spending large sums of the taxpayers' money there. Tourism has not really had a great boost in this State at all. I think it is fair to say that our record in tourism is the worst in Australia. When I used that term earlier and brought out some figures from an Australia-wide inquiry, the Premier said that the people who carried out the survey were considered by people in industry to have started at the wrong base, and that therefore their findings were wrong. At least they would have started from the same base in all States, and we were at the lower end of the ladder.

I believe that we have a problem with tourism in promoting our State, because we are not active enough and because the Government does not support private enterprise. It condemns regionalisation; it does not promote it. When it recognises that Victoria has won by

regionalisation, we in this State will win and gain at least our equal share of tourism from the Australian as well as the overseas market. Australia must be our main market. We cannot go much further, as we do not have an international airport. That must be the first thing if we want to attract many overseas people here. We get the second bite of the cherry when people land in other States.

Bills read a second time.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Chief Secretary) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for consideration of the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) and the Public Purposes Loan Bill.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Once again in this Parliament, we are about to play out what has effectively become a meaningless and scandalously irresponsible charade. Each year, the expenditure of all taxpayers' funds by the Government of the day is required to be authorised by Parliament. Each year the Executive Government of the State prepares and presents to Parliament a Budget of expenditure which it believes is necessary for the continued management of South Australia, and the maintenance of Government services. Each year, supporting documents are presented to Parliament with as much (or as little) information and explanation as the Treasurer may care to give.

The Auditor-General's Report on the previous year's expenditure is a most valuable guide to members, but of necessity its value is limited by the time available for Parliament's consideration of the Budget in its present form. Questioning in Committee frequently produces little more than a prepared answer from the Treasurer and Ministers, who either believe they should give away as little information as possible, regardless of their responsibilities to Parliament and the people, or are just not aware of the details asked for.

The Committee stages indeed can be a tedious farce—tedious because adequate answers are so often not forthcoming, and a farce because, as every member of this House knows, any amendment by the Opposition, no matter how constructively intended, will not pass. The Budget is fixed, and settled, and effectively out of the hands of Parliament.

Each year, therefore, the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money (\$1.27 billion this year) is approved by the members of this House after what can only be called, despite their best efforts, a ridiculously brief, remarkably uninformed, and ineffectual examination of the Budget. I emphasise that this is not the members' fault. That examination is about to occur again, and there is every indication to suggest that the present Government is only too pleased to have this state of affairs continue and to have Parliament interfere with its handling of taxpayers' money as little as possible. Indeed, the Government's attitude demonstrates a scandalous disregard for the basic principle of accountability to the people, and a burning desire to push the Budget through Parliament with as little detailed public examination as possible.

The present system has been satisfactory for a Government which is conscious of its responsibility to account to Parliament, and therefore to the people, for the expenditure of taxpayers' money. A Government determined to spend that money wisely, to obtain the best possible value for the taxpayers' dollar, will welcome close examination of its proposed Budget, and will support Parliamentary examination of its administration. It is in the best interests of the people and of the Government itself that areas of waste or extravagance in any Government are identified as quickly as possible and

rectified.

But this is not the record of the present State Government, which has increasingly earned for itself a reputation for secrecy and suppression of information, whenever there is any suggestion of wasteful, extravagant, or unnecessary spending. Even when inquiries are grudgingly announced, the strong impression given is always that it is a move to cover up or confuse the situation, and there is always a marked reluctance to make the findings public. This is a most unfortunate and grossly irresponsible attitude on the part of the Government, and demonstrates clearly its contempt for the people.

About a year ago I spoke of the deficiencies in the existing system of Parliamentary examination of the Executive Government's administration, and I was pleased to learn, from the Auditor-General's Report, and from brief comments in the Treasurer's Statement, that a final report on Government accounting and South Australian Budget papers had been prepared and was being evaluated. There has been a growing dissatisfaction with present methods of Government budgeting, and there has been a good deal of research done both here and in other States and countries on alternative methods, notably on rolling budgets, and programme and performance budgeting.

The Opposition is concerned that current practices do not adequately relate Government expenditures to the objectives of Government programmes; do not provide departments with any incentive to undertake their activities economically; and do not indicate the implications for future years of present levels of expenditure. Of all these points, the last is the most important in the long term. Governments are increasingly finding that the introduction of expensive programmes, sometimes for purely political or ideological reasons, foreclose their options for the future.

The Government may become locked into a situation where it is committed to expenditure which could well be directed into other new avenues, with changing conditions and priorities. Under these circumstances, the money which could become necessary for newer projects of a high priority may not be available. This is one of the factors which can lead to the ossification of a Government's programme, as we have seen happening in South Australia. The continued accrual of interest on failed projects such as Monarto also seriously cramps options for the future, as further borrowings are committed to service the increasing debt. I have mentioned the State superannuation scheme, which is causing great concern at present in much the same way. The Government's commitment to the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, at the expense of incentives or concessions to private industry, to help create more real jobs, has been an ideological decision which may well have disastrous effects on South Australia's long-term recovery.

The present process of line-item budgeting involves the examination of proposed expenditures compared with the previous year's actual outlays, and determining a percentage change. In the present economic climate, when we look to constrain expenditure, the tendency then is to reduce expenditure across the board by a percentage, rather than determine whether some programmes should be eliminated entirely, and others reduced or increased.

There are other deficiencies in the line budgeting system: the use of the previous year's expenditure as a base leads to Government departments fully spending their allocations so that the base for the next year is as high as possible, and wastage, inefficiency, and a lack of budgetary constraint can result; there are no requirements to look at or consider the long-term effects of

expenditures, so that the existence of a line in one year may be the only justification for its continued appearance in subsequent years; far more attention is paid to inputs of programmes and departments (e.g. wages and salaries, printing and stationery, etc.) than to the outputs of those departments (e.g. cost of service per head of population, or per patient, etc.).

There is no incentive in this system for the development or encouragement of managerial discretion, or personal initiative by public servants. Incidentally, an interchange programme for managerial staff between the Public Service departments and the private sector could provide a valuable insight into the other's sphere for the members of each group. Such a scheme should be seriously considered.

One of the most widely accepted solutions to these problems is provided by programme and performance budgeting, and this system has a great deal to offer South Australia in terms of getting the best value for the taxpayers' money. Programme and performance budgeting involves examination of entire programmes and their relevance to Government objectives, rather than individual lines of expenditure; review of programmes to determine if they should be maintained at all and, if so, at what level; review of the performance of both the programmes and their managers; assessment of the future impact of current expenditures (i.e. through rolling three- or five-year programmes).

In other words, programme and performance budgeting requires departments to justify their proposed expenditures, not on the basis of last year's spending, but in terms of their contribution to the achievement of Government objectives, their efficiency, and their long-term as well as short-term impact. It also requires that Government objectives be clearly stated, and this in turn requires an honest and clear statement of political direction, something which the people of this State have rarely enjoyed from the present Government, for example, on its industrial democracy programme, and its increasing take-over of the private sector as we have seen today with the opening of the Government Clothing Factory.

The more efficient provision of services and the implementation of programmes under a system of performance and programme budgeting will also involve a comparison of the relative cost/benefit advantages of utilising the private or the public sector in any particular project. The numbers employed in the public sector have grown rapidly in the last few years, and now represent almost 34 per cent of the work force, but there is considerable doubt as to whether efficiency in Government departments has increased proportionately.

While any change in budgetary procedure must be attended with great care, the present situation is rapidly becoming critical, and a start should be made on evaluating programme and performance budgeting by introducing it in one or two small departments, and this should be done as soon as possible. A task force should be set up by Treasury and the Public Service Board to supervise that trial, and I am pleased to see that such action is proposed by the Government. The aim of the exercise should be not only to evaluate the procedure but also to develop expertise and provide experience in programme and performance budgeting, and to assess the change in approach of the departments involved.

At the same time, the Auditor-General should be encouraged to look for evidence of areas in which departments have spent money simply for the sake of fully using their allocation. Appropriate changes should be made to the current procedures to ensure that departments are not penalised if they end the year with a surplus (in other words, if they do not spend their full

allocation).

I have dealt with programme and performance budgeting in some detail, because the Opposition believes it holds very great advantages for the people of South Australia. But I wish to make it absolutely clear that, with the introduction of such a system, the Opposition will not in any way condone a lower level of Parliamentary scrutiny of the Government's Budget or of its administration.

The present system of controls is designed to ensure that Parliament exercises its proper responsibility to the people by examining the Government's proposals for spending their money. The present system is unsatisfactory but a better system such as the one proposed, providing increased flexibility within departments will make it even more important that Parliament is fully informed of the Government's goals and its proposals for achieving them in adequate detail.

Together with the introduction of a system of programme and performance budgeting, changes are now proposed to the method of examining the Budget and to the controls properly exerted by Parliament on Government expenditure. These proposals which the Opposition now puts forward will include: Budget and Estimates Committees to examine the Budget in detail; the Public Works Committee to have ongoing powers of supervision until a project is completed; the Public Accounts Committee to be under the chairmanship, perhaps, of the Auditor-General (certainly an independent person) and to conduct its hearings in public; new legislation to be accompanied by a cost-benefit statement when introduced to Parliament; consideration of "sunset" legislation to require the periodic review by Parliament, or a Parliamentary committee, of certain Government programmes before their continuation is approved.

In more detail, the proposals are as follows:

Budget and Estimates Committees: The committee consideration of the Budget and Loan Estimates should be extended for a period of three weeks, or longer, and be divided between three Budget and Estimates committees each of, say, nine members and set up for that specific purpose. Each committee would examine a specified area of Ministerial responsibility, following the same procedure as that adopted by Select Committees, and would report back to the Parliament when its inquiries were complete, so that its findings could be debated. Not only Ministers but also departmental heads and officers should be required to attend and answer queries directed by members, as is done, for example, in the Senate Committees on the Federal Budget.

The proceedings of the committees would be open and form part of the records of the House and a senior officer of the Auditor-General's Department would be available to assist each committee. Consideration of the Budget and Loan Estimates in this way would not only provide members with a far greater understanding of the needs and aims of each department but also would encourage a high level of efficiency and accountability in those departments.

Public Works Standing Committee: This committee should be given additional powers to maintain a watch over projects in the course of construction and to consider proposed variations from the approved plan. This is one of the major problems associated with the Public Works Standing Committee at present. Once approval for a specific project has been given, the committee has no power of continuing supervision, and almost anything can happen. When a project has been completed, it is too late to discover costly and extravagant variations and extensions to the original plan, because the taxpayers' money has already been spent. This also is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs, as we have learnt most

recently with the Frozen Food Factory, and it cannot be allowed to continue.

The committee should require a certificate on the completion of each project to confirm that the work was carried out according to the specifications approved by the committee. A statement should be prepared as part of the Auditor-General's Report each year setting out the cost of completed works as compared with the authorised expenditure and giving reasons for any marked variation from this level—a variation, for example, of 5 per cent or more.

Public Accounts Committee: The setting up of the Public Accounts Committee was a most welcome step, but subsequent events have revealed all too clearly the deficiencies which presently hamper its effectiveness. Basically, this committee examines expenditure after it occurs and, in some cases, well after waste and extravagance have become manifest. Again, the particular instance of the Frozen Food Factory, and of catering in hospitals generally, has led to a long and protracted hearing by the Public Accounts Committee, long after the wasteful and extravagant spending has occurred.

The Public Accounts Committee should be reconstituted and strengthened and given additional clerical and research support. It should comprise six members, three from each side of the House, with an independent Chairman, and this could well be the Auditor-General as an officer of Parliament. This would ensure that the committee met regularly and followed a disciplined programme of work. Also, the clerical, research and investigative facilities of the Auditor-General's Department would be available to the committee in this way. Hearings of the Public Accounts Committee should be held in public, subject to the right to meet in camera where necessary and to the accepted restrictions presently applying to the reporting of proceedings in the courts.

The Commonwealth Public Accounts Committee has a wide charter, and inquires into over-spending and under-spending by departments and end-of-year spending for the sake of using up allocations. It examines all aspects of departmental finance administration, including matters referred to in the Auditor-General's Report and expenditure results of departments.

Control of expenditure by departments after the Budget is passed is thus always subject to scrutiny. Parliament should know what tasks the Government is trying to perform; how much each of them is costing; and how well the tasks are being performed. This is the same principle that should also apply to capital works and the Public Works Standing Committee.

Cost-benefit statements: The principle is self-explanatory, and, although it may not be easy to give exact figures in each case, the provision of a "cost-benefit statement" or feasibility study with new legislation should be equally as important as the provision of an environmental impact statement with a new industrial project. It is not so much how much money is spent which is important but how well that money is spent. That theme was developed by a previous Auditor-General, Mr. George Jeffery, on many occasions, and it is a principle which all too often has been lost sight of by this Government.

Sunset Legislation: First introduced in Colorado, this form of legislation has the effect of limiting the life of certain Government statutory bodies, requiring that they undergo periodic review (say, every six years) by Parliament or a Parliamentary committee. The review, which includes the hearing of public submissions, is held well before the expiry date, and the programme is continued only if the performance of that body can be justified to Parliament.

Obviously, bodies such as E.T.S.A. would not be subject to such provisions, but bodies such as the Builders Licensing Board, the Monarto Development Commission, which is a classic example, and the Land Commission could well be the subject of sunset legislation. It is certainly a subject which has been enthusiastically received overseas. It is legislation which is being introduced in many State Legislatures in the United States and which is being examined most carefully in other countries. I believe it should be carefully studied here to make sure that statutory bodies do not continue in existence simply because they have been in existence for so many years in the past.

These reforms to the process of examining the Executive Government's spending, together with the controls involved, would provide Parliament with the means to carry out its responsibilities to the people far more effectively and ensure far greater efficiency and value for the taxpayers' dollar. I have dealt in detail with the Parliamentary process of examining Government expenditure, with alternative budgeting procedures, and with other measures designed to get maximum value for the taxpayers' dollar. This has been done deliberately, in answer to the inevitable question when tax cuts or freezes or incentives are proposed, "Where is the money coming from?"

Programme and performance budgeting will lead to a far greater efficiency, in my view, in the provision of services in the public sector, and will thus lead to positive savings. Contrary to the implications of the oft-repeated question asked in strident defence by Government members (and we hear that frequently), "What services will you cut?", no services need be cut and no nurses or teachers need be sacked to achieve efficiency. Numbers in the public sector can be effectively controlled simply by normal attrition, and this would undoubtedly be the case with programme and performance budgeting.

At the same time, I believe that the Public Service should be restored as a career service, and appointments to senior positions should be made, wherever possible, from within the service. The large number of appointments made from outside the service recently has been enormously demoralising for many public servants, and certainly has not provided any added incentive for efficiency.

Mr. Goldsworthy: They tell me they have got Uren's staff over here *in toto*.

Mr. TONKIN: Indeed, I believe that almost the entire inner staff of his department, the Urban and Regional Affairs Department, that key department in trying to impose centralism and Canberra control on the people of Australia during the Whitlam regime, is now employed by and brought together again in a South Australian Government department. How can one expect public servants, who have made their lives in the Public Service in South Australia and who have given their best efforts, to maintain their morale in the presence of appointments such as those?

In my Budget speech, I outlined clearly that the Government can take some positive measures to restore and stimulate the private sector in this State. By so doing, it could enormously open up the opportunities which are there for South Australia. The positive incentives have been listed. I believe that they are well worth following, and I once again urge the State Government to examine them and to adopt them, to forget its petty and narrow Party political attitudes and to do the best it can to restore South Australia's prosperity. Before anything else can be done in South Australia, the Government must learn to control its spending, keeping it within the limits of money

available. I have outlined the basic measures I believe to be necessary to achieve the required controls and, therefore, desirable savings in Government administration.

I believe that these savings could well provide the key to South Australia's future. The strategy I have already outlined in the Budget debate depends totally on the availability of funds to provide the necessary stimulus to the private sector. Without the savings resulting from these measures, it will be impossible to provide positive incentives to stimulate economic recovery. With the necessary stimulus, the future for South Australia can be enormous, and I believe that we can achieve this future. However, the whole situation will depend on the amount of active support the State Government is prepared to provide for this purpose; initially, that means restraint, and control of expenditure.

The controls which I believe are vitally necessary to achieve this restraint and saving have now been suggested. The Opposition has given much time to looking at ways and means of ensuring that Parliament can exercise its proper function of keeping control of the Executive Government's expenditure, because the Executive Government is responsible to Parliament and, through Parliament, to the people. Executive Government must never forget that the money it spends is the taxpayers' money, and belongs to the people.

The necessary controls have now been suggested. It will be interesting to see whether the Government will adopt any or all of them. The State Government has the brakes firmly applied on South Australia's future development, and jobs and personal prosperity are all affected by its negative policies. If the Government will not take off the brakes, the people will have no option but to remove the driver from the wheel. South Australia has an exciting future ahead of it if we are allowed to achieve it. It is also too good and too important a place to let run down into second-rate mediocrity simply because of inadequate Government administration and lack of Parliamentary control.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I will refer to two matters, one of which I have alluded to previously in a grievance debate, namely, the service we get in answer to queries when Ministers and others say that they will obtain reports for us. I last took up this matter with the Minister of Education in a grievance debate and, after much time, I obtained a report from him. My latest complaint is in connection with the Premier's Department. I go into the Premier's office in the House from time to time, and there is a group of hangers-on there, whose titles I do not know. I went there last week to find out how an inquiry was going. Some character came out of the inner sanctum with what looked like a whisky and soda, and looked at me as though I had no right to be there, while I made my query known. I do not know what their functions are in the Premier's office here when the House is in session.

Mr. Chapman: It has been reported that he has 268 of them.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know. Some of them have a job to do, but I was not impressed by this character. I do not know who or what he was, but he was obviously having a drink at public expense, and looked at me as though I had no right to be there.

Mr. Chapman: Describe him more precisely.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He was a nondescript character. I assumed that he was on the Premier's staff. He looked as though he owned the place. My latest complaint is in connection with a question I asked the Premier in the House relating to the equalisation factors for land tax. It

was the first question I asked this session. The Premier said in his superior lawyer style that I did not know what I was saying, but that he would get a report to help me. The report has not seen the light of day. I will refresh the memory of anyone in the Premier's Department who may happen to read this debate. I should have thought that someone would be detailed to examine Parliamentary questions, out of the multitude of bods the Premier has on his staff, including the people who hang around his office here (and I would not like to reflect on all of them). If one of them was deputed to ascertain information for members, who represent people in the State, and to follow up the question, we might get some of the information we seek.

If perchance someone happens to read what I am saying now, I will quote the question I asked the Premier when the House resumed. As reported at page 17 of *Hansard* for 13 July, I asked:

Will the Premier investigate the obvious inequity in equalisation factors operating in relation to land tax charges? I detailed some examples of the inequities. The Premier said:

I will get a full report for the honourable member. I think, from what he said in his explanation, that he does not understand how the equalisation factors work. From the Premier's reply it was perfectly clear to me that he did not have a clue himself. He concluded by saying:

I will get a full report from the Valuer-General for the honourable member to assist him.

That was on 13 July, the first question I asked.

Mr. Chapman: You're not saying that you're still waiting for a reply?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, I have heard no more.

Mrs. Adamson: I'm waiting for a reply to a question I asked in December last year.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable gentleman should address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have made my point about these innumerable bods who now operate in the Premier's Department and about those who hang around his office down here when the House sits. I hope that someone is detailed to consider members' genuine questions and at least see that undertakings made by the Premier or the Ministers are followed up.

Dr. Eastick: You mean all questions, because they are all genuine, aren't they?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Questions asked by members on this side are genuine. I wanted to know what were the inequities of the equalisation system. The Premier promised me a full report. I have been less than satisfied many times, when I have telephoned the Premier's Department, about the sort of attitude of some of the younger officers with whom the Premier likes to surround himself.

The other matter I wish to mention relates to a topic on which I have made some public statements in relation to the dearth of work in the private sector in South Australia and the effect Government policy is having on private enterprise in this State. I made a statement that was reported publicly recently in relation to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. It is perfectly obvious from the Auditor-General's Report that that department is understaffed and that there is insufficient work for its workshops. The Auditor-General states that work has been found for most of these workshops from other Government departments, and that the department is doing work that would normally be let out by tender to private contract. Not enough work can be found for the Ottoway workshops. The Government had to make a payment of \$450 000 to those workshops to pay its

employees, even though the Government does not have enough work for them.

The Deputy Premier saw fit to reply a few days later to what I had said. In his reply he gave a misleading impression. The stock phrase that is churned out now is that Mr. Goldsworthy is deliberately being mischievous and is trying to mislead the public. That expression will not wash because, despite what the Deputy Premier says, if we consider the Auditor-General's Report, there has been no diminution in the number of people employed by the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

The report states that the department is trying by natural attrition to reduce the size of the department. However, nothing has happened since 1974. The number of employees in the department this year may be one more or one less than last year, but the number is more than 7 000 employees. In 1974 fewer people were employed by the department. The Deputy Premier is misleading the public by stating that the department is trying to reduce its numbers. I made clear that the Liberal Party would not sack people. You can, by attrition, by not filling vacancies created by resignations and retirements, reduce the work force, just as the Federal Government has done quite successfully in Canberra. I wish that the Government, and in this case the Deputy Premier, would stick to the facts when replying to questions we ask.

The latest Bureau of Statistics figures available to me indicate just how badly the private sector in South Australia is suffering in relation to building contracts. Projects in this category include roadworks, bridges, aerodromes, dams, weirs, railways, hydraulic reticulation, oil and gas production and distribution facilities, electricity generation and transmission, telecommunications, marine work, heavy industrial facilities and the like.

The statistics indicated that, of the number and value of the projects commenced for all States between 1 April 1977 and 31 March 1978 amounting to \$100 000 or more in each case, the value of these projects in South Australia is 2.5 per cent of the national total of the projects undertaken by the private sector when, in fact, we have more than 9 per cent of the Australian population. The number of projects completed during the same period amounts to 3 per cent, and the number and value of projects under construction in all States in the same period amounts to 2.3 per cent.

The document concludes that, in this field of construction operations, South Australia appears to lag well behind the other States on a pro rata basis. The extent of work carried out by the work force of Government departments in this State is not known, but, from the statistics shown, South Australia does not appear to fair very well as far as work carried out by private enterprise is concerned. The figures and the conclusion bear out what I have been saying for some time in this House. I wanted to amplify that matter further, but time precludes me from doing so.

Mr. WILSON: (Torrens): A few weeks ago the Deputy Leader of the Opposition brought to the attention of this House the question of the ingestion of the so-called "magic mushroom" by groups of teenagers. He went so far as to introduce a private member's Bill seeking to alter the law of trespass in order to prevent people straying on to private property for the purpose of collecting these fungi.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member will not reflect on decisions of the House in relation to a Bill before the Chamber.

Mr. WILSON: I will not, Sir. I wish to take the opportunity to warn teenagers and parents against this hazardous activity. I am indebted for much of my

information to Dr. Ron Southcott, whose work on Australian poisonous plants is well known. As well, I have received valuable assistance from Mr. Don Francis of the staff of the Botanic Garden, and also from the Health Commission through the Central Board of Health.

The word "berserk" comes down to us from a group of wild Scandinavians called "Berserkers" who worked themselves up into a wild frenzy after ingestion of the amarita species of mushroom. This species is world wide and occurs in South Australia. This is much the same as the work "hashish", which derives from the sect of the "Assasins", a murderous band which roamed the Middle East at the time of the Crusades. The so-called "magic mushroom" is not of the amarita species, but is one of the psilocybe species. This contains as its active ingredient psilocybin, which is an hallucinogen, the possession of which is an offence under the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act of this State.

One of the more hopeful signs of the present drug culture has been the rejection by those involved of artificially prepared drugs such as L.S.D. People in the drug scene have decided that such drugs are far too dangerous to use and, almost by consensus, have decided against their use. Nevertheless, there are now signs that a "fashion" may be emerging whereby people, and young people in particular, are using extracts from these mushrooms to initiate so-called "highs".

I am not suggesting that this is yet a major problem—it is not. In fact, it may well be said that the taking of large quantities of certain proprietary cough mixtures by schoolchildren, under peer group pressure, is even more of a problem.

Dr. Eastick: And petrol sniffing.

Mr. WILSON: Yes, and glue sniffing. Nevertheless, it is a potential problem that should be treated seriously. Psilocybin itself is an hallucinogen which is related in its effect to L.S.D., and mescaline, the latter, of course being derived from the notorious peyote cactus of Northern Mexico. Although not as potent as L.S.D., nevertheless the effects are similar and the wellknown psychedelic mood changes occur. In describing the psychedelic state, I refer to the fourth edition of the *Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics*, by Goodman and Gillman, as follows:

The feature that distinguishes the psychedelic agents from other classes of drugs is their capacity reliably to induce or compel states of altered perception, thought, and feeling that are not (or cannot be) experienced except in dreams or at times of religious exaltation. Most descriptions of the "psychedelic state" include several major effects. There is heightened awareness of sensory input, often accompanied by an enhanced sense of clarity, but a diminished control over what is experienced.

Frequently there is a feeling that one part of the self seems to be a passive observer, rather than an active organising and directing force, while another part of the self participates and receives the vivid and unusual sensory experiences. The environment may be perceived as novel, often beautiful, and harmonious.

The attention of the user is turned inward, pre-empted by the seeming clarity and portentous quality of his own thinking processes. In this state the slightest sensation may take on profound meaning. Indeed, "meaningfulness" seems more important than what is meant, and the "sense of truth" more significant than what is true. Commonly, there is a diminished capacity to differentiate the boundaries of one object from another and of the self from the environment. Associated with the loss of boundaries there may be a sense of union with "mankind" or the "cosmos". To the extent that these drugs reveal this innate capacity of the mind to see more than it can tell and to experience and believe more than

it can explain, the term "mind expanding" is not entirely inappropriate."

Members will realise from that description that these drugs are completely undesirable, if not dangerous, particularly for people of driving age. Leaving aside all unsubstantiated claims that psilocybin and related drugs cause brain damage and other serious side effects, the young people of this State would be well advised to let well alone.

As I mentioned before, the other type of mushroom or toadstool which is used to induce mood changes is the *amarita* species. For obvious reasons, I do not intend to describe the colour, form or habitat of these fungi, just as I did not name the particular cough mixture which is in fashion at the moment for abuse by schoolchildren. Undoubtedly, however, this information is available to those who wish to sample these dangerous products. The *amarita* species contains as one of its alkaloids or active ingredients the drug muscarine, or similar acting compounds. Muscarine-like drugs have a significant effect on the central nervous system of the body.

Pilocarpine is a related substance of muscarine and is a drug that would have been used extensively by the Leader in his professional practice. Some of the symptoms that follow the ingestion of muscarine are increased lachrymation and salivation, sweating, severe abdominal pain, diarrhoea, vertigo, confusion, coma, and, if a large amount has been taken, in extreme cases death may result. The specific antidote for this type of mushroom poisoning is atropine, in itself a very powerful and toxic substance.

Regarding atropine, in my discussions with Dr. Southcott, he pointed out another potential danger. There is a common garden plant which contains a similar compound, hyoscine or scopolamine, as it is sometimes called. This used to be known as the truth drug and it is sometimes used in medicine for the treatment of motion sickness. These compounds come under the name of the belladonna alkaloids, and members will realise that these are very toxic substances indeed. "Deadly nightshade" refers to plants containing these alkaloids, and such plants were much in vogue in detective fiction. Parents should be aware that some young people are experimenting with this plant and they should be aware of the dangers inherent in its use. Once again, I do not name it but no doubt, once again, those who really wish to use it already know how to find it or grow it.

It will be a great pity if people continue to experiment with any of these fungi or plants without being aware of the dangers involved. The drugs involved are of a type that can be useful to medical science, provided that they are given under proper supervision. They should not be used for any other purpose, for if such a cult grows to large proportions then, eventually, tragedies will occur.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): Earlier this year the Federal Minister for Science (Senator Webster) said he would make money available for research into the millipede problem if the State Government would meet part of the cost. The State Minister made press statements that he would co-operate with the Federal Minister in the project. Senator Messner had raised the subject in the Federal Parliament and the C.S.I.R.O. was interested in proceeding with the project. At that time the State Minister said to me that the only person who had a lot of knowledge about millipedes was Dr. Baker and that if he had an opportunity to get a job in another area the Minister was to be informed so that he could make sure Dr. Baker was retained. I subsequently received a letter from Dr. Baker, as follows:

Since I have heard nothing further concerning future research on the millipedes, I assume that employment on the

topic is still some way off. I have accepted the post-doctoral fellowship in Dublin that I mentioned to you earlier and leave for there on 17 September.

I contacted the Minister's office the Thursday before last and a staff member said that he would communicate with the Minister to find out whether I could make an appointment with the Minister for the following Monday in company with Senator Messner. I said that all we needed was a quarter of an hour with the Minister to discuss the situation because Dr. Baker was the most important man in the area of research that had to be carried out in relation to millipedes.

I received a phone call from the Minister's office saying that it was impossible for him to see me for the whole of that week. I said Senator Messner would not be available after Monday but that I did not care when I saw him, whether it was at night or during the day. The Minister of Agriculture told his staff to tell me that he could not meet me for a quarter of an hour for the whole of that week. No other Minister has ever taken that approach when I have asked for a meeting of short duration to discuss a problem that I believed was of common interest to him, the Federal Government, and to many people in the community. Dr. Baker has done much research in the field of millipedes. He has now gone to Dublin, placing in jeopardy the opportunity of finding some long-term solution to the millipede problem.

Some members may think this is a trivial matter, but as millipedes spread further and further more people will see what a serious problem the Government is creating by not allowing this research to be carried out. I hope the Minister presently sitting on the front bench will realise the seriousness of a Minister's saying that he could not give me a quarter of an hour of his time while Parliament was sitting to discuss an important matter that has been the subject of communication between the member, the Minister and a deputation. I got the cold shoulder from a Minister who I would have hoped would know better, at least in public relations.

On 3 February this year, the Secretary of the United Pest Control Association of South Australia Incorporated wrote to Dr. Baker pointing out a problem that he saw in an article. He said:

On Sunday 29 January 1978 an article appeared in the *Sunday Mail*, page 31, concerning the pest control industry. It dealt particularly with persons within the industry who are soliciting work at the back doors of prospective customers. It is alleged that these particular persons are not licensed. The article was not specific whether it referred to a restricted builder's licence, required for repair work, or a licence under the Health Act, which regulations were promulgated late in 1977.

The letter went on to explain to Dr. Baker that that article could have reflected on the whole association. The letter included the name of the firm involved, but I do not wish to name it here. The association wrote to the Attorney-General on 17 March, as follows:

We bring to your attention a matter of particular concern to this industry, and in particular to the members of this association who over a period of years have endeavoured to establish and maintain a code of practice and ethics which will protect the consumer. We particularly refer to a company, not a member of this association, trading under the name of . . .

It is alleged that on 7 March 1978 a representative from that company made an inspection of premises at 33 Carolyn Avenue, Morphett Vale, and reported the existence of borers in the timber of the residence at that address. A quotation, copy attached, states that these borers can be eradicated for a sum of \$260. Since that date two other

companies who are members of this association have made separate inspections and both report that there are no live borers in the timber. There certainly is evidence of borers having once been active but these borers have been dead for some time, probably prior to the residence having been constructed.

We believe that this matter should be brought to the attention of the public—not in the manner as was recently done in the *Sunday Mail* of 29 January in which the whole industry was condemned, but in such a way that the matter can be investigated and the name of the offending company made public. The association understands that the Government frowns upon this unsavoury method of business.

The association can take certain action against its members, should they be involved in similar unethical behaviour, which could include expulsion from the association. Unfortunately, the association is unable to take any action against non-members. In this we earnestly seek your support. A delegation of, say, two or three members would very much like to wait upon you and discuss the matter with you.

Subsequently, the Attorney-General wrote to the association on 23 March, as follows:

I acknowledge your letter of 17 March 1978 concerning the activities of . . . I am referring the matter to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs for further inquiry. Thank you for bringing the matter to my attention.

On 24 May the association wrote to the honourable Attorney-General saying:

I refer to your letter of 23 March 1978 concerning the activities of . . . The matter was first raised in my original letter to you dated 17 March 1978. We note that you referred the matter to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs. The association hopes that, when inquiries have been completed, some communication might be received from your office.

On 21 July Mr. Allen again wrote to the Attorney-General, as follows:

We refer to previous correspondence between this association and your office concerning certain alleged activities of . . . The matter was first referred to you in our letter of 17 March 1978. Your reply of 23 March advised that you were referring the matter to the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs for further inquiry.

We believe that the original matter was serious, and that the alleged activities constituted a threat to the good name of this industry. The members of this association would appreciate some advice from you of the results of the inquiry conducted by your department. This matter was again brought to your attention in our letter dated 24 May 1978.

That association, trying to act in accordance with certain standards that the Government says it believes in, asked the Attorney-General to investigate this matter through the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs. Still nothing has happened after all that correspondence. How genuine is the Attorney-General?

The company is in the Broadview area, but why does the Attorney-General not help an association that is trying to organise its members and to encourage membership? There must be a reason not known to this House, to me or to the association. I hope that the Attorney-General brings back a report to this Parliament about the letters and inquiries he has made.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I want to say a word or two about electricity charges in this State, a matter which I mentioned in the House last week. As members will know, in 1971 when the Premier brought in a similar Bill, he said that the Electricity Trust did not pay income tax, and he believed that it was only right and proper that he should make the trust pay into the Treasury 3 per cent of its gross

sales, not its profit. That part year it paid \$268 000. In the next full year it paid \$2 080 000. In 1973 the Premier brought in the Bill to raise the levy from 3 per cent to 5 per cent, and said that in that year it had to contribute \$2 200 000; in 1974 it was nearly \$4 000 000; and, in 1977, nearly \$7 000 000 would be paid by the Electricity Trust into the Treasury.

According to the report of the Auditor-General, the amount paid last financial year was \$8 000 941 into Treasury funds. Since 1974 there has been an increase in the electricity charges of 55.5 per cent. The total sum that the Electricity Trust has had to find above its working expenses has been \$33 994 342. I asked the Premier a few months ago whether he would consider indexing the charge paid by the trust into the Treasury. His reply to me was, "Which item in your electorate would you like me to cut out?" We have had very little consideration in Rocky River by the Premier, despite the fact that the Premier came in there electioneering with Mr. Connelly early in 1977.

Mr. Mathwin: Was that before he was an Independent?

Mr. VENNING: That was after he ceased being an Independent and went back into the A.L.P.

Mr. Mathwin: When they took him back into the fold.

Mr. VENNING: Yes. I wonder whether that had any effect on the situation as far as the Premier and Rocky River were concerned. But it concerns me, as the member, to find that the people in that area are contributing through their electricity charges so much money into the Treasury, and we are getting very little back, whether it be for pre-school kindergartens, or even a rainwater tank for the primary school at Gladstone. It is impossible to get the message through to the Government departments that these are the requirements in those areas. Over the weekend one heard the Premier announce the spending of about \$12 000 000, and possibly it will be \$47 000 000 in the long term, to develop a complex at the showgrounds.

And so it goes on all the time, with large sums of money being spent. It would not be so bad if they were spent where required, but we have seen the waste on Monarto and in other areas. We have only to look at our road systems to see where it is necessary to spend money.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. VENNING: The ability of the Government to handle finance and administration is hopeless.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You'd be a great expert.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VENNING: I should like the Minister to say what will be the cost of the new power station at Port Augusta. We believe the Minister has announced increased electricity charges from 1 October so that some of the money can go towards the new power station. What will be the cost of that station? The trust made a profit last year of more than \$6 000 000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The total all-up cost is \$400 000 000, similar to the development of Leigh Creek.

Mr. VENNING: I see. How often will we have to increase electricity charges to cover that installation? In the past four years, electricity charges have increased by 55 per cent.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Over that four-year period, what has the consumer price index gone up by?

Mr. VENNING: That has nothing to do with the situation. The Premier brought in this move as an income tax situation. Back in 1977, when the profit from the Electricity Trust was \$7 480 000, it paid \$6 956 000 into Treasury. My accountant tells me that the tax on such a sum would have been \$3 000 000, but the trust was required to pay nearly \$7 000 000, so the Government is

using this avenue to fleece the people. The Government needs money, and people, generally speaking, do not mind paying tax as long as they see that the money is wisely spent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VENNING: One needs only to go over the Gepps Cross crossing to see the delay in the construction of the over-pass. It is about time the matter was handed back to private enterprise to get some of these things finished. Our roads have never been worse. They are full of potholes. The former member for Pirie warned people not to ride on the railways because of their dangerous state, but it is almost unsafe now to drive on some of our roads. Although it has been a wet year, we must meet the problem and do something about it. When private enterprise has a problem, something is done about it. It is appalling to think that taxpayers in this State must put up with this for perhaps another two years before they get an opportunity, through the ballot-box, to change the Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VENNING: When I go door-knocking in Port Pirie, the pensioners plead with me to do something about the high cost of electricity, and I tell them that when we get back into Government we will look at the situation. There is no sympathy from this Government for the small man. It is out to fleece everyone. It is out to bring in what it calls socialism, but there is only a knife-edge between socialism and communism, and that is what we have in this State at present.

Mr. WOTTON (Murray): Earlier this afternoon, I referred to problems being experienced by a constituent of mine whose husband had died in 1976, only two or three months before this Government abolished succession and death duties between spouses. I referred to the massive problems faced by the wife and children of this family. I shall continue quoting from the letter, as follows:

Because of drought over the past two years, cattle prices have been low, and the return from the barley crop may just cover the cost of seed and super. With another year ahead of low potato prices increasing cost of maintenance, etc., I doubt whether we will even be able to meet interest payments on whatever duty is payable. We are still waiting on what the Commissioner of Succession Duties has in store for us.

This person has come to me, after having taken up the matter with the Ombudsman and through various fields, with special concern. She is determined to fight. She has fought since 1976 and will continue to fight. She has recently received a letter from the Australian Taxation Office, as follows:

Reference is made to your letter dated 18 May 1978.

As stated on the notice of assessment, the full amount notified is due for payment on the date specified in the notice notwithstanding the lodgement of an objection against the assessment.

In the circumstance of this case, if payment has not already been made, a minimum payment of \$30 000 should be made as soon as possible. The balance may be held in abeyance pending further advice from this office.

It is pointed out that additional duty by way of late payment penalty is accruing at the rate of 10 per cent per annum on the balance outstanding, but will be adjusted to the extent that it relates to any duty reduction as a result of the objection lodged.

In March of this year, in another place, the Hon. Mr. Hill moved a motion to the effect that the Government

should, within the life of the present Parliament, abolish gift and succession duties and consider reducing the incidence of capital taxation in other areas. During the debate on the motion, the Hon. Mr. Cornwall said that he saw no reason why wealthy people "who gave ordinary men and women nothing in their lifetime should not make a contribution when leaving it". This incensed my constituent, as I am sure it has incensed many other South Australians. She prepared a letter, which she has not sent, perhaps because she felt better about it. For that reason, I will not quote all of the letter, but I shall quote some of it, because it points out some of the problems and disadvantages experienced by this family because of the pig-headedness of this Government in relation to succession and death duties. The letter states:

When our son reached the age of 18 years, my husband was in the process of making arrangements in giving the son a portion of land, but fate chose otherwise. The daughters at an early age assisted with the dairy when the (live-in) workmen went home on weekends, thus denying them the privileges the children of ordinary people had in partaking in sporting events.

There is no time for sport for the son either, as we can no longer afford the much needed permanent help, so manage as best we can with casual help during harvest season.

There were low cattle prices due to poor condition of stock, due to drought over the past few years; returns from barley crop may cover cost of seed and super, and yet another year coming up with low potato prices. We are at present managing to keep up with interest payments on bank loans which we have worked on for almost 35 years, sharing a small secondhand car, and hoping that the day is not too far distant when the son will be able to afford a car of his own, like his friends, sons of the ordinary people.

I am referring to a person who has built up an estate worth about \$200 000 by sheer hard work and who is in this situation at present. The letter continues:

The worry of succession duties did nothing to prolong my husband's life. Doctors could not stop his untimely death, which came four months after his first blood transfusion. A victim of leukaemia, he died on 24 March 1976, before the abolition of duty between spouses in July 1976. Hobby farm valuation after his death in 1976 was over \$1 600 per acre. I, being a keen gardener and taking pride in the home and its surroundings, did little to minimise the valuation.

My constituent then states that her parents lived to an old age. The husband, having died at a reasonably early age, had not taken some necessary financial precautions. My constituent has written to the Premier, and I will quote from that letter, because I believe that it sets out her feelings clearly in the matter. The letter, which has been forwarded only in the past couple of days, states:

Having heard the Federal Budget recorded advertisement, time and time again ("Write to your Liberal M.P., tell him you're angry"), has prompted me to write to tell you what I am not happy about. Seeing you on T.V. in 1976, in an interview, when asked about succession duties, you commented, "People must expect to pay tax on what is, after all, a windfall." How can you define an inheritance as a windfall, when the inheritance received by the family is the direct result of the work contributed to it by the family?

Sunday Mail, February 1977, "Death and Those Duties", by Helen Caterer. "Helen, you're wrong"—Dunstan.

I would like to refresh your memory on a few paragraphs. You mentioned:

- (a) If Miss Caterer had bothered to check with the Government before writing her article, and not just spoken to Mr. DeGaris of the Liberal Party, she would have been told of this, and she would also have been told that many of the examples she

used were wrong.

Because of the time factor, I have not read all the letter. The Premier made a laughing matter of Helen Caterer's statements in her report relating to problems associated with succession duties. The letter continues:

Mr. Dunstan, the problem caused by succession duties just patently is absolutely true in our case, where my husband died just prior to the abolition of duty between spouses—July 1976. I trust that you will remind the Commissioner of Succession Duties of the power he has regarding the \$30 000 plus 10 per cent per annum.

I have already quoted from that document this afternoon. The letter continues:

Mr. Dunstan, what would you do if you were in my situation? Being discriminated against, with all women in the power structure, when no recognition is given, allowances made for wife and family sharing thirty years of work with your life partner, contributing equally to wages, improvements on a property purchased for £45 or \$90 per acre, bring it up to over \$1 600 per acre, "hobby-farmer" valuation, while the property at all times remained in my late husband's name. To be confronted with a tax on what tax has already been paid, all one hears is, this is legal, or this is law, what is justice? Death or succession duties!! In our case it can only be described as legalised criminal extortion.

She is only one of many people who are at present experiencing problems because of this Government's pig-headedness. It would help people, particularly those in the country, more than this Government would appreciate if it seriously examined the examples of other States in abolishing death duties, thus providing the incentive for people on the land that is desperately needed if we are to gain anything from primary production as we have done in the past, and as I hope that we will continue to do in the future for this State.

Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder): I raise a matter that has been brought to my attention from several areas; it concerns arrangements for Christmas late-night shopping in country shopping districts. It has been the practice in many country areas to set aside a special evening for late-night shopping prior to Christmas. Some areas have held it on Christmas Eve or a couple of days previously, and it has been a well-attended and much appreciated event. I realise that possibly the first thing that could be said is that the business houses and business people want this event held for business purposes, but I point out that families like this particular night. If a poll were held or an investigation made, I am certain that all families, particularly those with small children, would want to keep this event alive and as near as possible to Christmas Day.

Apparently, the Government has decided that this is not to be the case in the future. I will read a letter, obviously a circular letter, that has been issued by the Labour and Industry Department. The copy I have is addressed to the Secretary of the Yorke Peninsula shopping district, and states:

You are aware that the Shop Trading Hours Act, 1977, which came into operation on 1 December 1977, provides for late-night shopping in country shopping districts to 9 p.m. on Thursdays.

You may also be aware that because the Act had only been in operation for a few weeks prior to Christmas 1977 and because many shopping districts had made arrangements to hold special functions on the Friday prior to Christmas, Cabinet approved of many shopping districts holding their pre-Christmas shopping night on Friday 23 December 1977 in lieu of Thursday 22 December 1977.

However, at the same time as Cabinet gave that approval it also directed that in future the late shopping night prior to

Christmas must be held on the normal late closing night, i.e. Thursday. Any special functions such as pageants, Christmas trees, etc., which had traditionally been held to coincide with late-night shopping on a Friday early in December must in future also coincide with the normal late-closing night.

You are therefore advised that the late shopping night in your shopping district this year and in future years (except when Christmas Day falls on a Thursday in which case special arrangements will be made) must be held on the last Thursday prior to Christmas Day. If it has been the practice in your shopping district to have a special function on a Friday evening early in December to coincide with late-night shopping, that function must now also be held on a Thursday evening.

Perhaps the letter has been a little clumsily drafted, but the ultimate paragraph states that people are being told when this event must be held.

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

Mr. RUSSACK: I believe that a precedent has been set in that letter because the Bill had been passed late in the year and arrangements had been made whereby Cabinet approved a special night of opening. The last paragraph of the letter states:

Except when Christmas Day falls on a Thursday, in which case special arrangements will be made.

That proves that something can be done, so I therefore appeal to the Minister to receive applications and take each case on its merits. At the outset I indicated that I was speaking on behalf of country shopping districts. The same thing would apply to suburban and outer suburban areas where shops now open on Thursday evening.

The problem is that in one year Christmas Day could fall on a Wednesday and late night shopping would have to be conducted on the previous Thursday evening, which is almost a week before the Christmas festivities. I am certain that I am voicing the opinion of the community when I say that, near to Christmas, festivities are appreciated by the whole community, particularly families with small children.

Something was said this afternoon about electricity consumption and price increases. Recently, the Minister announced increases in the price of electricity and suggested that there was a formula that would encourage people to conserve electricity. The conservation of electricity that would be brought about by solar heating is such a consideration. When referring to solar heating devices in a report in the *News* last evening, the Minister stated:

However, some of these devices do not reduce the need for extra generating capacity to any significant degree. An effective commercial solar air-conditioning system would be tremendously valuable in easing peak summer loads. On the other hand, solar water heaters save fuel but do not at this stage affect the peak winter load because, when the sun is not shining on very cold winter days, the solar systems require the use of booster electric heating.

That is true, but I happen to have some records with me that have been kept by a domestic user over the past six years. He had a normal domestic heater and, in 1973-74, he used 4 800 kilowatts of electricity; in 1974-75 consumption rose to 5 949 kW; and in 1975-76 it rose to 6 107 kW. During the next financial year, 1976-77, the consumer purchased a solar heater in December and reduced the previous year's consumption from 6 107 kW to 5 478 kW. For the financial year just completed consumption was back to 4 283 kW. That is almost a reduction of one-third in the consumption of electricity

when compared to the previous full year of using a normal heater.

I therefore suggest that the saving of power for domestic users is considerable. Reference was made to giving some sort of consideration to domestic users who install solar systems. That would certainly be an advantage to them.

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

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): My grievance relates to the dismissal of Malcolm Cooper from the Birdwood Mill Museum. The museum is owned by the South Australian Government and is controlled by the Birdwood Mill Museum Board. I understand that the company's shares are held jointly by the Premier and Deputy Premier, acting as official officers for the State.

Malcolm Cooper of Gumeracha was employed at the museum for five years. His duties entailed security, maintenance of grounds, handling and banking money, relieving staff and supervision of staff. He worked up to 10 hours a day with no extra pay for overtime and was obviously assessed by his fellow employees as a person who was both honest and of the highest integrity. On 7 December 1977 he was sent by the Manager, Mr. Chisholm, to pick up an order of earthenware jars from Bennetts Pottery at Magill. He did so in his own car and arrived back at the museum at 6 p.m. He unloaded the jars with the aid of Mr. Chisholm's son.

On 3 January 1978, Mr. Cooper's wife cleaned out the car and discovered a jar inside it that had apparently fallen out of the packing holding these honey jars. The wife took the jar inside, apparently not knowing what it was, so that there was no further risk to it. On 17 January, Mr. Chisholm called Mr. Cooper in and asked for his resignation for the theft of an earthenware jar valued at \$4. I have correspondence to back up what I am saying, correspondence from Mr. Cooper and also correspondence back and forth with Mr. Chisholm and Mr. Dall, the Chairman of the board. I suppose if we wished to give this case a name we could call it "The honeypot sacking".

Mr. Bannon: Did he go and see his union?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will come to that soon. On 17 January, Mr. Cooper refused to resign so he was dismissed by Mr. Chisholm, who said at the time of dismissing Mr. Cooper:

You are sacked for dishonesty.

On 23 January 1978, Mr. Chisholm, in a reference for which Mr. Cooper asked, stated:

He has occupied a position of trust and has always given freely of his time when a job has needed to be done. We wish him well for the future and hope that he can find a position to his liking and in line with his skills.

I have a complete copy of that letter if any member of the House wishes to look at it. On 2 February this year Mr. D. J. Dall, Chairman of the Birdwood Mill Museum Board, in a letter to Mr. Cooper, stated:

I am aware of events leading to your dismissal. Without alleging that you are dishonest, the circumstances are such that it has left room for doubt in the Manager's mind and therefore does not justify your continued employment with the company. You will appreciate that a relationship of trust is essential between an employer and employees in a museum of this nature and, unfortunately, this relationship no longer exists.

Having implied in that letter "without alleging that you are dishonest" that he was in fact dismissed apparently for the circumstances that brought into doubt his honesty, Mr. Dall took a complete change of stance in a further letter that was sent on 3 March 1978 to Mr. Kidd, who had presented a petition from the staff of the museum calling

for a full inquiry into Mr. Cooper's dismissal and calling for his reinstatement. The letter states:

He was not dismissed for dishonesty, as if that had been the case he would have been summarily dismissed, and would not have received a week's pay in lieu of notice. The circumstances leading to the termination of his appointment led to a dispute between Mr. Cooper and the Manager, Mr. Chisholm, which was not conducive to the continued employment of both Mr. Cooper and Mr. Chisholm. As far as the board was concerned there was no allegation of dishonesty when they discussed the actions of the Manager and the decision not to re-employ Mr. Cooper was made in an effort to avoid any dissension among the employees of the company.

It is quite apparent that there is a conflict between what Mr. Dall said as Chairman on 2 February in a letter and what he said on 3 March of this year in a further letter to Mr. Kidd. The two statements are contradictory.

The unfortunate fact is that Mr. Malcolm Cooper has been dismissed over the apparent theft of a \$4 honey pot. To make matters worse, when the facts were revealed it was found that Mr. Cooper had not stolen the \$4 honey pot. I have had the matter referred to an industrial barrister. He has considered the matter and the letters associated with it, and assures me that there is every ground for describing this as a harsh, unjust and unreasonable dismissal. The unfortunate part is that Mr. Cooper, in his ignorance, failed to take the matter to a solicitor within 21 days of his dismissal and, therefore, lost his right under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

Mr. Bannon: Why didn't he go to his union?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member persists in his interjection. In fact, he went to other employees and they took the matter up with the employer, Mr. Dall. Mr. Cooper, unfortunately, purely on a technicality, cannot avail himself of his rights under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. If he could do that, I believe that there are substantial grounds for Mr. Cooper to prove that his dismissal was harsh, unjust and unreasonable. I challenge the Government to appoint a State industrial judge to inquire into the dismissal of Mr. Cooper. I believe it is most unjust for a State Government to Act in a way that causes anyone to be dismissed on such harsh and unreasonable grounds.

The Government should investigate this matter using as the independent investigator one of the State's industrial judges. I wrote to the Premier about this matter and, in a quite unsatisfactory reply, he wrote back saying that he would stand by the decision of the board irrespective of the fact that the decision of the board was apparently quite contradictory, because in February it said one thing and in March quite a different thing. Further, after there has been an independent inquiry, if it is found that Mr. Cooper has been dismissed harshly, unjustly or unreasonably, he should be reinstated immediately to his position or an equivalent position and fully compensated for all loss of salary he has incurred since he was dismissed.

We hear much from members opposite about private companies dismissing people, yet we have a case here where the Government has acted disgracefully in allowing a statutory body to dismiss somebody over the apparent theft of a \$4 honey pot. This case needs a full investigation. I appreciate that it is likely to embarrass the Government but its embarrassment should not stop justice being applied to any individual in this State.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Last Thursday the Government arranged for the proclamation and gazettal of a schedule of certain fees to apply to the prawn fishing

industry. Incorporated in that schedule is the intent of the Government to apply its earlier announced \$5 000 and \$9 000 fees to fishermen fishing in St. Vincent Gulf and Spencer Gulf, respectively. Also incorporated in that schedule are some details about an interim fee that is proposed to apply from 6 October this year.

Members would be well aware of the lengthy and extensive media coverage this subject has received in recent times. I point out to the House my disappointment about the way in which this matter has been handled over a period too lengthy to be desirable in the interests of the industry concerned. The recent action of the Government in proclaiming and gazetting that schedule of new prawn licence fees is yet another demonstration of its arrogant disregard for the fishing industry.

The Premier's announcement and, indeed, the tabling of that document today, on the eve of an occasion when he had arranged to meet members of the industry to discuss that subject, in my view shows a blatant disregard of a long-standing agreement which has applied between the Government and the industry in this State. That agreement, which has been referred to several times, means, and was intended to mean from the outset, that before the Government changed zones or major policies with respect to the fishing industry in South Australia it would discuss and consult with the authority set up in this State to represent the industry at large.

At no time has that agreement for consultation been intended to direct the Government as to what it shall apply in the way of taxes or fees, but it has been the understanding of the industry (and I am sure, if they are honest about it, the understanding of departmental officers) that that consultation would take place in relation to proposals by the Government, particularly in the field of licence fees, so that the formula, the method and the basis on which those fees were to be discussed would be raised and thrashed out with the industry before being adopted by the Government. That consultation did not take place, and the Minister of Fisheries in South Australia is in an embarrassing position at this stage (if he is not, he has a hide thicker than a rhinoceros). Certainly, the officers of his department, who have come in for some flack in recent times, are extremely embarrassed about their involvement in this exercise.

Dr. Eastick: How many other boo-boos do you think he's made?

Mr. CHAPMAN: On this occasion I want to speak specifically about this matter because it is one in which I have a direct interest and about which I am extremely concerned. I do not take away from the member for Light the other areas where this Minister has floundered during recent times. After the tabling of those regulations today, I gave notice of intention to move for the disallowance of those regulations tomorrow. I will proceed at that time to speak about several other aspects of the matter.

On this occasion, whilst not being privy to what happened at the meeting between the industry and the Premier this afternoon, I have the benefit of the report that came via the media after the meeting, and it seems quite clear from what the Premier said directly after the meeting and to the press this evening that he had taken the matter out of the hands of his Minister. I say that because this evening he said outside his office in this Parliament that the representatives of the fishing industry were going to report back to their meeting certain matters that had been discussed today and that it had been agreed that those representatives would come back to him within the next few days and discuss the matter further. That demonstrates to me quite clearly that the Premier has no

confidence in his own Minister to continue to handle this issue.

Another matter pertaining to this subject is the gross inconsistency that has been applied throughout this whole exercise. I am dealing now specifically with the formula of fixing fees. I will take, for instance, the method by which prawn licence fees are determined in other States. In Western Australia, in the Shark Bay area on the far west coast, which I understand has the richest prawn resource of any other bay or zone around the Commonwealth waters, there is limited entry by the prawn industry. A total of 35 licensed vessels operate in that area. Last year, in that richest prawn resource area in the Commonwealth, the licence fee was \$1 000 a vessel.

This year, directly as a result of full consultation with the industry and using a fair and proper formula based on nothing other than the productivity in the previous year (not length of vessel, horsepower of vessel, or number of crew), the new fee is \$1 500 a vessel. Still dealing with that State, in the second most valuable resource area (Exmouth Gulf), the prawn fee this year is \$1 250 a vessel and there are 24 vessels operating. In Nicol Bay, the third and only other zoned area where limited entry is involved around the whole of the State's waters for prawn fishing, 16 vessels are operating and the fee this year is \$200 a vessel. In the richest resource in Australia, the fee is a maximum of \$1 500 a vessel, regardless of size, and the income for each vessel is considerably more than it has ever been in South Australia.

In Queensland, under the Fisheries Act of 1976, which came into force on 1 January this year, there is a slightly different system of fixing the rates, but the maximum amount that a prawn fisherman pays in that State, if he has for example, three assistants on his vessel, is \$68 per annum. That is made up of \$25 for the master fishing licence, \$25 for a powered vessel more than 20 metres long, and \$6 for each crewman who assists the fisherman. In Victoria, the maximum that one would pay with a crew of three to five, irrespective of the size of the vessel, is \$185 a year. In New South Wales, the fee is \$52, plus \$1 for each net used (applicable once only). In Commonwealth waters, anywhere outside the three-mile limit and up to the 200-mile zone, the total fee, catch what you like, trawl for what you like, and sell where you like, is \$20. In South Australia, the Minister has the gall to talk about fees of many thousands of dollars. There is no way in hell that that is acceptable.

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

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I refer again to the electoral rolls and the electoral system in South Australia. I think members on both sides will recall that several times I have sought information from Ministers about the present state of the rolls and have given the House detailed studies of the figures provided. The most recent occasion was on 12 September (pages 757 and 758 of *Hansard*), when the Attorney-General gave information about the change in the numbers on the roll from December 1977 to July 1978. On the same day (page 793 of *Hansard*), I sought further information from the Attorney about the discrepancies revealed. The reply that the Attorney-General gave was deficient in several important ways. I am not suggesting that what he said did not reveal some of the difficulties, but it did not go far enough.

On 7 March this year (pages 1996 to 1998 of *Hansard*) and on 6 December 1977 (pages 1188 and 1189 of *Hansard*) a series of other questions about the shift in roll numbers in this State was dealt with. The June 1976 submission by the Electoral Boundaries Commission that

fixed the electoral districts for South Australia on the criteria given to the commission brought down 47 new districts. I have statistical material that I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member state that the material is purely statistical?

Dr. EASTICK: It is all statistical.
Leave granted.

CHANGES IN HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY ELECTORATE NUMBERS
AND PERCENTAGE VARIATIONS

House of Assembly District	Electoral Enrolments		Differ- ence Dec. 77/ July 78	Percent- age change Dec. 77/ July 78	July '78 Differ- ence from June 76 Quota— 16 785	Percent- age change June 76 Quota to July 78	June 76 Commis- sion Recom- menda- tions	Percent- age above and below mean	Diff. June 76 (Report figures) to July 78	Percent- age change June 76 to July 78	
	Dec. 77	Jul. 78									(a)
Adelaide	17 538	16 747	-791	-4.51	- 38	- 0.23	17 522	+4.39	- 775	- 4.42	
Albert Park	17 810	17 624	-186	-1.04	+ 839	+ 5.00	16 226	-3.33	+1 398	+ 8.62	
Alexandra	17 862	18 013	+151	+0.85	+1 228	+ 7.32	15 950	-4.97	+2 063	+12.93	
Ascot Park	17 167	16 642	-525	-3.06	- 143	- 0.85	16 973	+1.12	+ 331	+ 1.95	
Baudin	19 631	20 005	+374	+1.91	+3 220	+19.18	16 523	-1.56	+3 482	+21.67	
Bragg	17 345	16 967	-378	-2.18	+ 182	+ 1.08	17 300	+3.07	+ 333	+ 1.92	
Brighton	18 489	18 479	- 10	-0.05	+1 694	+10.09	17 543	+4.52	+ 936	+ 5.34	
Chaffey	17 778	17 824	+ 46	+0.26	+1 039	+ 6.19	16 960	+1.04	+ 864	+ 5.09	
Coles	17 707	17 786	+ 79	+0.45	+1 001	+ 5.96	17 433	+3.86	+ 353	+ 2.02	
Davenport	17 637	17 616	- 21	-0.12	+ 831	+ 4.95	17 068	+1.69	+ 548	+ 3.21	
Elizabeth	17 917	17 806	-111	-0.62	+1 021	+ 6.08	16 313	-2.81	+1 493	+ 9.15	
Eyre	15 992	15 717	-275	-1.72	-1 068	- 6.36	15 303	-8.83	+ 414	+ 2.71	
Fisher	19 491	19 425	- 66	-0.34	+2 640	+15.73	17 398	+3.65	+2 027	+11.65	
Flinders	16 002	15 946	- 56	-0.40	- 839	- 5.00	15 345	-8.58	+ 601	+ 3.92	
Florey	17 985	17 734	-251	-1.40	+ 949	+ 5.65	17 638	+5.08	+ 96	+ 0.54	
Gilles	17 666	17 433	-233	-1.32	+ 648	+ 3.86	17 320	+3.19	+ 113	+ 0.65	
Glennelg	17 725	17 478	-247	-1.39	+ 693	+ 4.13	17 519	+4.37	- 41	- 0.23	
Goyder	16 941	16 883	- 58	-0.34	+ 98	+ 0.58	16 011	-4.61	+ 872	+ 5.45	
Hanson	17 815	17 455	-360	-2.02	+ 670	+ 3.99	17 716	+5.55	- 261	- 1.47	
Hartley	18 528	18 515	- 13	-0.70	+1 730	+10.31	17 247	+2.75	+1 268	+ 7.35	
Henley Beach	18 228	18 262	+ 34	+0.19	+1 477	+ 8.80	17 472	+4.09	+ 790	+ 4.52	
Kavel	17 676	17 643	- 33	-0.19	+ 858	+ 5.11	16 635	-0.89	+1 008	+ 6.06	
Light	16 340	16 142	-198	-1.21	- 643	- 3.83	15 387	-8.33	+ 755	+ 4.91	
Mallee	15 732	15 667	- 65	-0.41	-1 118	- 6.66	15 304	-8.82	+ 363	+ 2.37	
Mawson	20 070	20 458	+388	+1.93	+3 673	+21.88	16 519	-1.58	+3 939	+23.85	
Mitcham	17 370	17 124	-246	-1.42	+ 339	+ 2.02	17 265	+2.86	- 141	- 0.82	
Mitchell	17 679	17 213	-466	-2.64	+ 428	+ 2.55	17 467	+4.06	- 254	- 1.45	
Morphett	17 751	17 169	-582	-3.28	+ 384	+ 2.29	17 580	+4.74	- 411	- 2.34	
Mt. Gambier	17 558	17 557	- 1	0.00	+ 772	+ 4.60	16 431	-2.11	+1 126	+ 6.85	
Murray	17 504	17 548	+ 44	+0.25	+ 763	+ 4.55	15 928	-5.11	+1 620	+10.17	
Napier	17 038	16 797	-241	-1.41	+ 12	+ 0.07	16 140	-3.84	+ 659	+ 4.07	
Newland	19 548	19 911	+363	+1.86	+3 126	+18.62	16 561	-1.33	+3 350	+20.23	
Norwood	17 773	17 090	-683	-3.84	+ 305	+ 1.82	17 610	+4.92	- 520	- 2.95	
Peake	16 979	16 631	-348	-2.05	- 154	- 0.92	17 132	+2.07	- 501	- 2.92	
Playford	18 355	18 079	-276	-1.50	+1 294	+ 7.71	17 278	+2.94	+ 801	+ 4.64	
Price	16 689	16 370	-319	-1.91	- 415	- 2.47	16 771	-0.08	- 401	- 2.39	
Rocky River	17 119	17 059	- 60	-0.35	+ 274	+ 1.63	16 359	-2.54	+ 700	+ 4.28	
Ross Smith	16 739	16 351	-388	-2.32	- 434	- 2.59	17 030	+1.46	- 679	- 3.99	
Salisbury	20 236	20 096	-140	-0.69	+3 311	+19.73	17 109	+1.93	+2 987	+17.46	
Semaphore	17 924	17 891	- 33	-0.18	+1 106	+ 6.59	17 502	+4.27	+ 389	+ 2.22	
Spence	16 229	15 937	-292	-1.80	- 848	- 5.05	16 418	-2.19	- 481	- 2.93	
Stuart	17 015	16 978	- 37	-0.22	+ 193	+ 1.15	16 700	-0.51	+ 278	+ 1.56	
Todd	17 898	18 168	+270	+1.51	+1 383	+ 8.24	16 491	-1.75	+1 677	+10.17	
Torrens	17 710	16 889	-821	-4.64	+ 104	+ 0.62	17 497	+4.24	- 608	- 3.47	
Unley	17 049	16 369	-680	-3.99	- 416	- 2.48	16 733	-0.31	- 364	- 2.18	
Victoria	15 723	15 616	-107	-0.68	-1 169	- 6.96	15 274	-9.00	+ 342	+ 2.24	
Whyalla	17 441	17 113	-328	-1.88	+ 328	+ 1.95	17 008	+1.33	+ 105	+ 0.62	
	828 399	820 223	8 176		31 314		788 909		+31 314		

a, b. Answer to Question on Notice *Hansard* pp 757-758 September 12 1978.

g, h. Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission Report 1976 pp 122-123.

PERCENTAGE ABOVE AND BELOW QUOTA (16 785) AT EFFECTIVE DATE, 30 JUNE 1976

Effective Date 30 June 1976 (a)	1977 State Election Roll at 24 August 1977 (b)	1977 Federal Election Roll at 10 November 1977 (c)	July 1978 Electoral Office Figures (d)
	+24.56 Fisher	+20.58 Salisbury	+21.88 Mawson
+20 per cent		+18.62 Mawson	+19.73 Salisbury
	+17.68 Salisbury	+16.95 Fisher	+19.18 Baudin
		+16.19 Newland	+18.62 Newland
	+15.21 Mawson	+15.82 Baudin	+15.73 Fisher
+15 per cent	+13.84 Baudin		+10.31 Hartley
	+13.46 Newland		+10.09 Brighton
	+11.38 Hartley	+10.60 Hartley	
+10 per cent	+ 8.25 Brighton	+ 9.66 Brighton	+ 8.80 Henley Beach
	+ 8.24 Henley Beach		+ 8.24 Todd
	+ 8.04 Playford	+ 8.72 Playford	+ 7.71 Playford
	+ 7.83 Semaphore	+ 8.32 Henley Beach	
+7.5 per cent		+ 7.02 Florey	+ 7.32 Alexandra
	+ 6.82 Florey	+ 6.78 Todd	+ 6.59 Semaphore
		+ 6.61 Semaphore	
		+ 6.12 Norwood	+ 6.19 Chaffey
		+ 6.06 Hanson	+ 6.08 Elizabeth
	+ 5.96 Hanson	+ 5.94 Elizabeth	+ 5.96 Coles
		+ 5.66 Coles	
		+ 5.64 Albert Park	+ 5.65 Florey
	+ 5.61 Norwood	+ 5.24 Torrens	
	+ 5.52 Todd		
+ 5.55 Hanson	+ 5.51 Coles	+ 5.15 Mitchell	+ 5.11 Kavel
		+ 5.11 Chaffey	
		+ 5.00 Morphett	+ 5.00 Albert Park
+ 5.08 Florey			
+5 per cent	+ 4.92 Norwood	+ 4.96 Glenelg	+ 4.95 Davenport
	+ 4.74 Morphett	+ 4.92 Davenport	
	+ 4.52 Brighton	+ 4.89 Gilles	+ 4.60 Mount Gambier
	+ 4.39 Adelaide	+ 4.37 Kavel	+ 4.55 Murray
	+ 4.37 Glenelg	+ 4.33 Adelaide	
	+ 4.27 Semaphore		+ 4.13 Glenelg
	+ 4.24 Torrens		+ 3.99 Hanson
	+ 4.09 Henley Beach	+ 3.86 Mount Gambier	+ 3.86 Gilles
	+ 4.06 Mitchell	+ 3.61 Alexandra	
	+ 3.86 Coles	+ 3.52 Whyalla	
	+ 3.75 Fisher		
	+ 3.46 Bragg	+ 3.13 Murray	+ 2.55 Mitchell
	+ 3.43 Kavel	+ 3.03 Mitcham	+ 2.29 Morphett
	+ 3.07 Bragg		+ 2.02 Mitcham
	+ 2.94 Playford		+ 1.95 Whyalla
	+ 2.86 Mitcham	+ 2.83 Bragg	+ 1.82 Norwood
	+ 2.75 Hartley	+ 2.14 Ascot Park	+ 1.63 Rocky River
	+ 2.07 Peake	+ 1.22 Rocky River	+ 1.15 Stuart
	+ 1.93 Salisbury	+ 1.16 Unley	+ 1.08 Bragg
	+ 1.69 Davenport	+ 1.13 Napier	+ 0.62 Torrens
	+ 1.46 Ross Smith	+ 0.91 Stuart	+ 0.58 Goyder
	+ 1.33 Whyalla	+ 0.76 Peake	+ 0.07 Napier
	+ 1.12 Ascot Park	+ 0.18 Goyder	
	+ 1.04 Chaffey		
	+ 0.006 Rocky River		

0.00 per cent			
- 0.08 Price			- 0.23 Adelaide
- 0.31 Unley			
	- 0.41 Napier		
- 0.51 Stuart		- 0.68 Price	
- 0.89 Kavel		- 0.70 Ross Smith	- 0.85 Ascot Park
	- 0.79 Price		
- 1.33 Newland			- 0.92 Peake
- 1.56 Baudin			
- 1.58 Mawson			
- 1.75 Todd			
	- 1.81 Ross Smith		
- 2.11 Mount Gambier			
- 2.19 Spence			- 2.47 Price
	- 2.22 Spence		- 2.48 Unley
- 2.54 Rocky River		- 2.76 Light	- 2.59 Ross Smith
- 2.81 Elizabeth			
- 3.33 Albert Park	- 3.72 Light		
- 3.84 Napier		- 3.41 Spence	
			- 3.83 Light
- 4.61 Goyder			
- 4.97 Alexandra			

-5 per cent			
- 5.11 Murray	- 6.26 Flinders	- 5.18 Flinders	- 5.00 Flinders
- 8.33 Light	- 6.67 Eyre	- 5.33 Eyre	- 5.05 Spence
- 8.58 Flinders	- 7.57 Mallee	- 6.84 Mallee	- 6.36 Eyre
- 8.82 Mallee	- 7.76 Victoria	- 6.86 Victoria	- 6.66 Mallee
- 8.83 Eyre			- 6.96 Victoria
- 9.00 Victoria			

(a) Commission Report.

(b) Answer to Question on Notice—*Hansard* pp. 1188-6 December 1977.

(c) Answer to Question on Notice—*Hansard* pp. 1188-1189 6 December 1977.

(d) Answer to Question on Notice—*Hansard* pp. 757-758 12 September 1978.

Percentage Movement from Effective Date 30.6.76
to July 1978*

Effective Date 30.6.76	Roll Figures July 1978
+ 5.55 Hanson	+ 23.85 Mawson
+ 5.08 Florey	+ 21.07 Baudin
+ 4.92 Norwood	+ 20.23 Newland
+ 4.74 Morphet	+ 17.46 Salisbury
+ 4.52 Brighton	+ 12.93 Alexandra
+ 4.39 Adelaide	+ 11.65 Fisher
+ 4.37 Glenelg	+ 10.17 Murray, Todd
+ 4.27 Semaphore	+ 9.15 Elizabeth
+ 4.24 Torrens	+ 8.62 Albert Park
+ 4.09 Henley Beach	+ 7.35 Hartley
+ 4.06 Mitchell	+ 6.85 Mount Gambier
+ 3.86 Coles	+ 6.06 Kavel
+ 3.75 Fisher	+ 5.45 Goyder
+ 3.19 Gilles	+ 5.34 Brighton
+ 3.07 Bragg	+ 5.09 Chaffey
+ 2.94 Playford	+ 4.91 Light
+ 2.86 Mitcham	+ 4.64 Playford
+ 2.75 Hartley	+ 4.52 Henley Beach
+ 2.07 Peake	+ 4.28 Rocky River
+ 1.93 Salisbury	+ 4.07 Napier
+ 1.69 Davenport	
+ 1.46 Ross Smith	
+ 1.33 Whyalla	
+ 1.12 Ascot Park	
+ 1.04 Chaffey	

State Average	0.00		+ 3.97
	- 0.08	Price	+ 3.92 Flinders
	- 0.31	Unley	+ 3.21 Davenport
	- 0.51	Stuart	+ 2.71 Eyre
	- 0.89	Kavel	+ 2.37 Mallee
	- 1.33	Newland	+ 2.24 Victoria
	- 1.56	Baudin	+ 2.22 Semaphore
	- 1.58	Mawson	+ 2.02 Coles
	- 1.75	Todd	+ 1.95 Ascot Park
	- 2.11	Mount Gambier	+ 1.92 Bragg
	- 2.19	Spence	+ 1.66 Stuart
	- 2.54	Rocky River	+ 0.65 Gilles
	- 2.81	Elizabeth	+ 0.62 Whyalla
	- 3.33	Albert Park	+ 0.54 Florey
	- 3.84	Napier	- 0.23 Glenelg
	- 4.61	Goyder	- 0.82 Mitcham
	- 4.97	Alexandra	- 1.45 Mitchell
	- 5.11	Murray	- 1.47 Hanson
	- 8.33	Light	- 2.18 Unley
	- 8.58	Flinders	- 2.34 Morphett
	- 8.82	Mallee	- 2.39 Price
	- 8.83	Eyre	- 2.92 Peake
	- 9.00	Victoria	- 2.93 Spence
			- 2.95 Norwood
			- 3.47 Torrens
			- 3.99 Ross Smith
			- 4.42 Adelaide

ø Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission 1976.

* Answer to Question on Notice *Hansard* pp. 757-758 September 1978.

Dr. EASTICK: The material shows that the seven districts in which there was no change at the last electoral redistribution (Adelaide, Ascot Park, Norwood, Price, Torrens, Unley and Mitcham) and most of the five other districts in which there was limited change (Bragg, Mitchell, Peake, Ross Smith and Spence) are all well below the State average. There are others, and the member for Morphett will find that his district is below the State average, because many names have been taken off his roll in the cleansing or purging that has been undertaken.

The criteria used by the Government in its direction to the Electoral Boundaries Commission have again, from the detail I presented, proven to be deficient. The fact that the Commissioners had to use the existing boundaries as near as possible, together with the other restraints placed upon them, has meant that the movement in the electorates in question has been down numerically. Between December 1977 and July 1978 the number of electors registered in South Australia has dropped by over 8 000 from 828 399 to 820 223.

Some electorates have had a very much larger percentage loss in the cleaning-up process than have others. I refer especially to Norwood, Torrens, Adelaide and Unley, although others have also experienced big losses. One must ask why there has been a need to remove so many people from those rolls. We can see that on the Adelaide and Torrens rolls there are people employed in certain large hospitals and tertiary institutions who move on after a short period, but a number of the other shifts cannot be easily explained.

I recommend that all members look at the information to which I refer and which indicates the types of shift that have taken place. It shows, for instance, that the Mawson District is 21.88 per cent above the base figure, followed

by Salisbury at 19.73 per cent, Baudin at 19.18 per cent, Newland at 18.62 per cent, and Fisher at 15.73 per cent. At the other end of the scale, we find Flinders at minus 5 per cent, Spence at 5.05 per cent, Eyre at 6.36 per cent, Mallee at 6.66 per cent, and Victoria at 6.96 per cent, each of these figures being well below the quote of 16 785 in the Electoral Commissioner's Report. As at July 1978, had there been a redistribution, the quota would have risen to 17 452.

I now want to take up the difficulty (mentioned by the member for Goyder last week) of many small businesses in country areas in finding accommodation by banks and lending institutions. I laud the fact that money was made available to assist the rural community during the drought period, but the farming community was not the only group concerned. The people who provide services and supply assistance to the rural community have also been in a very difficult position. Many of them at present have no prospect of an immediate income or improvement in funds until the farming community obtains its payment for the 1978-79 season.

Regrettably, the assistance given through drought relief payments has not been available to those people. As my colleague the member for Goyder mentioned, lending institutions have written to a number of these people indicating that funds are no longer available to them because the lending institutions are containing their activities within the metropolitan or near-metropolitan area.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I wish to draw attention to what I term as the disgraceful situation resulting from the strong arm of the Government forcing private bus operators out of existence. These operators, who run buses to tourist areas in this State, are in a very bad

position, with Government forcing their backs to the wall. I brought the matter of the Glenelg tourist bus service to Parliament two years ago, and the member for Morphett would be well aware of this matter; he probably went on a trip with this bus company when he was young, and enjoyed it. After two years we still have this discrimination by the Government against these companies. I wonder why that situation prevails. The private bus operators are taxed 5 per cent on each passenger that they carry, and this of course does not occur with Government buses. We have a very good operator running the tourist bus in Glenelg and although he has a licence to tour down to the South Coast the Government has repeatedly refused to grant him a licence to carry tourists to the Barossa Valley.

Mr. Groom: Why won't they tour around Glenelg?

Mr. MATHWIN: The member for Morphett should stand up and support the city he represents in this House, instead of bleeping behind the pillar, hiding away and trying to bring this matter down to a low level. Tourism is as important to the district of the member for Morphett as it is to my district of Glenelg. It would do the honourable member good to put some pressure on his front bench and his Premier to do something about the situation that prevails. We in Glenelg have more tourist attractions than most other tourist areas in this State, yet if tourists come to Adelaide one of the great things that the Government suggests in its pamphlet is that they should go to the Barossa Valley.

What is the situation if people are staying in Glenelg? They have to get on that drab brown tram operating between Glenelg and Adelaide, and then get on a tourist bus to go to the Barossa. After they have done the tour, they again have to catch public transport back to Glenelg, often in the rush hour. If the member for Morphett thinks that is a good idea, let him get up and say so in the area he represents. Time and time again we have asked for this operator to be given a licence and it has been refused by the Government; the last occasion being in August this year. If the Government, which is supposed to support tourism in this State, is really concerned about it, it ought to consider the visiting tourists. If Government members think it is a good thing that tourists coming to this State should use public transport to get to the city before going to the Barossa Valley, they are completely failing in their duty. In the Premier's 1975 policy speech, he made the following statement on tourism:

We have leapt ahead in tourist development. We now have Australia's highest income per head from tourism. We have developed a film industry with spectacular success.

Presenting his Government's policy prior to the last State election, he did not even see fit to refer to tourism. That indicates the priority given to tourism by this Government. Private operators have to pay the State Transport Authority a licence fee for which they get no security whatever. Indeed, they can lose their licence at the flip of a coin or at the whim of the authority or its members. The only tourist bus lines servicing the Barossa Valley are the Premier Line, the Government service and Ansett Tours, which all operate from the city of Adelaide. I understand that the operators in question receive no help or information from the Government.

I understand that they have often given the Government Tourist Bureau brochures on the tours that they run throughout South Australia, but that these brochures are conveniently forgotten and left under the counter. Indeed, the bureau does nothing whatever to assist private operators or help stimulate tourism for their benefit.

A tourist bureau in any country is supposed to promote tourism, but I ask Government members who have been overseas (and this applies to many members on the

Government front bench) where in the free world is there a Government that discriminates so much against private operators as the South Australian Government does.

Private operators have to fill in forms indicating who they are carrying, who has booked the bus, and what charge is made, etc. Why does the Government or the authority need such information? I presume it is to enable them to compete with private industry and take every opportunity to visit people booking private buses in an attempt to undercut the operators' business and take away their trade. That is apparent from what is going on in this industry.

I now wish to raise a matter referred to in today's *Advertiser* under the headline "Foster mothers in Government rip-off". This matter concerns the Minister of Community Welfare, who always seems to be in trouble and who is struggling hard to keep his head above water. I suppose the Minister hopes that in the next Cabinet reshuffle he will be relieved of his responsibilities concerning community welfare and be given a more cushy portfolio that is easier to manage. Indeed, I am told that it is on for young and old tomorrow in the Caucus room; they have the favourites up, and bets can be laid.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: I can give members 10 to 1 that it is the member for—

The SPEAKER: Order! No betting is allowed in this House, and the honourable member knows that.

Mr. MATHWIN: I apologise, Mr. Speaker. A young person, who comes from Brookway Park, is now living in my district. He has been put out from a private school, which will not have him because he is so destructive, and he is attending a public school only half day a week, yet the Government has seen fit to provide only a minimum of finance for the poor lady looking after this young fellow. When such young people are allowed out in the community, one would think that the Government, although it claims it has not started the new scheme—

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

Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles): I take the first opportunity that has presented itself to express my concern and that of many South Australians about the statements and recent conduct of the Attorney-General, who is the Chief Law Officer of the State. As such, his conduct, especially regarding legal matters, is expected to be above reproach. Yet South Australia's Attorney-General has repeatedly demonstrated that he is unfit to hold high office of any kind, let alone any office that should be exemplary in regard to the law.

Mr. Keneally: Is this a personal view?

Mrs. ADAMSON: I am expressing the view of many South Australians and of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs. ADAMSON: It is interesting to hear the comments of members opposite. We know that, when an attack is made on a Government Minister from this side, inevitably the hatchet men from the other side seek to defend him. Who will it be tomorrow? Will it be the member for Gilles, who so often is asked to do the Government's dirty work? Will it be the member for Morphett? Will the Government pick a lawyer to defend the indefensible? It will be interesting to see who defends the Attorney-General in this House tomorrow.

The Attorney-General's recent outburst against and vilification of visiting British morals campaigner Mary Whitehouse ranks among the worst of the many attacks made on innocent people under the cloak of his office. To call a woman who has spent a large part of her life working

to expose and prevent exploitation of children a "notorious Pom" and "an agent of darkness" is vicious in the extreme.

Members interjecting:

Mrs. ADAMSON: There would have been grounds for suing, no doubt. No wonder Mary Whitehouse said:

It is quite an extraordinary thing to me, coming from Britain with the status of the Attorney-General there, to hear an Attorney-General making an unfounded personal attack. I would have thought it lowered the whole dignity of the office. It brings into contempt the status of the law. No man of his legal standing should throw about attacks that have no basis.

It is an appalling indictment of the Premier, the Government and the Labour Caucus that they are willing to retain in office a Minister who has repeatedly abused the office of Attorney-General. Working backwards to his most recent indiscretions, I refer to his comment on universities. On 1 September 1978 the Attorney-General was reported in the *Advertiser* as saying:

The sad fact is that universities are becoming increasingly irrelevant, both in their traditional role as apprentice schools for the managerial elite and as centres of academic research and learning.

If ever a remark was guaranteed to denigrate scholarship and academic standards, the Attorney-General's remark was it. What are the administrators, staff and students of universities in Australia to make of such a remark? What are the taxpayers to make of it—people who accept the values of academic standards and believe that they are worth preserving? There is something sinister about the ethics of an Attorney-General who attempts to undermine respect for scholarship and learning as upheld by the universities of Australia.

Of course, we know that the purpose of the Left is to undermine the respected institutions of society. We know by his own admission that the Attorney-General is an exponent of the Left. Now we go back a little further to the Attorney-General's remarks about the Elizabeth Town Clerk, and I am sure that the member for Napier will be interested in this aspect. The *Advertiser* report of 18 August comments on this matter as follows:

The Attorney-General, Mr. Duncan, told a public meeting called by the Elizabeth Ratepayers Action Group that the basic fault for the excessive rate increases lay with the Town Clerk, Mr. M. C. Jenkins.

The Attorney-General said:

If I were in council I would have long ago called for his resignation. Any Government—Federal or local—makes its decisions on the basis of information supplied to it by the experts it employs, and in this case it was the Town Clerk.

So much for the responsibility of elected representatives. The Attorney-General is clearly a man who will sell out anyone if it is in his political interests to do so. Mr. M. C. Jenkins, the Town Clerk, a 60-year-old man with a good war record and an unblemished career as an accountant and public servant who has served his employers for 14 years without a black mark against him, gets a bucket tipped on him by the Attorney-General. We must remember that the Attorney-General is the member for Elizabeth, and he has a political interest in ensuring that the ratepayers and the councillors of Elizabeth are on his side. If an honest man has to be buried in the process, that is a mere nought to the Attorney-General.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs. ADAMSON: Going back a few months further, I was interested to read the remarks of an interstate member of the press (Mr. R. R. Walker), a writer with the *Melbourne Age*, who had the misfortune to come under

attack by the Attorney-General as a result of his comments on the Attorney's proposed legislation on class action. Mr. Walker, referring to the Attorney-General, said in his column in the *Age* of 12 August:

He launched an attack on this correspondent of such astonishing intemperance and wide-ranging error that it seems a bit cruel to set him up in this way. However, when competence and integrity are challenged, the barricades must be mounted . . . as he was either too lazy to talk or write himself and seek the necessary background or too eager to score obscure political points . . . it might be wise for Mr. Duncan to apply similar tests before he rushes into print next time or embarks on any hasty legislation that will cost the consumer dear.

In November 1977, the Attorney-General addressed an audience of scientists in Canberra, and this was reported as follows:

First he tells an audience of scientists in Canberra that he is worried that a nuclear power industry would somehow turn us into a Fascist State filled with police spies. Then he publicly supports action to prevent uranium producers putting their case before the public.

The *News*, in an editorial of 15 November last, states:

Let's not mince words. That is censorship, the hallmark of Fascist societies. Also in the course of this tirade he lightly brackets heroin smuggling with uranium mining, finding heroin smuggling "somewhat less dangerous".

The editorial also states:

Even by the lax standards of political rhetoric, Mr. Peter Duncan's outburst on uranium mining yesterday was extraordinary.

That is not the first, nor will it be the last, editorial comment on the Attorney-General. The *Advertiser* editorial of 21 September 1977, referring to the Supervising Stipendiary Magistrate (Mr. D. F. Wilson), stated:

He appears to have become the victim of a serious indiscretion by the Attorney-General (Mr. Duncan).

We know what that indiscretion was. Mr. Duncan agreed with a talk-back speaker on radio that there appeared to be one law for the rich and one law for the poor. The editorial continued:

The situation now is that the Attorney-General, the Minister responsible for the administration of justice in this State, is apparently content to allow to remain in judicial office a man he has, in effect, accused of bias.

On the same subject, a retired member of the South Australian Judiciary (R. R. Chamberlain) said:

As Attorney-General, Mr. Duncan is nominal head of the legal profession and among other things the guardian of public faith in the impartiality of the Judiciary. His remark was not only a personal insult to a conscientious senior magistrate, but was calculated to bring discredit on the institution which it was his duty to uphold. The proper remedy is to find a position for Mr. Duncan where his irresponsibility can do no harm.

I have no doubt—

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope interjections will cease.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): Thank you, Mr. Speaker; your warning to Government members indicates their attitude to this debate, in which they have not taken the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Groom: There's nothing to answer.

Mr. BECKER: I would have thought that, with all the beatings of members of the Labor Party and their cohorts in political crime in this country, namely, certain sections

of the trade union movement, they would have taken the opportunity to have another look at the Federal Government's Budget and tell us how they represent their constituents and what they are doing on their behalf. I was concerned in studying the Budget documents that the Federal Treasurer said:

In relation to social welfare payments, the Government has also decided to extend the 1976 decision to subject to tax a wide range of social welfare payments; the other kinds of payments now to be subjected to tax, as from 1 November 1978, are the following: rehabilitation training allowance; rehabilitation living-away-from-home allowance; incentive allowance (rehabilitation); invalid pension for persons under age-pension age; sheltered employment allowance; repatriation service pension on account of unemployability or pulmonary tuberculosis for persons under age-pension age; tuberculosis allowance for persons under age-pension age; and tuberculosis housekeeper allowance. People in receipt of these payments will not be disadvantaged by comparison with other income recipients; almost all of those solely dependent on the benefit will be below the tax threshold; others will become liable for tax only if they have other income above their social welfare payments sufficient to bring them above the tax threshold. The gain to revenue from this proposal is estimated at \$3 000 000 in 1978-79 and \$5 000 000 in a full year.

When my attention was drawn to this matter, I wrote a letter to the Federal Treasurer (Mr. Howard). I did not pull any punches in the letter, because I was annoyed to think that the Federal Government had been advised to use the invalid pension, sheltered workshop allowances, and other allowances to the disabled as a method of taxing. I was delighted this evening, on listening to the news on 5DN, to hear that the Federal Government has reversed its decision so that the taxation will not apply to certain allowances, particularly the sheltered employment allowance.

Unfortunately, the invalid pension will remain as part of the taxing benefit. Having accused the Federal Treasurer of penny-pinching from the disabled, I thought that I would have to send him a telegram tomorrow to get out of this, but my letter stands as regards the invalid pension. I was disappointed, on contacting certain sheltered workshops in Adelaide yesterday, when Bedford Industries informed me that about 80 per cent of the people it cares for would be affected by this tax (about 475 disabled people). The Phoenix Society estimated that between 50 and 60 per cent of the people in its workshops would also have been affected. The difficulty is not only taxing these people the \$7 or \$8 a week.

This is a miserable amount, but it is a tremendous sum for people who have to live below the poverty line for the whole of their lives. I will give credit to the Prime Minister that he has amended the Federal Budget: regrettably, the present State Government has never amended its Budget. Disabled people and people who are dependent on the invalid pension who need constant heat treatment will suffer most from the Electricity Trust increases announced before the State Budget was brought in. It is about time the State Government consulted with the Electricity Trust of South Australia and came to an arrangement whereby such disabled people are given some financial relief from the cost burden of electricity. It would not be a great amount, but at least it would be something. If the Federal Government can amend its current Budget, I challenge the State Government to amend its Budget. The State Government should re-examine the scale of electricity charges and offer a discounted rate to invalid pensioners. This would not break the State, and no-one in the community would begrudge giving these people some

financial assistance.

The public generally believes that most politicians are not honest. An issue that has grieved me for some time is the establishment of the Hospitals Fund in South Australia. At page 46, the Auditor-General's Report states that the Hospitals Fund is a deposit account maintained at the Treasury to which are credited moneys received pursuant to the following legislation: the Racing Act, the State Lotteries Act, and the Stamp Duties Act.

At the beginning of the financial year 1977-78, the balance of the Hospitals Fund was \$3 900 000. Regarding receipts from the South Australian Totalizator Agency Board, off-course statutory deductions totalled \$4 800 000; unclaimed dividends, \$400 000; and transfer of fractions, Dividends Adjustment Account, \$700 000. The racing clubs' unclaimed dividends amounted to \$90 000. The amount transferred from operations of the Lotteries Commission totalled \$6 900 000, and unclaimed prize money totalled \$6 000. Stamp duty on motor vehicle insurance policies amounted to \$1 800 000. Total receipts were \$15 000 000, and the total amount available was \$19 000 000, yet only \$15 000 000 was transferred to Consolidated Revenue as a contribution toward public hospital costs.

This is where the deception by the State Government comes in. Most people in this community believe that when they buy lottery tickets and T.A.B. tickets and they do not claim their dividends, or when they pay stamp duty on insurance for motor vehicles, all the money goes to various charities. Everybody believes that lottery profits go to hospitals, but in fact they go direct to general revenue via the Hospitals Fund. The Government may as well abolish the Hospitals Fund, because it serves no purpose; it is a book entry that deceives the people of this State.

We have a clear statement by the Auditor-General that money was credited to general revenue as a contribution to public hospital costs. It is neither here nor there; it is all put into the wash, and it is still up to the Government to decide how it will allocate this money.

Dr. Eastick: It reduces the money they pay out of Consolidated Revenue.

Mr. BECKER: That is right. The Government has to find less from Consolidated Revenue for the running of public hospitals and other hospitals. It also reduces the amount that the Government has to give to various welfare and charitable organisations. I am disgusted when I look at the amount paid to some of these organisations.

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

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): It was obvious a few weeks ago that the State Government was going to spend some time in decrying the efforts of the Federal Government in order to defend inadequacies in the State Budget. At that time I commented in the *Border Watch* that the campaign to organise factory gate meetings would meet with lamentable failure. It is very pleasing to see that the Australian Council of Trade Unions membership voted unanimously against a national strike in Australia, against the Federal Budget. I am not going to suggest that the members who voted against a national strike were saying they were pleased with the Federal Budget, because members of this side have expressed some displeasure with certain aspects of that Budget over the past few weeks.

My faith in the common sense of the general working person has been thoroughly vindicated by the decision to which I have referred. The decision clearly tells the State and the Federal Governments to get on with the job in

hand; that is, resolving our problems, instead of expecting people to stop work, thereby creating further problems. If the people had to bear further expense, there would be one more burden for the housewife. A commonsense decision has been handed down, and it is now up to the State and Federal Governments to get on with the job in a spirit of co-operation, rather than bickering.

An issue which has been troubling members of the South Australian section of the Library Association of Australia for about 18 months is the appointment of a Deputy Librarian to the State Library. The Minister of Education should recognise that when we lost a person of the calibre of Mr. Sharman, the former Deputy Librarian, it was a considerable loss to sustain. It is similar to a major industry losing a senior executive and then having to soldier on with a diminished staff for 18 months. The L.A.A. asked me over a year ago to inquire into the progress that was being made with the appointment of a successor. The Minister assured me about 12 months ago that the position had been advertised, a person had been interviewed, and an appointment would be made in the near future, but we still do not have a Deputy State Librarian.

The most recent reply that I received from the Minister stated that an appointment had been made in August 1977, but the person had declined the appointment five months later; this seems to be a long while for somebody to make his mind up. More importantly, the position has been held vacant since December 1977 pending the completion of a Public Service Board review of the Libraries Department. This raises the question of whether there is going to be a major overhaul of the Libraries Branch and whether some form of libraries commission is being considered, with the Libraries Board usurping the powers held by the Senior Librarian and the Deputy Librarian.

For almost a century the South Australian libraries system has been handicapped by the strength of the former Institute library system in South Australia. Here we have a move where, for 18 months—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Come on!

Mr. ALLISON: If the Minister knew anything about librarianship, he would know that there is no question about that. The Minister has obviously not studied the pros and cons of it. The strength of the Institute certainly prevented the development of the South Australian libraries system in the country for a free library service, which is what country areas really need.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You were a councillor at Mount Gambier involved in that situation.

Mr. ALLISON: We voted for the establishment of a free library service in Mount Gambier, even before I went on to the city council. The Minister is therefore placing the blame on the wrong foot altogether and is several years out. For the Government not to have a Deputy State Librarian now for 18 months places South Australia at a far greater disadvantage than that in which it should have been placed. It is little wonder that the Librarians Association is expressing continued concern about that matter. I hope that something is done and that the Public Service Board review of the situation will happen soon. No date has been set for handing down the decision, so I assume that the appointment could be a considerable time away.

Another issue that has concerned me over the past few weeks is the retirement of the Premier's Youth Work Unit from active service in country areas. Admittedly, we still have the CITY projects, which are working successfully in some parts of Adelaide. I do not know whether it is an admission of failure by the Premier's Department. I hope

it is not, because the money that was committed to projects in my own area on the Youth Work Unit by the Premier's Department certainly had some teething problems. We have established a strong non-political committee comprising businessmen and members of the community in the South-East to oversee the work of the Mount Gambier Youth Committee.

We appreciated the money that was being put into that project by the Premier's Department. We certainly had problems in working out how best to deploy the troops down in that area. Just at a time when the problems are being resolved the Premier has abdicated the field to the Commonwealth Youth Support Scheme and his own Youth Work Unit members are being phased out from active service, when we are in a critical situation.

I hope that the newly reformed youth work unit, whatever its name is to be in Adelaide, will not simply be a research bureau but that it will again become involved actively in collaboration with and not in competition with the Commonwealth Youth Support Scheme. There is scope for State and Federal Governments to get stuck into this problem and to help our young people who are faced with unemployment.

Mr. Whitten: They spend 50c a day.

Mr. ALLISON: I do not care how much the honourable member is saying is being spent on this youth work scheme but, irrespective of whether the State or Federal Government puts funds into the Mt. Gambier scheme, out of the 170 young people who came in voluntarily to do work under the projects, more than 70, because of the experience and modest training they were given by volunteers and paid staff, actually found employment. In fact, we were not baby sitting, as it was originally suggested this scheme might be doing, but we were training these people into industry and commerce.

The measure of success is such that we are upset to think that the Premier's Youth Work Unit has pulled out when success was being registered. We hope that the Premier has not considered that the funds put into the South-East were a failure. We can assure him that they were not. We appreciate what was done by the State Government and we continually appreciate what is being done by the Commonwealth. We are helping young people into jobs instead of just baby sitting.

Totalizator Agency Board turnover in 1975 amounted to \$78 091 000; \$64 000 000 was paid to investors; \$4 800 000 was paid into Government revenue, which represented 6.19 per cent of the turnover; and the distribution to the clubs was \$2 500 000, or 3.21 per cent of turnover. Out of \$97 000 000 gross turnover in 1977, \$79 000 000 was returned to investors; \$6 008 000 went to Government revenue, which is 6.42 per cent; and the clubs received only \$2 500 000, or 2.64 per cent of turnover.

I strongly suggest that, if the Government is not going to kill the goose that is laying the golden egg (the clubs who are conducting the meetings, and providing Totalizator Agency Board betting on course), it might consider relinquishing some of the 6.42 per cent and giving 1 per cent back to the clubs so that the goose can continue to lay those golden eggs for the general revenue of South Australia. I suggest that that is the important issue.

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

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I bring to the attention of the House a matter that was brought to my notice several times over the weekend. It relates to the policy of the Community Welfare Department in sending single parent families to Whyalla. I was approached by a member of a fairly large voluntary organisation about this matter: I will not mention the name of the organisation, but it has a fine

reputation in this town for assisting underprivileged people in the community.

The matter that concerned this person, who is Chairman of the organisation in Whyalla, is the large number of these people who have been brought into the area to occupy vacant Housing Trust houses, of which there are many in the town. I have no objection to that because it is a good idea to house people in these houses, otherwise the houses would be left vacant and the trust would not receive anything for them. In addition, these people are certainly entitled to accommodation.

On another occasion I shall have a little more to say about the underprivileged in the community and where I believe several of these people could be transferred to vacant houses in Whyalla. However, this person is concerned that, when many of these people arrive in the town, they are virtually destitute, and the Community Welfare Department has been suggesting that this organisation could provide these people with food parcels. The organisation does not mind doing this as long as funds are available.

What concerns the organisation is that it is being called on to provide an ever-increasing service. The organisation believes that one town should not receive so many of these people and that the burden should be more evenly distributed across the State. This person is concerned about the policy, not that his organisation would refuse to assist these people. He believes that it is not a good policy to have many of these people congregated in a small area. Not only is it not good for the environment of the local area concerned but it also places a heavy burden on voluntary organisations in this town. I hope that the Minister will consider this matter and ascertain whether the department needs to vary slightly its policy on it.

Mr. Keneally: If there are no houses elsewhere to house these people, where do you suggest they should go?

Mr. GUNN: I have not raised the matter with the deliberate intention of criticising the Minister. I was asked to raise it. I am fully aware of the housing problem throughout South Australia and that no other houses would be available. I pointed this out to this person. The organisation has not refused to help, but this problem is placing an ever-increasing burden on its resources. The organisation has been supplying food parcels on a regular basis to these people and it is concerned about it.

Many times the Community Welfare Department has suggested to the people concerned that they can get assistance from that organisation.

The second matter I raise is the concern expressed about the Government's decision earlier this year to export jobs from Whyalla, when it granted contracts for the new powerhouse to Japanese and interstate firms and the effect that that is to have on Reyrolle Parsons. I was pleased to hear on the radio that the Premier announced today that a small contract has been let to that company in Whyalla, but I was perturbed when I heard the manager of that company say that many people will be retrenched by Christmas as the contract the company received is only a small one compared to others let elsewhere.

Mr. Keneally: Did you see the tendered price?

Mr. GUNN: It is interesting to note the attitude the honourable member takes now, and compare it to that of the member for Whyalla and what they have said about the shipyards: they have been quite hypocritical about it. Because of the attitude that the Government has expressed in relation to the closure of the shipyards when those shipyards could not compete even with a heavy subsidy, it ought to put into effect the policy it has been preaching to the Federal Government when letting its own contracts: either the Federal Government was right, and

the State Government was wrong. It is no good the member for Stuart parroting on, as he normally does in these matters. The Government has been proved to be completely hypocritical in its attitude. I believe that it is high time the Government reviewed the tendering process and gave preference to South Australian based firms.

Mr. Max Brown: At all costs?

Mr. GUNN: It is interesting to note that the great industries that the Playford Government established in this State are being closed and destroyed by actions of a socialist Government. It will not be long before the people know which Government built South Australia and which Government is going to wreck South Australia.

I refer now to the attitude taken by the South Australian Minister of Agriculture in a recent matter. The first action the Premier should take in relation to the Hon. Mr. Chatterton is to sack him and sack his wife. It is well known throughout South Australia that Mrs. Chatterton is the force behind the throne in the Agriculture and Fisheries Department. She is not only despised, but wherever one goes there is criticism of her. Most people regard her as the one who makes the decisions.

Mr. McRae: Did you say she is despised?

Mr. GUNN: Yes, in many circles.

Mr. McRae: Despised for what?

Mr. GUNN: Because of her interfering attitude, and she is a busybody.

Mr. KENEALLY: On on a point of order, Mr. Speaker! The statement by the honourable member that Mrs. Chatterton is thoroughly despised throughout the State is a reflection on Mrs. Chatterton and I wonder whether that is allowed under Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. The honourable member must stand by what he said.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: It's allowable but despicable.

Mr. GUNN: I make no apology

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: He wouldn't know how.

Mr. GUNN: I suggest that the Minister gets out of his cocoon and goes around the country and talks to people who are involved with agriculture and fisheries. I was present at an agricultural show on Saturday, and a prominent person involved with agriculture said to me:

It's about time you blokes did something to get the department back on its feet, because the current administration is absolutely shocking.

In dealings fishermen have had with the Agriculture and Fisheries Department, they know the person who has been making many decisions. Why is this person sitting in on interviews? Why is she making comments to fishermen around the State? That is not her role; it is the role of the Minister. I think it is quite improper for the Premier to employ a Minister's wife in his office to advise him on matters under her husband's control. I hope that the member for Stuart received a letter from the West Coast Crayfishermen's Association today, and I hope the Minister reads it. I believe that if members read this document, they will understand the sort of problems to which I referred earlier. The letter states;

I would ask you as State Premier, to have a very good look at the policies of your Government on licensing and fisheries of this State. The Minister's attitude and the running and administration of the Fisheries Department are an abomination and cannot be tolerated by any responsible section of industry. Bungling and wastage in such areas as research by the *Joseph Verco* only enforce such stands as that evidenced by the present prawn licence dispute.

On behalf of this association, I ask that a responsible commonsense approach be adopted by the Government to fisheries management through consultation with industry at all levels. Industry has acted most responsibly, but is tired of

being let down on all sides by the Government. The rest of the letter is interesting. The interference and incompetence of the present Minister cannot be tolerated any longer. I say to the Government that if it wants to see the industry develop—

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

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): When the Premier delivered this Budget speech, he told the people of South Australia that he could not do anything about following the example of other States regarding succession duties. That statement did not fall on deaf ears. If one examines the rural press this week, one can realise that some positive action is being taken by people who are more generally affected by this iniquitous form of capital taxation than perhaps are some other people. I am referring to rural properties.

Advertised this week in quite a prominent way are about 94 South Australian properties. We also see advertised in the rural press about 44 interstate properties. This is a new innovation, a sampling of the South Australian market by those States that have already abolished succession duties. Real estate agencies in Queensland, Western Australia, and New South Wales (God bless Mr. Renshaw and Mr. Wran for their action in this direction), and Victoria have advertised 44 properties in the rural press this week. That is something we have not seen in recent weeks, and it is not merely coincidental that it follows within two weeks of the Premier making his announcement.

During the past month, I have been approached by six young people from this State for advice, asking me to make representation to the Director of Agriculture in New South Wales and the Department of Agriculture in Queensland, about seasonal records of districts such as Goondiwindi, Emerald, and Warwick in Queensland, and several districts in New South Wales. These young people have seen the writing on the wall. They were expecting an announcement by the Premier regarding capital taxation in South Australia.

However, his reasons are well known to those who sit behind him and they will not have a bar of the abolition of succession duties. A total of 94 extensive properties in South Australia are listed for sale at prices totalling about \$7 000 000. The valuation of the properties would be twice that. Obviously, there will not be quick sales, but people on the land are considering moving out of the State. It is all very well for members opposite to chide the member for Coles for saying that people are moving interstate because of the actions of the Dunstan Government.

Mr. Keneally: How does the net increase in migration to South Australia fit in with that?

Mr. RODDA: That has not much bearing on the matter. They could be hippies, or people sitting on the beach.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Come on!

Mr. RODDA: The Minister of Education condemns himself by his utterance, but he must face facts. Queensland does not swell great in the breasts of members opposite, but in Goondiwindi in that State 9 070 hectares have been offered at \$35 a hectare, or a total of about \$318 000. I have looked at the credentials of that property, and it has enormous potential.

Mr. Keneally: Are you leaving us?

Mr. RODDA: No, I do not believe in running away from a sinking ship, but we do not blame young people when they hear statements such as they have heard from this Government. When these things happen two weeks after the announcement by the Premier, the Leader of the Government, the debonair "with it" Premier, we see that the announcement is scaring people out of the State and

will bring about dis-investment. If the 94 holdings that have been advertised this week are sold (and they will be), there will be arrangements for finance involved. When people are paying for heavy capital, they have not spare funds to put into productivity, and productivity will fall.

The stated \$700 000 000 income to the State will not occur. The backward policy of the Government, the policy that is out of tune with policy in the rest of Australia, will have a deleterious effect on the income-earning of the State. The member for Stuart, who has not been impractical in some suggestions regarding rural South Australia, should be able to exert influence on his colleagues, but he tries to justify them. He may be in the running for appointment to the Ministry and it seems to me from what is going on in Ministerial circles that it would not be as silly as it sounds to make him Minister of Agriculture. Judging by the way he performed in Whyalla talking to fishermen on a hot ship, he probably could deal with the fishermen better than can the present Minister. At least he did not end up fighting with people. I think the maize statement by the member for Stuart amazed us. One of his first statements here was that he would step up maize production.

I am sure that, when the Government looks at statements in the rural press this week, it will find that people in the rural sector in this State are concerned. This week in my district land is being sold by public auction because of high succession duties, and we should be concerned when we see valuable and lucrative investment being fragmented because of an iniquitous capital tax. That is why such reports have appeared in the rural press this week. I hope that this plea will not fall on deaf ears as far as the Premier and his Government are concerned.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I cannot let this opportunity pass without commenting on the Premier's statement to the press this afternoon. Earlier today I pointed out that his claim was completely false in regard to my having been referring to only the Industries Assistance Commission finding. In fact, the Premier has not referred to the actual I.A.C. recommendation. It is not only a reduction from 65 per cent to 20 per cent *ad valorem* that is involved. As I pointed out last week, that is part of the I.A.C. recommendation.

The second part of the recommendation is that, subject to the 20 per cent, a bounty of 5c a litre be paid for a limited period on orange juice made from fruit delivered to processors. Therefore, at present the recommendation of the I.A.C. is for more protection to the citrus industry than was the South Australian submission and recommendation before the Premier altered it this afternoon, because the tariff of 20 per cent on an import f.o.b. in Australia at 11c a litre amounts to 2.2c a litre, plus the bounty of 5c, or a total of 7.2c.

The South Australian Government submission was either 25 per cent *ad valorem* or 6c a litre, one or the other, but the I.A.C. recommendation was that the two be joined, that there be the 20 per cent plus the bounty of 5c in the first year and reducing over three years. Therefore, the I.A.C. recommendation was for greater protection than was that of the South Australian Government. It is obvious from the Premier's statement this afternoon that he has not looked into the matter closely enough to know the position.

Mr. McRae: Are you saying that prior to the submission by the Government—

Mr. ARNOLD: No. Before this afternoon, when the Premier altered the South Australian Government submission, the I.A.C. recommendation was for greater protection than was that of the State Government. The

South Australian Government is recommending either 25 per cent *ad valorem* tariff protection or 6c a litre single strength orange juice, but the I.A.C. recommended a 20 per cent *ad valorem* tariff, plus a 5c bounty, which meant that it recommended a 7.2c a litre tariff protection in total. As a result of last week's urgency motion, the Government has now changed that 6c and recommends 8c, which is slightly more than the I.A.C. recommends.

We can ignore the 35 per cent *ad valorem* tariff because there is no relationship between the two. As the price at which the citrus juice will come into Australia during the next 12 months is said to be between 11c and 14c, we can forget the 35 per cent; that is neither here nor there. What is important at this point is the 8c that the State Government now recommends. This is quite a major move. Obviously, members of Cabinet have closed ranks around the Minister of Agriculture. It was obvious on Thursday afternoon in this House that a number of Ministers were not pleased that the Minister of Agriculture was abandoned by the Premier, as a result of the urgency motion, and quite obviously pressure has been put on the Premier to endeavour to protect the Minister.

Mr. Tonkin: There was a difference between his performance today and Thursday.

Mr. ARNOLD: A marked difference, and obviously pressure has been put on the Premier in Cabinet to amend the situation and to save the Minister of Agriculture. That has been quite clearly borne out by the definite move to go from 6c to 8c; it might not sound much but it is a significant move. That is a key point. While the Premier made numerous accusations this afternoon, an important point was that the Premier said that the quota would have a very detrimental effect on small growers in the Riverland, particularly the ethnic community. The Premier is obviously confusing the quota to be applied to imports as being a quota to be imposed on the grower. They are poles apart. He has totally confused the situation.

The quota we refer to is a quota on the imports of juice from foreign countries. Unfortunately, he has confused the issue and believes that we must be talking about a quota that will apply to each grower in a way similar to that in which wheat quotas applied some years ago. The quota on import and tariff protection have far greater benefits for the small operator than they do for the large operator, who has a better chance of making ends meet than does the small operator.

Just on that point, the Premier clearly displayed to the House that he had very little understanding of what it was all about, as he confused the issue to such a degree, applying the quota as a quota on production for growers and not as a quota on the imports of juice into this country. It is extremely unfortunate that totally uniformed comments should emanate from any Leader, whether it be a Premier or Prime Minister.

Mr. Millhouse: A lot of people say that Malcolm Fraser makes them from time to time.

Mr. ARNOLD: They come from many people, but I am concerned about the comments from the Premier. Unfortunately, the Premier is not doing his own homework. He is relying on others to do that for him and they have completely misinformed him about the true situation. Unfortunately, he has not been able to grasp the threads of the problems that exist in the industry.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

In Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: With the concurrence of honourable members, I intend to deal with the Appropriation Bill

(No. 2) in total first followed by the Public Purposes Loan Bill.

Schedule.

Legislative Council, \$237 000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: An enormous increase has taken place in the cost of Parliament over the period that I have been here. I know that as a rule these lines go through with a minimum of or no debate. I suppose I may breach the rules of the club in drawing attention to this matter. Is it in order for me to canvass all the lines under the heading "Legislature" at this stage?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Mitcham should speak to the lines that are listed under "Legislative Council". If he is able to relate his comments to any of the items or lines under "Legislative Council", he is in order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In due course I want to draw attention to the enormous increase there has been in the cost of Parliament since the mid-1950's, when I first came into this Chamber.

Mr. Becker interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Hanson probably enjoys being a member of Parliament and is probably happy to take all the perks that come his way. I have to protest, because in my view Parliament is now far too expensive for the value that people get from it. Under this line, we propose to spend \$48 969. In the 1954-55 year the amount voted was—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are dealing with the line concerning the Legislative Council.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The amount proposed is \$237 000, yet in 1954-55 it was £8 465 (about \$17 000). That is a great increase. Taking the increase at the beginning of the life of this Government in 1970-71, the total proposed was under \$50 000. In the past eight years under this Government there has been a four-fold increase in the cost of the Legislative Council in this State. I draw attention to this because, although the value of money has halved in that time, the cost of the Legislative Council to this State has greatly increased, and I do not know what value anyone in South Australia is getting for such extra expenditure. This is typical of all lines dealing with the Legislature. Personally, I believe the trend should be halted. We are taking too much to ourselves. Indeed, most of us, and I do not exclude myself for the purposes of this argument, are prepared to take all we can get, and we are not giving value to the people of South Australia for what we are getting.

Mr. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, so-called, makes some acid interjection.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Honourable members may think it is right, and I know that I am not popular in this place for drawing attention to this matter, but I believe that we should have greater regard to the money that is spent on Parliament. This is the first item to which I refer concerning this matter, and I intend to draw similar attention to each of these items as we go through the Estimates.

The CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member intends to do that, he will have to stick strictly within the lines under discussion, the present line involves the Legislative Council. The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr. EVANS: I do not disagree at all that costs have increased and that the amount involved under this line has substantially increased. People know what my approach has been where the opportunity has been given, but I will not expand on that because most of my approaches have been followed correctly through direct approaches to the

Government. However, although I have some respect for the ability of the honourable member who has just spoken, if every member in this Chamber operated on the same basis and were in a private practice and did not come into the House until the courts finished, Parliament would not work at all from 2 p.m. to 4.30 p.m., or even 5 p.m., on most sitting days.

I object to a member using this place to make such attacks when that member does not admit exploiting the situation more than do most other honorable members. I hope that the honorable member will admit openly that, if every honorable member operated on a similar basis, Parliament would not operate between 2 p.m. and 5 p.m. on most sitting days.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot let that matter pass. I thought that the member for Fisher was going to rebut what I had said or suggest what we could do. Of course, he merely took the opportunity to make a personal attack on me. I want to make this quite clear, although I acknowledge that it is quite impossible in the nature of our society for this to happen: in my view every member of Parliament would be a better member if he had some other job as well as to that of representing his district in this place.

True, I am one of those fortunate enough to be able to combine representation in Parliament with a profession, and I do not seek to avoid that for a moment, but I believe that I play a fairly effective role in this place. Certainly, when I am here I am chided for not being present on other occasions, but I suspect that sometimes members wish I were not here at all (that is not suspicion, it is a pretty well-founded belief).

That is my view of the situation: we would all be better if we had some other job as well as this one, because this is a pretty artificial life. If one is absolutely dependent upon it, as a member who has no other job is, it must sway one's judgment in making decisions on matters, because one's whole economic future, and security, as well as that of one's family, is at stake. No-one can tell me differently, because I have tried it. I have been a full-time member of Parliament in my time. I am not now, and I hope that I never will be again.

Mr. Chapman interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Alexandra is in the same position as I am. He has independent means and can afford to chide me. I know what it is like to have only a Parliamentary income to live on, and I know what an influence that is on the making of decisions.

Mr. Hemmings: When was that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Between about 1965 and 1970 when we went out of office. For about five years I was almost entirely dependent on my Parliamentary income. No fair-minded person either inside or outside this Chamber can deny what I have just said. We would all be better off if we were not dependent on the game as we are. The member for Fisher may say what he has said about me, but I make no apologies for the fact that I am able to combine a profession, as the Premier used to do before he took office and as other members on both sides of the House have always done. That is no answer to my criticism that so many people now are taking gross advantage of the fact that they are members of Parliament.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the Committee that I did allow criticism of the member for Mitcham. I was probably wrong for doing that, and the honourable member had the opportunity to reply. However, I suggest that in future all comments on the Estimates be confined strictly to the lines. The member for Hanson.

Mr. BECKER: That is exactly what I was going to seek your ruling on, Sir. The statements of the member for

Mitcham in criticising another Chamber and the role of members of Parliament do not relate to this vote at all, as it deals with the salaries of the Clerk of the Legislative Council, the Clerk Assistant and Black Rod, the Accountant to the Legislature and clerical and general staff, and with terminal leave payments, pay-roll tax administrative expenses, purchase of office machines and equipment, Select Committees, travelling expenses and fees, and so forth, which would be operating expenses of any modern Parliament. What is the reason for the large increase in terminal leave payments (\$35 600 this financial year), whereas, in 1977-78, \$24 200 was voted and actual payments were \$3 442?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The actual expenditure was applicable to a messenger and an anticipated payment to the Clerk of the Council that did not eventuate. There was proposed expenditure in respect of terminal leave payment, in lieu of long service leave and accumulated recreation leave, to the retired Clerk of the Legislative Council (Mr. Drummond) being paid in 1978-79.

Line passed.

House of Assembly, \$417 000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I point out the enormous increase that has occurred in this line as well. The amount is to be \$417 000. In 1970-71, it was \$102 938—a four-fold increase in eight years. In 1955-56, the amount was £13 080. One can see again how the cost of this Chamber has increased. Frankly, for all the paraphernalia we now have to help us with our jobs, such as electorate secretaries in offices and researchers in the library, I do not believe we are as a whole better equipped to do our job or that we do it any better than we ever did. One specific matter I want to raise is the practice and procedure of the House with regard to the reception of petitions.

Mr. BECKER: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, will the honourable member tell us which line he is considering?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not accept that as a point of order. I was about to point out to the honourable member for Mitcham that the matter he wishes to discuss, in the view of the Chair, is not in order.

Mr. TONKIN: I refer to "Public Accounts Committee Members' fees" and note that the same allocation is made for the coming year as was made last year. Does the Premier envisage making changes to the committee which would necessitate changes in the estimated expenditure for 1978-79? He may not have been aware that this afternoon I made some proposals for changes in the composition of the committee, together with some suggestions for increased clerical support and investigative research officers. I believe that that is an important matter. While it is not often that I advocate an increase in staff establishment, it seems to me that in this instance the committee is doing an important job in this Parliament and has the potential for doing an even better job. It could be made even more effective and efficient if given additional help. Has the Government considered the suggestion that there should be three members from each side of the House, with an independent Chairman, possibly the Auditor-General, on the committee?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government does not believe that a change of that kind is warranted. The committee was set up after years of debate in this place and after investigation of similar committees elsewhere, and I believe that it is properly constituted. Additional staff for the committee would not come under the line to which the Leader has referred, which refers only to members' fees; it would come under the provision for clerical and general staff. However, the Government

would not consider an alteration in the provision unless there was a request from the committee to the Government. That request would then be reported on to the Government by the Chairman of the Public Service Board before the Government made any determination in the matter. That has not happened. In relation to this line, there was a slight decrease in actual expenditure last year because of an absence from full membership during part of the year. This year, it appears that the forecasts have returned to normal.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I note that the Clerk of the House of Assembly received a payment above that designated in the vote last year, and that this year the payment is somewhat less than that designated last year. Can the Premier explain the variation? I have also detected that the Clerk is absent from the House. Where is he?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Questions as to the whereabouts of the Clerk should be directed to the Speaker and not to me. The expenditure is greater than that voted because of national wage increases and arrears. It differs from the amount received by the Clerk of the Legislative Council, as that officer received less than the full year's salary, as he ceased office on 26 June. The proposed amount is the normal amount, based on salaries applicable as at 30 June.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am surprised that Liberal Party members have not followed up the Leader's muted complaint about the Public Accounts Committee. I do not support his suggestion that there should be greater staff for it. If the members did their own work, that would be all right. I am not a member of that committee.

Mr. Nankivell: If you were on it, you'd appreciate what is being asked for.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps I am wrong.

Mr. Becker interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Hanson is still sore because his own members would not put him on the prostitution Select Committee. I take it that that was the reason for his interjection.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member's comment is out of order. I want to bring to the attention of the Committee the fact that I will not allow a full-scale debate on the effectiveness or otherwise of the Public Accounts Committee. We are dealing with the salaries of the committee and, if that is the line to which the honourable member is referring, I will allow him the same latitude as I gave the honourable Leader.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As I understand it, the real problem with the committee is that Government members use their majority on it to block the presentation of reports to the House.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable gentleman is attempting to broaden the debate on the Public Accounts Committee. The activities of individual members of the Public Accounts Committee have no relevance whatsoever to the matters that we are discussing now. If the honourable member wishes to continue to discuss this matter, he will have to confine himself to the salaries.

Mr. Millhouse: I was just trying to help the Leader.

Mr. TONKIN: I accept the Premier's remark that any further discussion on Public Accounts Committee support staff, or otherwise, is more properly directed when the appropriate line comes forward. I now refer to the total salaries, particularly in relation to the general staff, the administrative expenses, and the purchase of office machines and equipment. I want to relate those items back to the total allowance for increased wage and salary rates of \$43 000 000, which, as the Premier will recall, was allocated last year, and compare it with the \$33 000 000

that has been allocated this year as a contingency.

I refer also to the allowance for increased prices of \$5 000 000 which was voted last year, and I want to compare that with \$2 500 000 proposed for this year. Those figures appear in the summary on page 4, but nevertheless they apply to these items, because they form part of the salaries and wages and purchase of office equipment. It is significant that the amounts that have been allocated to cover potential increases in salaries and in prices are considerably less than they were last year, as shown in last year's papers. I therefore take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the Federal Government for doing what the Premier has referred to (and I believe it was the only good word he had for the Federal Government) in containing inflation and bringing it down to its present level, and it is still falling. This is reflected considerably in the two sums allocated for potential increases in the coming year.

Mr. BECKER: What is the provision for accumulated leave and accumulated long service leave? Have all the staff taken their leave entitlements and, if they have not, what is being done to bring the leave entitlements up to date?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The terminal leave payments do not apply to long service leave where that leave is taken during the normal course of the year. They refer to leave on termination of employment. It is not anticipated that there will be any case for making any terminal leave payments this year; that is why we have not made any provision for it. Long service leave is normally expected to be taken during employment, and that is provided for under the general line.

Mr. BECKER: Would that be within administration expenses? There must be provision for leave somewhere.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I refer you to the item "Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms, Clerical and General Staff".

Mr. BECKER: The Clerk is due to retire within this financial year. I find it difficult to reconcile the figures. Has all leave due been taken? Has there been any accumulated leave? What long service leave is due?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no information at present on that subject, but I will inquire for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Parliamentary Library, \$177 000.

Mr. TONKIN: The allocation for library staff represents a considerable increase over last year's actual payments for library staff. How will the additional money be spent?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Terminal leave payments were not anticipated during 1977-78 but one staff member retired on medical grounds, necessitating a payment in lieu of long service leave and the payment of the balance of recreation leave due. The proposed amount required for 1978-79 in respect of impending terminal leave payments for other staff members during the year accounts for the remainder.

Mr. TONKIN: I find that hard to reconcile. First of all, however, I again pay a tribute to the Parliamentary Librarian for the work that he and all the staff in the Parliamentary Library do. The research staff situation, and I recall this vividly, is not as good as it should be. The people who perform research for us do an exceptionally fine job, but (and I am speaking for members of the Opposition here) those people are under extreme pressure. I can recall applying to the Premier for additional staff for my office, but basically to service the Opposition members and the Shadow Cabinet. That application was considered, and I understand that a scheme for providing research staff for the Parliamentary

Library was promoted instead, and I had no quarrel with that. Nevertheless, there has been some discussion about the salary of the Parliamentary Librarian and whether the duties he performs are adequately remunerated by that salary scale. There was discussion as to how many people were on staff and whether or not the number of people on staff called for a higher classification for the Librarian. I presume that little increase has been made. It seems we have no additional research staff, even though there was a suggestion last year that we were going to get additional research staff.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have already explained to the honourable member why the increased vote has been provided, and it is basically as a result—

Mr. Tonkin: I accept that. Does that mean that there will be no additional research staff?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not proposed to increase research staff, and I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition, who is constantly complaining when we propose mere alterations to the existing organisation of staff without appointing additional staff and who has constantly demanded that the Public Service and the public sector be reduced, when it comes to his own area of service, is assiduous in suggesting that we should appoint additional Public Service paid officers.

We are providing zero population growth. Facilities that had been provided to members of the Opposition are vastly in excess of those that were ever given by Liberal Governments to members of Parliament in this State.

Mr. Mathwin: Surely that applies to Government and Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Opposition should have adequate provision, and I believe that we have made it and made it for members opposite. Increases in staff were made under the Hall Government, particularly in the Premier's office but, I, as Leader of the Opposition, got an extra typiste and was refused the staff that I later granted to the Opposition because I knew that it was necessary.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SHEARERS ACCOMMODATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WOTTON (Murray): For some time in this House the Government has been crowing about the achievements of the State Government Insurance Commission. The Government has stated how proud it is of the profits that have recently been made by the commission. I refer to matters about the commission about which I am somewhat concerned. It was reported in the *Sunday Mail* of 17 September that 40 people had been fined for not notifying the commission that a person had been injured in an

accident in which he had been involved. It would be interesting to know how many people were prosecuted for failing to report an accident, which involved bodily injury to their insurance companies before the commission's monopoly.

Section 124 of the Motor Vehicles Act has been in force for between 15 and 20 years, and the police steadfastly refuse to prosecute people under this section for failing to report an accident even though, in the case of a private insurer, it may have involved the insurer in a greater liability not only for the injury suffered by the other driver but also for a passenger. The S.G.I.C. is similarly not prejudiced by insuring both cars. It is automatically liable for all passenger injury claims. Because the Police Department and the commission are both State Government departments, a driver may be excused for believing that making a report to only one of them was sufficient, especially as, in reporting the matter to the commission, he is providing information that can later be used to default his claim if he is injured. Surely, this reeks of bureaucratic harassment of the private citizen.

I have also been concerned about the recent advertising programme with which the commission has been associated, because it has been misleading. In several radio advertisements the commission advertises that its policies cover vandalism as well as malicious damage. As I understand the law they are the same. This is somewhat akin to saying that the policy covers ignition as well as fire. How long would the Trade Practices Commission let a private insurer get away with that? I am concerned about this advertising, because I see it as being scandalous, to say the least.

That is why I was interested to learn that the Life Underwriters Association had written to the commission about this matter. The association believes that, if private companies advertised in the same biased manner as the commission does, they would have received a bullet long ago. The council of the Life Underwriters Association approached the commissioners of the S.G.I.C. seeking a meeting on the question of advertising ethics. The following reply was received to this request:

I am acknowledging your letter of 27 June 1978 addressed to Mr. K. L. Milne, who is at the moment overseas. Your letter was placed before a meeting of the commission yesterday, and, after due consideration by members of the commission, it was resolved that the commission was not prepared to meet with your association.

I, as does the Life Underwriters Association, believe that that decision is rough, because it could have given private companies the opportunity to discuss a matter that concerns them. As I said earlier, if any private company advertised as the commission does, it would have copped the lot from those in the industry who would rightly have objected to this biased type of advertising.

Another matter, which has been brought to my notice and has concerned me, has also concerned the person who has received this letter. The letter was sent to a constituent of the Premier; she lives in Royston Park. To many people, this letter would be acceptable. It is a chain letter. We all know that many similar letters are circulated throughout the community. The interesting thing about this letter is that it came in an envelope stamped, "If not delivered within seven days return to the State Administration Centre, Victoria Square, Adelaide." As we are debating the Budget, I presume that this is how much of the Government's finance disappears down the sink. The letter in part is as follows:

While in the Phillipines, General Welch lost his life six days after he received this letter. He failed to circulate it. However, before his death he received \$770 000.

Before I go further—

Members interjecting:

Mr. WOTTON:—I want to make the point that the person who received this letter is an elderly person who took it to heart and was genuinely concerned about it, because she received it in a State Government stamped envelope. In addition, she was concerned about what the letter contained. The letter continues:

After a few days, you will get a surprise. This is true, even if you aren't superstitious. Take note of the following: Constantine Diaz received the chain in 1953. He asked his secretary to make twenty copies and send them. A few days later he won a lottery for two million dollars in his country. Carlo CREDIT, an office employee, received the chain. He forgot it and in a few days lost his job. Five days later he got an even better job, after he found the chain and sent it to twenty people. Dolin Moirqhile received the chain and for not believing it, threw it away. Nine days later he died. For no reason whatsoever must this chain be broken:

Members opposite can go on with all that tripe but, as I pointed out, it was a constituent of the Premier who contacted me and who was very concerned about having received the letter. The Premier should be more careful about what sort of letters are issued by Government offices in this way. We want to know more about them.

Members interjecting:

Mr. WOTTON: The Attorney-General is not very concerned about the State. The letter just happens to be in a State Government envelope. If that did not come from his office, I would like to know what did. The next matter I bring to the notice of the House is my concern about the Lands Department. Last month I wrote to the Minister seeking information on behalf of a constituent who wished to buy some land at Mypolonga. An application which had been submitted to the Land Board in Adelaide had been rejected on the ground that the applicant did not own land at Mypolonga and a present policy did not permit the selling of small rural allotments to outsiders.

I do not intend to go into much detail about this matter, but I sent that letter to the Minister. About a month later I received a reply, not from the Minister, but from a Mr. G. Piscioneri, for the Manager of the Central South-Eastern Region.

I do not know what this gentleman does. I respect the fact that he may hold an important position in that department, but the point I make is that it is rough when a member is seeking information from the Minister and the Minister does not reply to a letter. No reference can be made to the Minister in this regard. It was probably a clerk from his department who answered a letter that I need to pass on to a constituent. I believe that this is not right and that it is a matter that the Government should look into.

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): Tonight I want to say how surprised I am that at last the Prime Minister has come around to speaking the truth.

Mr. Groom: That's new for him.

Mr. WHITTEN: It certainly is. I am surprised that, after all this time since the coup he perpetrated in 1975 in collaboration with the Governor-General, he has decided at last to speak a little bit of truth. Members will recall that in 1975, after 11 November, he talked about the unemployed, saying, "We will be generous to those who cannot get a job and want to work." Later, in 1977, he said that only under a Liberal, National Country Party Government would there be jobs for all who wanted to work. We know what happened. We have an unemployment figure that increased from 265 000 in June 1976 to 394 000 in June 1978. That is not the only untruth he told in 1975.

Mr. Wotton: Why don't you bring Uren over?

Mr. WHITTEN: I did not interject while the member for Murray spoke, but if he wishes to interject, that is O.K. by me, because I will dish out as much as he dishes out to me.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

Mr. WHITTEN: Let us look at the unemployment situation. There were 394 000 unemployed at the end of June this year; seasonally adjusted, that figure is 418 000.

I will continue what I started to say about Fraser and how surprised I was when he started to speak the truth. A report in today's *Financial Review*, headed "Fraser turns gloomy on jobs", states:

The Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser, publicly admitted for the first time yesterday that his pre-election predictions of a sustained fall in unemployment were being proved wrong by events. In doing so, Mr. Fraser moved to close the distance between himself and the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Mr. Street, on the unemployment outlook.

It is now clear that the major speech on unemployment which Mr. Street made in Parliament on 14 September has forced the Prime Minister out into the open.

Mr. Slater: Perhaps the Werriwa by-election had something to do with it.

Mr. WHITTEN: If we analyse the figures in Werriwa, we realise that the 11.7 per cent swing to the Labor Party was, in fact, a 15 per cent swing, as anyone with half a brain would see. The former member for Werriwa (Gough Whitlam) had a big personal following and, as a new man was coming in, that augers well for the Labor Party at the New South Wales election in a fortnight. I predict that Labor will have a majority of at least 15 in the New South Wales Parliament, and the next thing will be "Look out Dick Hamer", because we know the trouble he is in in Victoria.

I refer now to some of the untruths. In 1975, in his policy speech, Fraser said he would reduce the tax burden and fully index personal income tax for inflation over the next three years, but he did not keep that promise. One of these days, Fraser will be dinkum and say that he was as wrong there as he was on unemployment. When the people of Australia wake up, as they are starting to do now, he will be forced to tell some of the truth.

Fraser, at the prompting of Street, has admitted that early in the New Year there will be at least 500 000 unemployed. If we follow his projections, it seems that the number unemployed in 1981 will be between 600 000 and 700 000, and that is when we get the opportunity to throw Fraser out, where he belongs. Last month's figures from the Commonwealth Employment Service show that 3 246 people were registered as unemployed in my district and there were 36 job vacancies. The national average of the number of people chasing every job available is 22, but in Port Adelaide 89 are chasing every job.

There is no way in which people who leave school in the latter part of this year or early next year will be able to get jobs. Industries are closing and apprenticeships are not available. Many young men who want to learn a trade have had their indentures cancelled. This afternoon, the member for Mount Gambier spoke of the CITY scheme.

He did not refer to the "sweet pea" scheme. What has Fraser done for that scheme? It was envisaged supposedly to help young unemployed to get some sort of job skills, but I suggest to the member for Mount Gambier that it has allowed the employer to get fat at the taxpayers' expense. The qualification was that the person had to be out of work for four months and if the employer gave him a job, his wages would be subsidised by \$65 a week. What did

Fraser and Howard do in the recent Budget? They chopped it back to \$45.

The only scream there will be from employers who were employing these people for six months. They will say, "You are no good; you can't ring up the change in the supermarket, so we don't want you. We will put you out of work, and get another one and get our wages subsidised again." That has happened in industry today. I said that Fraser chopped it back to \$45. He did not: he cut it back to \$44. I refer not only to the lies that he perpetrated, but let us look at—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member—

Mr. WHITTEN: The mistruths: they know what I mean about it, and so do you, Sir.

Mr. Chapman: Aren't you going to withdraw that unparliamentary remark?

Mr. WHITTEN: If it is unparliamentary, I certainly withdraw it. They were blatant mistruths. Young people have been put out of work, and there is no way under any redundancy scheme that any worker can be satisfied. Redundancy schemes are not satisfactory, because they only give someone \$1 000 or \$2 000 at the time. What should be worked out is that, before that company goes broke—

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

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): During the next few weeks and while debating the lines of the Budget in Committee members will have the opportunity to grieve about almost every subject that is drawn to the attention of Parliament throughout the session. Generally, these grievance debates are used by some members to raise legitimate subjects of grievance, but by other members simply to pass the time so that the House can formally adjourn and we can go home. Frankly, this grievance period, whilst it is useful in some cases, has become one hell of a bore for me. After listening to the honourable member for Price and the way in which he forced himself yet again to use the opportunity to slate the Federal Government and chatter about all sorts of things, I believe that Government members are not terribly impressed with this opportunity to grieve, nor do they make reasonable use of it.

I should like to direct a compliment to a section of the House staff from which we all enjoy services, rather than just grieve or grizzle for the sake of doing so. I refer to the Joint House Committee that controls and administers the services not only for members of the Chamber in this place and the other place but also for permanent and part-time

staff members. I pass a compliment to the management displayed by the Joint House Committee throughout the period that I have been here. However, upon observation I note that, while we as members of Parliament enjoy the total facilities available within the refreshment room (and particularly within the dining room), those facilities are not available to all members of the staff in this place.

I note with interest that some of the more hard-working members of our staff, particularly messengers, library staff and *Hansard* staff that serve us each day and each night that we sit in this place, do not have access to hot meals during the day. At this stage facilities may not be available, but those who are here early in the morning and after we leave at night, ought to have access, if it can be arranged by the committee responsible, at least to a hot meal during the day.

Also, regarding efforts made to provide facilities, whatever is available to members and senior officers of Parliament should be available also to other staff members.

Mr. Whitten interjecting:

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am pleased that the member for Price agrees with me. My comments do not arise as a result of complaint or from the observations of anyone else. It is simply an observation that I have made and, without making extensive inquiries, I draw this matter to your attention, Mr. Speaker, so that, if at all possible, all members and all staff in this place can have equal access to the available facilities.

I do not believe that it would be a great problem for staff members to have access to the Strangers dining room, even if it is on a roster basis. If that room is unavailable, perhaps the Speaker's dining room could be made available to messengers when it is not otherwise occupied. In any event, whenever those persons are required to take a meal, they should have access to a kitchen-cooked hot meal, if it can possibly be arranged.

Mr. Becker: Would it include prawns?

Mr. CHAPMAN: The honourable member refers to prawns and, of course, I support the industry and any other industry, which is under the Government's administration, in getting a fair go, and that industry is no exception. However, I do not wish to pursue this matter at great length. I hope that the authorities controlling these matters will take up the points I have made, and consider providing equal opportunities for all to enjoy the facilities rather than for a privileged few and certainly not just members of this House and those another place.

Motion carried.

At 10.18 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 27 September at 2 p.m.