

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 7 August 1979

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

## LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

## QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 61, 63, 64, 65, 69, 70, 72, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 84, 89, 90, 129, 133, 134, 135, 139, 152, 153, 156, 157, 158, 163, 164, 171, 174, 175, 177, 178, 180.

## GOVERNMENT ENVELOPES

61. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. Why were the letters "O.H.M.S." taken off Government envelopes?
2. Why will the Government not put these letters back on Government envelopes?

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

1. To identify envelopes sent by the South Australian Government, the letters "O.H.M.S." were replaced by "South Australian Government".
2. It is considered more appropriate that the letters "South Australian Government" be used to identify official envelopes used by the South Australian Government.

## ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE

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

1. What is the estimated cost of the extensions to the festival centre?
2. What facilities will the extensions provide?
3. Is it anticipated that the extensions will be completed for the 1980 festival?

The **Hon. J. C. BANNON**: The replies are as follows:

1. The estimated cost of the extensions to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust is \$1 900 000.
2. The extensions will provide for: a large flexible multipurpose venue capable of seating 800 people, or 500 at banquets and subdivisible into four sound-proofed meeting rooms; foyer space for exhibition and visual arts displays; full kitchen and service support for functions etc. In addition, the extensions include modification of existing facilities in order to: rationalise existing bar/dining facilities at the Festival Theatre and relocate dining areas to provide economies of operation, together with maximising the benefits of the exceptional views available over Elder Park; integrate existing kitchen facilities with convention area kitchen and improve service access.
3. It is planned to complete the extensions in time for the 1980 festival.

## WAYVILLE SHOWGROUNDS

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

Is it still the intention of the Government to develop convention facilities at the Wayville Showgrounds and, if so, when is it anticipated that work will start and, if not, why has the Government changed its plans?

The **Hon. J. D. CORCORAN**: The Government has decided to defer the development of facilities at Wayville Showgrounds on the grounds that the project would now cost much more than that originally estimated by the project consultants and because, in the Government's view, other capital work programmes should receive priority in the light of restricted Loan funds being made available from the Commonwealth Government.

## WEEKEND BAKING

65. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Does the Government plan to take any action in relation to the control of weekend baking of bread and, if so, when and will the opportunity be given for those involved in baking on weekends to put their side of the argument before any such action is taken?

The **Hon. J. D. WRIGHT**: Adequate provisions exist in the Industrial Code 1967-1972 in relation to the baking of bread at weekends, and no further action is contemplated by the Government at present.

## TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT TENDERS

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

1. What was the outcome of the tenders called for "Equipment to produce drivers licences bearing the photograph of the holder" as reported in the *Advertiser* on 29 December 1977?
2. How many tenders were received and from what organisations?
3. When is it expected that the equipment will be delivered, who was the successful tenderer, what is the cost and what will be, or alternatively would be, the cost per licence?
4. What were the major findings of a feasibility survey on the subject conducted within the Transport Department and what were the recommendations?
5. If no decision has been taken, when can a decision be anticipated and if the proposition has been stood aside is it temporary or permanent and what are the details?

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

- 1 and 2. Eleven proposals were received from the following companies: Agfa Gevaert Ltd., Victoria; Cruikshank Pty. Ltd., Adelaide; Morane Plastic Co. Ltd., England; Polaroid Australia Pty. Ltd., N.S.W.; Shackman Instruments Ltd., England; Wagner Photographic, Victoria; John Barry Group, N.S.W.; Selleys Scientific Ltd., Adelaide; J. A. & L. P. Oliver, Adelaide; Convex-Macro Pty. Ltd., U.S.A.; Dek/Electro Division, U.S.A.
3. No tender was accepted. The approximate cost per licence \$1-36.
4. Because of the costs involved in implementing such a scheme, the difficulties associated with the State's widespread population and the inconvenience to some sections of the public, the decision was made not to proceed at this stage.
5. The matter is being kept under review.

## MOUNT GAMBIER CABINET MEETING

70. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Did Cabinet meet at Mount Gambier on 25 June or on some other and what day and, if so:

- (a) why;
- (b) how many Ministers attended and which members of their staffs went with them;
- (c) did it meet in the Council Chambers and what inconvenience did this cause to the council and its officers;
- (d) what was the cost of having the meeting there and how is that cost made up; and
- (e) what benefits, if any, have so far accrued to the State because of the Cabinet meeting at Mount Gambier and what further benefits are expected?

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

- (a) The prime reason why the Cabinet meeting was held at Mount Gambier on 25 June was that it was invited to Mount Gambier by the Mayor and Council of that City. Several Ministers have long held the view that Cabinet meetings should be held in country centres and their support for the proposal to bring the Government to the people left me with no doubt as to the wisdom of accepting the invitation.

- (b) All Ministers attended the Cabinet meeting. The only Ministerial staff who travelled to Mount Gambier were three Press Secretaries—Messrs. T. Loftus of the Premier's Department, J. Stubbs of the Deputy Premier's Office, and M. Nicholls of the Minister of Transport's Office, plus four drivers.

The Public Service staff who travelled to Mount Gambier for the meeting and assisted with the work of the Cabinet Secretariat and at deputations and conferences with local people included—Messrs. G. J. Inns, B. W. Rundell, G. Parkin, Misses J. Bennett and J. Chambers (all of the Premier's Department) and Mesdames P. Robinson (Dept. of Community Development) and A. Patsouris (Department of Transport).

- (c) The Cabinet meeting was held in the Council Chambers and although some inconvenience must have been caused to the council staff on the morning of the meeting, all Ministers and Government staff received the utmost courtesy and help from the Mayor, councillors and council staff. We were the guests of the council in their offices and we were certainly made to feel most welcome.

- (d) So far as the council is concerned, no cost was involved. Of course such an operation costs money, but from the beginning I issued instructions that all costs were to be kept to a minimum.

The preliminary planning for the Mount Gambier Cabinet meeting was undertaken by one officer who made two brief visits to the city before the day of the meeting. One was of 24 hours duration and the other of 12 hours.

In order that the press and media representatives could maintain appropriate contacts, they were provided with the exclusive use of three telephone extensions. Ministers and the small Public Service and Ministerial staff

brought from Adelaide obviously also required telephone contact with Adelaide.

A temporary telephone switchboard with a capacity of five exchange lines and sixteen extension telephone lines was installed at the Town Hall at Government expense. This was done so as to ensure the least possible disruption to City Council staff and their operations. I had earlier issued instructions that our use of the Town Hall was not to involve the City Council in any financial cost.

The final account for the telephones has not been rendered yet although an estimated account for \$998 has been submitted by Telecom and paid. It is possible there will be a refund on this amount.

The Government costs over and above those normally expected for a Cabinet meeting were:

	\$
Government reception for 190 local citizens—given at the Court House, Mount Gambier on Sunday evening 24 June 1979 .....	947
Hire of bus for tour of Mount Gambier by Council and Ministers ..	40
Hotel accommodation and meals for Ministers, staff and drivers—(2 nights) .....	1 631
Air charter fees and air tickets ....	1 309
Staff overtime related to the visit ..	936
Telephone and telex installation and rental .....	998
Costs incurred in modifying electrical switchboard and providing temporary power from City Hall .....	334
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$6 195</b>

I have not included the running costs of Ministerial cars and drivers involved with the visit to Mount Gambier as it is reasonable to consider that the use of only four drivers when all Ministers were in Mount Gambier would be less than the costs of 13 drivers conveying Ministers to their usual business engagements on weekends, either in Adelaide or intrastate.

- (e) It is difficult to assess the cost benefits of such an operation. Against the outgoing costs should be measured the savings to local people, who, instead of having to incur the expenditure of travelling to Adelaide for deputations to Ministers, were able to present their views locally.

Before Cabinet began on Monday 25 June, 20 deputations, covering many subjects, were received by Ministers.

The people of Mount Gambier were unstinting in their praise of the innovative project and the Government on its part appreciated the opportunity of bringing Government to the people.

The Cabinet meeting was conducted in the normal way of weekly meetings in Adelaide.

The *Border Watch* in an editorial on the 23 June, 1979, stated:

And, let us give Cabinet as good as we get—a feeling of being 'part of it' and of not 'being forgotten'.

And between us we may arrive at some increased understanding of the needs each of the other.

For, there is nothing new under the sun except, perhaps, the odd moment of understanding between people. I think no further comment from me is necessary.

#### ELECTION COMMITMENT

72. **Mr. MILLHOUSE:** (on notice):

1. On 29 August 1977 did not the former Premier, the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, say "We seek a mandate for simultaneous elections of the Legislative Council and House of Assembly, and the abolition of the six-year minimum term requirement for the Legislative Council. A referendum will be put to the people for the removal of the power of the Legislative Council to refuse Supply to a Government with majority support in the House of Assembly" and, if so, does the Government propose to honour such commitment and when?

2. If the Government does not propose to honour such commitment, for what reason?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** As already indicated by the Premier to the member for Mitcham, legislation for a referendum to remove the power of the Legislative Council to refuse Supply will be introduced by the Government at a suitable time during the current Parliament. Legislation providing for simultaneous elections of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly and the abolition of the six-year minimum term requirement for the Legislative Council also will be introduced by the Government at a suitable time during the current Parliament.

#### HAWKER TO ORROROO ROAD

75. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Is it intended to provide any money for the sealing of the Hawker-Orroroo road during the current financial year?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** No.

#### BUILDING REGULATIONS

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

1. Is the Minister aware that the Building Advisory Committee has expressed the opinion that there is an industry demand for and a public interest in a loose leaf edition of the building regulations and that the decision not to reprint this publication was taken unilaterally by the Government Printer and, if so, what action has been taken or is intended to be taken to reconsider the matter?

2. If the Minister has taken no action in this matter, is it intended to have the matter fully considered and if so, when?

**The Hon. J. C. BANNON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. Agreement has since been reached with the Government Printer for the reintroduction of the loose leaf edition of the Building Regulations. It is anticipated that these regulations will be available incorporating all amendments to 31 December 1979 as from January 1980.

2. See 1.

#### HAWKER TO LEIGH CREEK ROAD

77. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): How much does the Highways Department intend to spend on the Hawker to Leigh Creek road in the current financial year?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** An amount of \$1 650 000 between Moralana and Parachilna and \$750 000, including

an Electricity Trust of South Australia contribution of \$490 000, on the deviation of this road at Leigh Creek.

#### QUORN HOSPITAL

78. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Will funds be made available to the Quorn Hospital Board for substantial upgrading of the theatre complex in the Quorn Hospital?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Consideration is being given to the provision of funds in the 1979-80 Estimates.

#### CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

79. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to restrict or prevent principals of schools administering corporal punishment?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** No decisions have been made by the Government regarding corporal punishment.

#### NURSES MEMORIAL CENTRE

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

1. Has the Premier responded to the letter forwarded by the Nurses Memorial Centre of South Australia Inc. on 20 June 1979 and, if so, what was the response?

2. Has a delegation of the centre met with the Premier, a senior member of his staff or any other Minister to resolve the difficulties which the centre's letter highlights and, if so, what are the details?

3. Does the Government have any other solution to the problem outlined by the centre and, if so, what is it?

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

1. The Director-General, Premier's Department responded to the Nurses Memorial Centre of South Australia Incorporation's letter of 20 June 1979 on my behalf on 9 July 1979 stating that the matter raised was receiving attention.

2. No, although there have been telephone discussions concerning alternative solutions between officers of my department and the past President of the centre.

3. The South Australian Housing Trust has forwarded an alternative plan to the Nurses Memorial Centre and is awaiting a response. That solution proposes a space for 78 cars that can be supervised by the centre.

#### PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS

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

1. How many pedestrian crossings were erected in each of the years 1977-78 and 1978-79 and how many are projected for 1979-80?

2. How many of the above are school crossings?

3. How many school crossing lights are being upgraded to pedestrian activated lights each year?

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

1. 1977-78, 22; 1978-79, 37; 1979-80, 29 (anticipated).

2. 1977-78, 2; 1978-79, 7; 1979-80, 3.

3. 1977-78, 9; 1978-79, 19; 1979-80, 20.

In addition to the upgrading of school crossing lights to pedestrian activated lights, the following school crossings have been, or will be, replaced with traffic signals at adjacent intersections or junctions:

1977-78, 8; 1978-79, 5; 1979-80, 4.

**MODBURY HOSPITAL**

90. Mr. WILSON (on notice):

1. When is it proposed to open the Psychiatric Unit at Modbury Hospital?

2. What is the present stage of construction?

3. What is the estimated total cost?

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

1. Estimated opening date is 1/1/80.

2. The building was completed in August 1978.

3. \$1 745 000.

**FLAMMABLE LIQUIDS**

129. Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. What safety regulations govern the use of road tankers carrying flammable liquids and gases in South Australia?

2. If no safety regulations exist, will the Government formulate reasonable regulations as a matter of urgency and, if so, when can it be anticipated that they will be proclaimed?

3. Does the onus for the roadworthiness of the vehicle transporting the flammable liquids or gases rest with the South Australian division of the company involved and, if not, why not?

4. In the case of an accident in South Australia is the company liable for damages for injuries to members of the community?

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

1. Regulations under:

(a) The Inflammable Liquids Act, 1961-1976.

(b) The Liquefied Petroleum Gas Act, 1960-1973.

2. See No. 1.

3. The regulations were made on 19 September 1963 and 27 May 1965, respectively.

4. Yes.

5. Yes.

**REDCLIFF**

133. Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What progress has the Government made towards reaching an agreement with the Dow Chemical Company on building a petro-chemical plant at the Redcliff site?

2. If no negotiations have been completed, when does the Government anticipate such a completion?

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

1. Substantial, but it will be during the first half of 1980 before finality can be reached.

2. Vide 1.

**COOBER PEDY AIRPORT**

134. Mr. GUNN (on notice): Has the Outback Areas Community Development Trust provided funds for the upgrading and sealing of the Coober Pedy airport and, if so, how much and is it intended that lights will be provided for the airfield?

**The Hon. J. C. BANNON:** No. There has been no change since the reply given by the Minister of Transport to Question on Notice No. 922. The trust is still awaiting a response from the Commonwealth Department of Transport. No request has been received by the trust for the installation of lights.

**ANDAMOOKA AIRFIELD**

135. Mr. GUNN (on notice): Has the Outback Areas Community Development Trust given consideration to

providing funds to upgrade the Andamooka airfield and, if so, how much money is it considering to provide?

**The Hon. J. C. BANNON:** The Chairman of the trust has held discussions with officers of the Commonwealth Transport Department on how the situation could be improved. It is the intention of the department to visit Andamooka and carry out an on-the-spot inspection of the area.

**CHRISTIE DOWNS RAILWAY SERVICE**

139. Mr. WILSON (on notice): Does the Government intend to proceed with the electrification of the Christie Downs railway service and, if so, when?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** Yes, as soon as the Federal Government provides sufficient funds under Urban Public Transport for the project to proceed.

**ROAD GRANTS**

152. Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What amount of funds does the Highways Department intend to distribute to local government bodies in 1979-80 as grants for district roads and what are the individual amounts for each council?

2. What amount has been provided for similar work in each financial year 1970-71 to 1978-79, inclusive?

3. What has been the reaction of local government to the current programme?

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

1. See attached list.

2. Financial Year

Amount  
\$

1970-71 .....	2 704 295
1971-72 .....	2 774 934
1972-73 .....	2 593 350
1973-74 .....	2 523 480
1974-75 .....	2 631 941
1975-76 .....	2 877 530
1976-77 .....	3 313 050
1977-78 .....	4 425 984
1978-79 .....	4 486 006

3. Road grants are allocated to roadworks on a State-wide priority basis and some councils who received less grants for 1979-80 have sought clarification of this policy.

**HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT**

District Roads Grants—Statement showing Grants allotted for 1979-80

Council	1979-80 Allocation \$
Corporation of—	
Adelaide .....	93 500
Brighton .....	87 000
Burnside .....	40 000
Campbelltown .....	122 000
Elizabeth .....	32 000
Enfield .....	68 500
Gawler .....	46 000
Glenelg .....	16 000
Henley and Grange .....	32 000
Hindmarsh .....	70 000
Kensington and Norwood .....	45 000
Marion .....	120 000
Mitcham .....	145 000
Naracoorte .....	13 000

Council	1979-80 Allocation \$	Council	1979-80 Allocation \$
Noarlunga .....	217 000	* Excludes:—	
Payneham .....	17 000	Rural Roads Emergency Reserve .....	118 500
Port Adelaide .....	105 000	Tourist Roads .....	50 000
Prospect .....	125 000	National Park Roads .....	20 000
Salisbury .....	180 000		
Tea Tree Gully .....	128 000	Total .....	\$188 500
Thebarton .....	36 000		
Unley .....	20 000		
West Torrens .....	90 500		
Woodville .....	201 500		
District Council of—			
Angaston .....	150 000		
Barossa .....	30 000		
Burra Burra .....	10 000		
Clare .....	100 000		
Cleve .....	58 000		
Clinton .....	30 000		
Coonalpyn Downs .....	45 000		
Crystal Brook .....	20 000		
Dudley .....	16 000		
East Torrens .....	40 000		
Eudunda .....	70 000		
Franklin Harbor .....	20 000		
Gladstone .....	20 000		
Gumeracha .....	94 000		
Kadina .....	40 000		
Kapunda .....	7 000		
Kingscote .....	20 000		
Lacepede .....	35 000		
Le Hunte .....	40 000		
Light .....	43 000		
Lincoln .....	39 000		
Loxton .....	52 000		
Lucindale .....	35 000		
Mannum .....	50 000		
Meadows .....	93 000		
Meningie .....	120 000		
Millicent .....	35 000		
Minlaton .....	7 000		
Morgan .....	80 000		
Mount Barker .....	30 000		
Mount Gambier .....	50 000		
Munno Para .....	120 000		
Murat Bay .....	58 000		
Naracoorte .....	35 000		
Onkaparinga .....	25 000		
Owen .....	25 000		
Peake .....	31 000		
Pinnaroo .....	24 000		
Pirie .....	25 000		
Port Elliot and Goolwa .....	35 000		
Port MacDonnell .....	42 000		
Port Wakefield .....	14 500		
Robe .....	25 000		
Robertstown .....	5 000		
Stirling .....	74 000		
Strathalbyn .....	40 000		
Streaky Bay .....	63 000		
Tatiara .....	66 000		
Truro .....	40 000		
Tumby Bay .....	51 000		
Waikerie .....	25 000		
Willunga .....	55 000		
Monarto Development Commission .....	5 000		
Total .....	*\$4 412 500		

### TOURIST GROUPS

153. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Will the Government allocate financial assistance to other tourist groups in South Australia to assist them with their promotional activities similar to the allocation towards tourism promotion in the South-East?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** While special arrangements were announced for the South-East, particularly because of the relationship with south-eastern Victoria, consideration is given continuously to the needs of the whole State. Regional tourist organisations will be fostered, so long as matching grants are available from local government and the business community. The same approach will apply in the Green Triangle.

### TEROWIE TO PETERBOROUGH ROAD

156. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): How much money has the Highways Department allocated towards the continuation of the sealing of the Terowie to Peterborough road?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** \$110 000 in 1979-80.

### ADELAIDE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT SYSTEM

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

1. What consideration has the Government given to electrifying the Adelaide metropolitan transport system, including buses?

2. Has consideration been given to using double decker buses?

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

1. Full consideration has been given to electrifying Adelaide's metropolitan rail system but, regrettably the project has been deferred indefinitely because of the cutback in Federal funding.

2. Yes, but double decker buses are not favoured for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the inconvenience to the travelling public.

### MONARTO

158. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Is the Minister now in a position to report further on studies that have been undertaken regarding the matter of future subdivision on the Monarto site as outlined in an answer to the member for Murray to his question without notice on 22 March 1978?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The possibility of establishing a small residential-type subdivision at Monarto has been deferred until a more accurate assessment can be made of the effect the opening of the final section of the South-Eastern Freeway will have on demand for urban land at Monarto. The matter is to be reviewed again in the 1980-81 financial year.

## INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

163. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice): Is it Government policy that all non-government hospitals and other bodies receiving financial assistance amend their constitutions to provide for industrial democracy and, if so, why and what happens if they refuse?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** No.

## HOSPITAL FUND

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

1. What was all the income received by the Hospital Fund for the financial year ended 30 June 1979?

2. How much was transferred to general revenue during the past financial year?

3. What was the balance carried forward and why?

4. Why does the Hospital Fund not receive interest on moneys received and held?

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

1. The total income of the Hospitals Fund for the year ended 30 June 1979 was \$22 084 319.

2. During 1978-79, the amount transferred from the Hospitals Fund to Consolidated Revenue as a contribution towards public hospital costs was \$18 000 000.

3. At 30 June 1979, the balance of the Hospitals Fund was \$8 088 171. The amount of \$22 000 000 mentioned in 1. above was higher than the amount anticipated when the Appropriation Bill was prepared in August 1978. Section 7 (a) of the Appropriation Act limits the amount of transfers to Consolidated Revenue from the Hospitals Fund and the \$18 000 000 transferred during 1978-79 represents the maximum amount permitted under this clause of the Act.

4. Since annual expenditures on public hospitals are vastly in excess of amounts transferred from the Hospitals Fund, the crediting of interest would be a pointless accounting exercise.

## ROAD GRANTS

171. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): What were the individual amounts in road grants paid to each local government authority for 1979-80 in—

(a) country areas; and

(b) the metropolitan area?

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

(a)	Council	Grant \$
C.C. Mount Gambier		40 000
C.C. Port Augusta		135 000
C.C. Port Lincoln		—
C.C. Port Pirie		20 000
C.C. Whyalla		—
C.T. Jamestown		—
C.T. Moonta		—
C.T. Naracoorte		13 000
C.T. Peterborough		—
C.T. Renmark		—
C.T. Wallaroo		—
D.C. Angaston		150 000
D.C. Balaklava		35 000
D.C. Barmera		—
D.C. Barossa		30 000
D.C. Beachport		104 000
D.C. Berri		—
D.C. Blyth		60 000
D.C. Browns Well		20 000
D.C. Burra Burra		20 000
D.C. Bute		—
D.C. Carrieton		40 000
D.C. Central Yorke Peninsula		35 000

Council	Grant \$
D.C. Clare	100 000
D.C. Cleve	58 000
D.C. Clinton	30 000
D.C. Coonalpyn Downs	45 000
D.C. Crystal Brook	20 000
D.C. Dudley	27 000
D.C. Elliston	160 000
D.C. Eudunda	70 000
D.C. Franklin Harbor	60 000
D.C. Georgetown	—
D.C. Gladstone	20 000
D.C. Hallett	100 000
D.C. Hawker	35 000
D.C. Jamestown	100 000
D.C. Kadina	40 000
D.C. Kanyaka-Quorn	15 000
D.C. Kapunda	7 000
D.C. Karoonda-East Murray	58 000
D.C. Kimba	64 000
D.C. Kingscote	40 000
D.C. Lacedpede	35 000
D.C. Lameroo	50 000
D.C. Laura	25 000
D.C. Le Hunte	55 000
D.C. Lincoln	51 000
D.C. Loxton	52 000
D.C. Lucindale	35 000
D.C. Mallala	35 200
D.C. Mannum	50 000
D.C. Meningie	120 000
D.C. Millicent	35 000
D.C. Minlaton	20 000
D.C. Morgan	80 000
D.C. Mount Barker	30 000
D.C. Mount Gambier	50 000
D.C. Mount Pleasant	20 000
D.C. Murray Bridge	20 000
D.C. Murat Bay	58 000
D.C. Naracoorte	35 000
D.C. Orroroo	40 000
D.C. Owen	25 000
D.C. Paringa	14 000
D.C. Peake	31 000
D.C. Penola	42 000
D.C. Peterborough	110 000
D.C. Pinnaroo	34 000
D.C. Pirie	30 000
D.C. Port Broughton	20 000
D.C. Port Elliot and Goolwa	35 000
D.C. Port Germein	60 000
D.C. Port MacDonnell	42 000
D.C. Port Wakefield	14 500
D.C. Redhill	90 000
D.C. Ridley	70 000
D.C. Riverton	18 300
D.C. Robe	25 000
D.C. Robertstown	30 000
D.C. Saddleworth and Auburn	100 000
D.C. Snowtown	100 000
D.C. Spalding	—
D.C. Strathalbyn	40 000
D.C. Streaky Bay	63 000
D.C. Tanunda	—
D.C. Tatiara	66 000
D.C. Truro	40 000
D.C. Tumby Bay	51 000
D.C. Victor Harbor	30 000
D.C. Waikerie	41 000

Council	Grant \$
D.C. Warooka	20 000
D.C. Wilmington	—
D.C. Yankalilla	—
D.C. Yorketown	30 000
(b)	
C.C. Adelaide	93 500
C.C. Brighton	87 000
C.C. Burnside	40 000
C.C. Campbelltown	122 000
C.C. Elizabeth	32 000
C.C. Enfield	68 500
C.C. Glenelg	16 000
C.C. Henley and Grange	32 000
C.C. Kensington and Norwood	45 000
C.C. Marion	120 000
C.C. Mitcham	145 000
C.C. Noarlunga	217 000
C.C. Payneham	17 000
C.C. Port Adelaide	105 000
C.C. Prospect	125 000
C.C. Salisbury	180 000
C.C. Tea Tree Gully	128 000
C.C. Unley	20 000
C.C. West Torrens	90 500
C.C. Woodville	201 500
C.T. Gawler	46 000
C.T. Hindmarsh	70 000
C.T. St. Peters	—
C.T. Thebarton	36 000
C.T. Walkerville	—
D.C. East Torrens	40 000
D.C. Gumeracha	94 000
D.C. Light	43 000
D.C. Meadows	93 000
D.C. Munno Para	120 000
D.C. Onkaparinga	25 000
D.C. Stirling	74 000
D.C. Willunga	55 000

#### PORT LINCOLN HOSPITAL

174. **Mr. BLACKER** (on notice):

- When is it expected that the proposed extensions to the Port Lincoln Hospital will commence?
- What is the anticipated completion date?
- What is the anticipated cost of such extensions?

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

- Consideration is being given to a scheme to upgrade geriatric accommodation at the hospital. If funds are available, tenders will be called during 1979-80.
- Twelve months from the date of tender call.
- Approximately \$500 000.

#### DAYLIGHT SAVING

175. **Mr. BLACKER** (on notice): Has the Government any plans to lengthen the period of daylight saving in—  
(a) hours per day; or  
(b) weeks per year?

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

- No.
- No.

#### PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

177. **Mr. BLACKER** (on notice): Does the Government intend to introduce legislation to control the incomes and/or cost of services of—

- doctors;
  - lawyers;
  - veterinarians; or
  - accountants,
- and if so when?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Not at this stage.

#### EYRE PENINSULA ROADS

178. **Mr. BLACKER** (on notice):

1. When will the Elliston to Lock road (Main Road 43) be sealed?

2. When will the remainder of the Bratton Way between Cummins and Mount Hope be sealed?

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

1. The sum of \$150 000 has been allocated to commence work this financial year. The Commonwealth Government's present roads legislation expires on 30 June 1980 and completion of work on this road will depend on the financial provisions of the ensuing roads legislation and the priority of the work in relation to other road projects in the State.

2. At present, it cannot be predicted when this work will be carried out for the same reasons indicated in No. 1. above.

#### WHARF BELT CHARGES

180. **Mr. BLACKER** (on notice): What is the current wharf belt charge per tonne for grain loaded through South Australian ports and what was the charge for each of the past five years?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** 1. The current charge is \$1.30 per tonne.

2. 1974—equivalent to 49c per tonne effective 14 February 1966.

1975—\$1 per tonne effective 1 January 1975

1976—\$1

1977—\$1

1978—\$1.30 per tonne effective 1 April 1978.

#### PETITION: MILLIPEDE CONTROL

A petition signed by 3 871 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to implement a programme for the control of the widespread infestation of millipedes was presented by Mr. Evans.

Petition received.

#### PETITION: ABOLITION OF LAND TAX

A petition signed by 63 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to revalue all properties assessed this year and to abolish land tax on residential properties immediately was presented by Mr. Becker.

Petition received.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: HOUSE INCIDENT

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

Leave granted.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** I have a confession to make to the House.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Newland is out of order. The honourable member for Davenport has the floor.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** It was my foot that went through the wooden panel last Thursday, not that of the Deputy Leader. The accusation by the Minister of Labour and Industry concerning the Deputy Leader last Thursday, made when the Minister was answering a question, was quite wrong, as usual. When the Deputy Leader enters this Parliament tomorrow, apparently on crutches, as I have been told, members should not jump to the conclusion that he received the injury through kicking out the panel.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** One Our Father and three Hail Marys!

## QUESTION TIME

### STATE ECONOMY

**Mr. TONKIN:** That was reasonable penance indeed, proposed by the Premier. My question is directed to the Premier and is on a rather more serious subject. Will the Premier say how he reconciles his statement that the South Australian economy may be about to turn the corner with the figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics that he chose not to quote in his speech yesterday? In his speech he did not say that A.B.S. figures showed a loss of about 12 800 private sector jobs in South Australia from May 1977 to May 1978, or a loss of 9 600 from January to May 1978, creating an abnormally low base for future measurement. He also did not say that the latest figures show that the other States created 47 300 private sector jobs while South Australia created its 700, South Australia's share of the total being less than 1.5 per cent; that the total number of private employees actually fell in South Australia by 600 in the months April to May, while increasing by 8 700 in the other States; that the private sector work force in South Australia was now smaller than it had been eight years ago, while it grew by 22 900 in Western Australia, and 40 600 in Queensland; or that total employment in South Australia decreased by 400 in the months April to May and by 1 900 in the past 12 months, compared to an annual growth of 62 900 in the other five States.

Taken in the total context, the figures for private sector employment irrefutably confirm the Government's dismal failure to attract industrial and mineral development to South Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader is commenting.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I expected that the Leader would draw attention to this matter, but he would not dispute the figures that I quoted: they did come from the A.B.S. In addition, the quarterly employment survey conducted by the Economic Development Department for the June 1979 quarter has now been completed. The department surveyed 122 important companies in the State and found that there were over 2 400 more jobs than there had been in the June quarter of last year. Employment in manufacturing industry accounted for the dominant share of the additional jobs. The A.B.S. civilian employees data is available for May 1979.

The findings, as they relate to South Australia, are spelled out in Appendix 1, and the Leader would be aware of that. In summary, the bureau's data record an increase of 700 in private jobs in South Australia in the 12 months ended May 1979. This was the first 12-month period since

that ending in April 1977 in which private sector employment growth was recorded.

I know that great play can be made of the finding that the total employment in South Australia was down by 2 600 (and I cannot deny this), which the Leader mentioned, in May compared to May 1978, and that South Australia was the only State to decline over the period. These are factual statements. The composition of South Australia's job decline should be examined. In recent statements, the Leader has alleged that thousands of jobs have been lost, but he has not indicated how many were in the private sector and how many were Government jobs. Throughout 1978 the Opposition bemoaned the loss of private sector jobs, claiming that State taxes and charges were contributing to and causing private sector decline. The Leader cannot deny that.

Now the Opposition has dropped all reference to the private sector employment, and the reason is plain to see: private sector employment is expanding, and was 700 higher in May 1979 than in May 1978. Between 2 000 and 3 000 job losses have been in the Government sector.

**Mr. Tonkin:** You've departed from your script.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader has asked one question and then interjected. I hope that he will cease interjecting.

*Mr. Tonkin interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call the honourable Leader to order.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Undoubtedly, the Opposition, which criticised the Government for Public Service growth over a number of years, is now criticising the Government for job losses due to cut-backs in the Public Service. The Leader knows that there was no growth in the Public Service last year and that I have announced this year that there will be no growth. The reason is clear: the Federal Government cuts that this State has suffered as a result of the financial policies of the Federal Government, to which the Leader subscribes, have been such that we have not been able to hold the jobs at the previous level, and we have lost that number of jobs in the public sector. It is a fallacy to believe that, if we drop jobs in the public sector, they will automatically be picked up by the private sector. That is not and has not been the case.

The Leader asked why I predicted yesterday that we were about to turn the corner. The indicators I used are there. One is the increase of 700 jobs over the same period in 1978 in the private sector. The second is the rate of overtime being worked, which is always an early indicator that more employment might take place, and the Leader cannot deny that. The third is the increase in retail sales in South Australia, the figures for which display that it is double the increase applying to the rest of Australia.

I will give the figures, because they cannot be disputed, and, if there is any argument, the Leader ought to argue with the A.B.S., not with me. During the March 1979 quarter, retail sales in South Australia, in dollar value, grew by 5.6 per cent, compared to the December 1978 quarter. These figures have been seasonally adjusted, and the Leader knows what that means. During the same period, the national growth in retail sales was a fair 2.9 per cent, whereas the growth in retail sales in South Australia was nearly double the national average during the March quarter, as I indicated yesterday.

It is absurd for the Leader, or anyone else, to suggest that these figures are manufactured; as I have already said, they are obtained from data from the A.B.S. and are the latest figures available to the State showing a State-by-State breakdown. There are other indications, too; building approvals, for example, for business premises (a large component of which is retail outlets) are rising quite



rapidly. A comparison of the 1978-79 and 1977-78 financial years shows an increase of 53 per cent in the value of approvals for business premises.

The official statistics I released yesterday should certainly demolish the claims by Opposition spokesmen, and their allies, that high personal savings in South Australia are retarding economic growth. Traditionally, South Australia has had a higher savings bank deposit per head of population than the national average. I am confident about the future, and I wish the Leader would recognise the signs and express similar confidence, because he constantly puts himself into the position of knocking the State, instead of giving people in this State the sort of encouragement and confidence that they need for the State to get going again.

### CONSTITUTIONAL MUSEUM

**Mr. WELLS:** Is the Minister of Labour and Industry aware of statements made by the member for Davenport in this House during a recent adjournment debate? As I was concerned about the statements that the honourable member made, I made some investigations. I was unable to find any justification at all for his remarks. Consequently, I ask the Minister whether he has investigated the matter and whether he will comment on this matter concerning the Constitutional Museum.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister may not comment.

**Mr. WELLS:** Will the Minister advise the House of the situation at the Constitutional Museum site, because I am concerned (and I am sure that other members on this side of the House are concerned) because it appears to me—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. WELLS:** —that workers and management have been maligned.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is debating the question.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I just happen to have with me the information that the honourable member is seeking.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** It was on the A.B.C. news this morning.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I do not know where the honourable member picked it up; he could have picked it up on the A.B.C. news. Last Thursday, in the course of the adjournment debate, the member for Davenport chose to read from a letter he claimed to have received in relation to work on the site of the Constitutional Museum. That letter contained a series of allegations, not only against workers on the site, but also against the departmental supervisors and, by implication, against senior officers of the Public Buildings Department. As a result, those allegations, and the member's comments on them, received wide and sensational publicity.

The letter is, as far as the Government is concerned, an anonymous one. It is my normal practice to ignore such letters, and the one in question provides abundant reason for taking that attitude, as I shall show. Unfortunately, the intervention—a better word would be "interference"—of the member for Davenport has given serious offence to many people who are entitled to look to me for their defence, and has caused a delicate industrial situation to reach flash point. I have accordingly made inquiries, and called a conference of both the secretaries and the site representatives of all the unions involved.

Since the author of the letter purported to appoint himself spokesman for the site, it is important to record that all those officials, and all those representatives, made clear their dismay at this publicity on behalf of themselves

and those whom they had been duly elected to represent.

The investigation made clear that the author of the letter had little regard for the facts. It was claimed that he had complained both to management and to the unions. No such complaints were ever made. In the true spirit of anonymous letters, the author had taken, out of context, one or two grains of fact and used them as the foundation for an edifice of distortion, misrepresentation and, in fact, untruth. Even a cursory investigation would have shown this.

The letter contains allegations against one of the workers' representatives, and claims that management condoned various abuses of his rights. That is quite untrue. The union concerned has made quite clear that it does not seek, and never has sought, any privilege beyond those privileges necessary for the representative to conduct his union affairs. At no time has the department or have its officers made any departure from the normal work practices or disciplinary standards on the ground that any individual was a union representative.

Once these allegations are discounted, there remains only the question of the removal of certain outriggers from a mobile scaffold on the site. This had already been investigated by the department, which regarded it as a serious matter, as, indeed, do I. If personal responsibility for this action could have been ascertained, dismissal would have resulted. All that could be established was the bare fact of the removal of the outriggers. It is clear that there were no eyewitnesses, and all workers on the site denied any complicity in the action. Since there was no evidence, and the opportunity existed for quite a few people to have done it, there was no basis in justice for the department to single out any individual. The author of the letter, of course, chose to ignore this departmental investigation in making his allegations. The officers concerned have every right to consider themselves defamed.

I do not deny that the site in question has been the subject of considerable industrial disputation, or that various work bans have applied from time to time. That has concerned me, and continues to concern me. I have not, however, departed from my normal practices in handling industrial disputes, practices which have, incidentally, helped to give South Australia the best industrial record in the Commonwealth.

When other avenues appeared to have been exhausted, I convened a meeting of those interested. My intention was to try to get to the root cause of the disputes, not to conduct a witch-hunt on what are at best ill-considered and at worst trumped-up allegations. As a result, I can report that bans have been lifted, not just on the Constitutional Museum, but on several other sites of the Public Buildings Department. One very marginal dispute which has not been solved will come before the court on Wednesday. This case relates to builders labourers and carpenters. I was unable to negotiate a settlement in this case, but hopefully this matter will be finalised on Wednesday.

The parties involved in these matters have returned to the negotiating table, and to normal methods of resolving disputes. I hope that a basis has been laid on which constructive industrial relations can be resumed. I can also state that, as a result of the statement by the member for Davenport, there is more tension on the site rather than less. In giving currency to what are no more than baseless rumours, he has raised further barriers to good industrial relations, not lowered them. I invite his nameless correspondent to raise his problems in the normal way in future, as he claimed, quite untruthfully, to have done in this; and I invite the member for Davenport to be less credulous and more worldly-wise.

### RETAIL SALES

**Mr. EVANS:** Does the Premier now agree that he was wrong in his assumption, which he gave to the House and to the media, that retail sales in South Australia were rapidly increasing, and that in future he would be wise to contact the Executive Director of the Retail Traders Association before making such statements? A report in today's *News* states:

The executive director of the Retail Traders' Association, Mr. M. G. McCutcheon, said Mr. Corcoran was "completely wrong". "We are way behind the other States, not leading the way", Mr. McCutcheon said . . . "The latest figures [for retail sales] show the March to March national growth rate was 12.35 per cent. "South Australian growth in the same period was 10.7 per cent—which in no way can be construed as being near double the national average".

Later, Mr. McCutcheon is quoted as saying:

Throughout the past year sales growth in South Australia has been as low as 50 per cent of the national average, and the general retail outlook in South Australia has been grim.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Mr. McCutcheon was in touch with my research officer yesterday, I think, and again this morning. It seems that he has great difficulty in understanding the figures that have been given in the Australian Bureau of Statistics' statement. If he has any disagreement with those figures, he should be arguing not with the Government but with the Australian Bureau of Statistics, because the figures are there. Unless he misunderstands them, cannot understand them or does not want to understand them, I cannot, for the life of me, understand what he is getting at. The figures clearly show that at the end of this quarter the increase in retail sales in South Australia is almost double, if not double, the national average. I have given the figure in reply to the Leader of the Opposition—5.6 per cent as opposed to the national average of 2.9 per cent. I do not know why the honourable member is laughing. Yesterday in my speech I referred to an increase of 12 per cent, and that figure was gained from an article headed the "South Australian Economy", by the ANZ Bank. I will give the honourable member a copy of that article if he so desires.

### "NORM"

**Mr. KLUNDER:** Can the Minister of Community Development give any information about the possible effects on the "Life. Be In It" campaign of the use of "Norm", its well-established Ocker character, in the new and expensively funded Federal Government campaign called "Project Australia"? Apparently, Norm is already featuring in television commercials in the Australian Government's \$3 750 000 attempt to unite Australians and get the country moving again. This must be a trifle confusing for Norm, as he will not know whether to stand or run, especially as the *Age* of 7 August has indicated that the campaign has so far already managed to isolate the Federal Government from all the State Governments.

**The Hon. J. C. BANNON:** I welcome the opportunity to say a word or two about this matter. I think it is generally agreed that the "Life. Be In It" campaign has been remarkably successful since it has been operating. The public perception of that campaign has been outstanding and has, according to surveys, resulted in a tremendous awareness of the need for physical activity, recreation and fitness generally. One of the features of the campaign has been its general acceptance as a non-political non-partisan exercise. Some State Governments and the Federal

Government have collaborated in funding and supporting in very concrete ways what has been a major and important campaign.

Therefore, I am extremely concerned about the translation from that campaign of its leading character, its star, Norm, into what is a much more doubtful exercise. I am not suggesting that a campaign aimed at stirring up Australians to activity or making us aware of the benefits and values of living in this country is in itself a bad thing. However, the way in which the "Project Australia" campaign has been conducted and the fact that this character has been imported could cause severe problems to "Life. Be In It", particularly its non-partisan, non-political aspect, which we support very strongly.

I was very surprised that the Federal Government, which is battling to provide only about \$1 000 000 for sport and recreation, can cheerfully hand out \$3 000 000 over three years for this media campaign. It seems odd that it can find money for that when it cannot find it for other areas of much higher priority. Moreover, by doing it on the cheap, simply by employing the same advertising agency, which in turn employs a character from another of its successful campaigns, not only reflects badly on the "Project Australia" but also has some pejorative effect on "Life. Be In It" itself.

I hope that "Life. Be In It" will not be damaged. I think that the "Project Australia" campaign, however worthy the intentions behind it, cannot, because of its sponsorship, and because one of the most disruptive figures we have ever had in recent political life—the Prime Minister—is associated with it, really be expected to get us to pull together in the consensus way that is aimed at. The Federal Government is squandering money in attempting to supply the consensus by advertising methods that it has not been able to provide by leadership over the past three or four years. That is plain to all Australians who take an interest in it. To use the successful "Life. Be In It" campaign to further this attempt is quite despicable and should be resisted.

When I first heard about this, and it was within a matter of weeks before the campaign went to air, I hastily contacted Mr. Brian Dixon, the Victorian Minister, who has been very much involved with "Life. Be In It", and pointed out these problems to him. He did not agree with me, but I do know that every single officer involved in devising and implementing the "Life. Be In It" campaign in all the States, including Mr. Dixon's own department (the Victorian Government holds the copyright), decided that permission should be refused for Norm to be featured in this "Project Australia" campaign. Despite that, the Federal Government has overridden those objections, and imported the character. I do not know how it got around the copyright problem but certainly we, as one of the participants in "Life. Be In It", were not consulted; it was against our objections. As a result, damage could be done to what is essentially an important and useful campaign in raising public awareness of recreation by this devious attempt to pretend there is some sort of consensus when we are led by the present Federal Government.

### NORTHFIELD RESEARCH FARM

**Mr. WOTTON:** Will the Minister of Planning confirm that consideration is being given by the Government to the release of a major portion of the Northfield Research Farm, Fosters Road, Northfield, to the Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs Department for the purpose of housing, and that the first portion is to be released in

1981? If that is so, will the Minister provide details relating to the release of this land?

I am aware of the concern of residents of the area who are upset about the possible loss of this valuable open space. They feel that if this Crown land is to be released by the Agriculture Department it should be the responsibility of the Government to retain the land for open space in the way of park lands or recreational areas and that it should not be lost under housing, particularly in the light of the current difficulties being experienced by the Land Commission in the sale of land for housing already owned by the Government.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** In putting the question, the honourable member revealed that at least one other Minister is involved in this matter when he mentioned the Minister of Agriculture. He also expressed concern on behalf of residents in the area and, accordingly, I will look into this matter and see whether I can bring down a detailed report. At the same time, the honourable member has taken the opportunity to disparage the activities of the Land Commission of South Australia. I deplore that because, for the life of me, I cannot understand the attitude of the honourable member in attempting to disparage a body which has as its main rationale the provision of low-cost land to enable people who wish to do so to become house owners at a cost lower than might otherwise prevail in a free, open-slather market. I am surprised that the honourable member—

**Mr. Millhouse:** It all depends on whether it's doing it's job properly.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will have an opportunity to ask a question.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I am not sure whether the member for Murray was a member of this House when the original Bill on this matter passed through this place, so I will not impute to him motives that do not necessarily apply. I am surprised at the attitude the honourable member has adopted in this matter, because the Land Commission to date has demonstrated that it is a successful operation, bearing in mind that at the same time more than one private development company operating in the real estate field has not been able to remain viable, irrespective of the detail that is sometimes brought into this matter, whether there is the requirement of the Land Commission to pay or not to pay certain charges which apply in the private sector. What the honourable member ought to be thinking about is the operation in total. He should ask whether there has been a successful stabilisation of land prices which can be attributed to action by this Parliament. If that is so, he would be justified in taking pride in that fact because he is a member of this Parliament, which enabled the passage of a Bill that set up this body, which has operated successfully in this area.

I can only suggest to the honourable member that he ought to re-examine his role as a spokesman for the Opposition on some of these matters. I personally cannot see any merit in the term "shadow Minister". I understand that the term has no meaning constitutionally or in any other way. However, I am prepared to accept that a member is a spokesman on an area of Government activity. That seems to me to be a far more sensible and reasonable description. I understand that journalists throughout Australia are examining the title "shadow Minister", and I also understand that they are tending to move away from this area because there is no real substance in the term, as implied by the very title "shadow" Minister.

**Mr. Wotton:** Have you forgotten the question?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I have not forgotten the

question. I have pointed out that, because of the concern expressed through the member by the residents of the area and in view of the fact that he has stated clearly that one other Minister is involved in the matter, to ensure that the concerns of the people about whom he has spoken are properly considered and protected, I will obtain information and bring down a considered reply.

#### SUNDAY TRADING

**Mr. SLATER:** Will the Minister of Health, representing the Attorney-General, say whether any amendments are proposed to the Licensing Act to provide for additional trading hours by hotels on Sunday? Recently I have noted, from reports in its trade journal and again today in the press, that the Australian Hotels Association is making a submission for the hotels to be open on Sunday, in the belief that there is great public demand for this proposal. I have also noted that the Attorney, in a statement in recent weeks, indicated that there was no intention to alter the present situation. Consequently, I ask the Minister whether the submissions about to be made by the A.H.A. will alter that opinion regarding Sunday trading by hotels.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The Government's policy over quite some period has been not to change, in any fundamental way, the licensing laws that apply to Sunday trading. To my knowledge, no proposals have been put to the Government for a change. The matter has not been considered by Cabinet lately. Therefore, I think that this report in the press is from some organisation that is flying a kite. I will refer the matter to the Attorney, asking him whether there has been any change. To my knowledge there has not been and, unless the matter was referred to Cabinet, no changes would be proposed.

#### NORTHFIELD RESEARCH FARM

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** My question of the Premier is further to the one asked by the member for Murray.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** What was the question?

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** You ask what the earlier question was. You should have been listening, but I will ask my question just the same. What new research farm facilities will be made available to the Agriculture and Fisheries Department to ensure that agricultural research in South Australia is not retarded severely by the proposed use of the Northfield research farm land for new housing development? As a former employee of the department at Northfield for six years—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** They were very disappointed to see me go. As a former employee, I know how essential that research farm is in much of the agricultural research carried out in South Australia. Equally important is the effect that this proposal will have on the morale of the officers of the department. Until the early 1970's, the head office of the department was to be transferred to the Northfield research area, and the farm retained. Then, after about 1973, the head office and the research laboratories were to be transferred to the new city of Monarto, the city that never has been.

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

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Then the head office was transferred from the old building in Gawler Place to the new Grenfell Centre.

Now, apparently, from the announcement that has been

made, the research farm at Northfield is to be lost for research purposes, even though the actual laboratories will remain. If that is the case, it will have a devastating effect on agricultural research in this State.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I have some knowledge of this matter.

**Mr. Wotton:** You've more than the Minister of Planning, have you?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I was Minister for Planning until March this year. First, no decision has been taken on the matter, but, secondly, were a decision taken, relocation of the department's agricultural facilities would be part of the decision. The discussions that have taken place between the Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs Department and the Agriculture Department have been on that basis. So, there is absolutely no case for the implied conclusion in the honourable member's question that the land would be transferred and used for housing, and the research facilities closed down.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** It has not been considered?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** It is being considered. It was made clear previously that the matter was under consideration.

**Mr. Wotton:** Being considered for housing?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Being considered for alternative use. The Opposition carries on a treat about the waste of money. Here, we have land within four or five miles of the centre of the city being used for agricultural research. That land, for urban development purposes, even if large provision is made for playing fields, parks, and that sort of thing, will have a value many times greater than its value for agricultural research. It may well be the case that the agricultural research facilities can be relocated, for example, in an area such as Roseworthy, and still leave a profit in it in using the land at Northfield for other purposes. That is the kind of investigation that has been looked at. It is a perfectly proper thing. Obviously, if it were thought to be too costly to re-establish these facilities and get urban development going in that area, it will not be done.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** You would like to get your hands on the Waite Agricultural Research Institute?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** One should not have to chase every *canard* that the member for Davenport wants to spread. He is better occupied kicking out panels than at floating paper darts inscribed with the latest rumour he wants to spread.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** Do you think—?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members complain about the length of replies by Ministers. During this reply there have been four or five interjections, so I cannot see how they have reason to complain.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** First, no decision has been taken and, secondly, no research activities will be closed down, although they could be relocated in an area suitable for agricultural research work. Thirdly, it has to be demonstrated that the result of that overall situation can lead to urban development on a reasonable basis. I should have thought that any urban development at Northfield, if it were to take place, would be preferable to further urban development on the extremities of the city.

I suppose that the member for Davenport and the member for Murray have heard about what has happened to petrol prices. I suppose that those two members know something about what the future will hold for this country in about 10 years time in terms of the availability of petrol. Therefore, any action taken by the Government which will minimise the extent to which people have to travel is action that ought to be taken. That is the position at present. When a decision is taken—

*Mr. Dean Brown interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:**—it will be only after full consideration of the issues involved, and after, as the Minister of Planning mentioned, consultation with people in the local area and proper consideration of the issues.

## OIL AND COAL PRICES

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Will the Deputy Premier inform the House what action the Government is taking to keep down the price of oil and coal used for power generation and in the manufacturing industry, in view of the impact on industry of the Commonwealth policy of world parity prices for oil?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** A conference of Ministers involved in economic development was held in Brisbane last Friday. At that conference the issues created by world parity prices for oil were discussed. It was put to the conference that we should be concerned in this country to take action to ensure that coal and gas used for power generation and coal and gas used directly in manufacturing industry would not be pushed to world parity prices.

In making that point (and I was the Minister responsible for doing that), I pointed out that world parity prices for oil had the effect of putting Australian manufacturing industry at a disadvantage, comparatively, with other countries in the world, first (and principally) because the impact of transport costs on manufacturing costs is proportionately greater in Australia than in any other industrialised country. If oil prices move, for example, to world parity in the United States and in Australia, the percentage increase in manufacturing costs in Australia will be greater than it is in the United States because of the basic and crucial role that transport costs play in our manufacturing costs.

It was pointed out to the Commonwealth Minister for Industry and Commerce (Mr. Lynch) that Australian manufacturing industry needs offsetting advantages to the effect of increased prices for oil. One of the advantages we have at present is that power costs in Australia are significantly lower than they are in most other industrialised countries: currently, power costs in Australia would be half the level of those in the United States, Japan and Western Europe. We need to ensure that that advantage is maintained in this country if we are to have an offset to the effect of increased oil prices. It was also pointed out that coal and gas used directly in manufacturing industry would act as a further offset if those commodities were kept at a relatively lower price to offset the effect of increased oil prices.

We put a resolution to the conference expressing our support for policies that would ensure that coal and gas used in power generation, or for manufacturing industry, would be kept relatively cheap. Unfortunately, the Federal Minister for Industry and Commerce refused to back the proposition, although it had the backing of the Victorian Premier, Mr. Hamer, and of New South Wales, Queensland and Tasmania. As a consequence of that situation, no press statement was issued from that conference.

I think that we now have to ensure that the Commonwealth Government is made aware of the problems of manufacturing industry in this country and of the need to ensure that our costs are not put up adversely against it, and that manufacturing costs are not increased because of an attempt by the Commonwealth Government to put extra excise taxes on coal and natural gas.

Yesterday, I issued a statement calling on the Federal Government to make a clear statement that it would not allow the price of coal and gas used in power generation and in the manufacturing sector in Australia to rise to world parity prices.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** What do you reckon they'll do about it?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** When I raised the matter on Friday in Brisbane, we expected that automatic support would be forthcoming from Mr. Lynch, the Federal Minister for Industry and Commerce. It was thought that he, as the Minister who had a direct responsibility for the development of industry, would support the basic logic. The Victorian Premier had no difficulty at all; in fact, the resolution was really a composite resolution, drafted by Mr. Hamer and me, with suggested alternative phrasing later on from Mr. Lee, the Queensland Minister. However, Mr. Lynch refused to support it.

In the circumstances, I become very suspicious of what Mr. Howard and his colleagues have been up to and what is contained in the Commonwealth Budget. I believe it is essential to take up this issue now and to make the point to Canberra that action to push up prices for coal and gas used internally in Australia is not an action that will be supported by industry generally or by State Governments.

#### SOUTH-EAST COAL DEPOSIT

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I would like to ask a question of the Premier, and it is supplementary to an answer that he gave me to a Question on Notice, to the first question asked today by the Leader of the Opposition, and also to some of the garbage that has just been uttered by the Minister.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the honourable member will not comment in asking a question. This is not the only occasion on which this has happened. I hope in future the honourable member does not carry on in this manner.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I must explain that, having listened to the Deputy Premier, my comment was irresistible. The question is—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have just spoken to the honourable member; if he continues with this conduct, I will take action.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** My question is: does the Premier know anything about the discovery by the Western Mining Corporation of large deposits of coal in the South-East, and, if so, what does he know? As I said before I transgressed (and I am now making my explanation), this question is in part supplementary to an answer the Premier gave me to a Question on Notice about the cost of traipsing to Mount Gambier for a Cabinet meeting.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is now digressing from the question that he was asking.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** No. I would have expected that, being in the South-East, the Premier had heard about this matter, but apparently he has not, because I have been waiting all day for something to be said. Western Mining Corporation reported last week that it had made a discovery in the South-East.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I refer to page 9 of *Hansard*, on which appears a question asked by the honourable member for Victoria, which is very similar to the one the honourable member is asking.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** With great respect, Sir, it is not the same question. I am asking the Premier what he knows about the matter. This is supposed to be the third main steaming coal province in Australia, if it comes to anything. It will have enormous implications for this State and will resolve a lot of gloom.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the honourable member will resume his seat and will not continue to speak when the Speaker is on his feet. The question asked by the honourable member for Victoria related to a report of the alleged coal find in the South-East; I consider that this question is very similar. If the honourable member continues in this vein, I will not allow the question.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** All right; I will therefore stop at this point. This is something that could be of great benefit to the State and could do a lot to improve the economy. I therefore ask the Premier what he knows.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! In future I will call the honourable member for Mitcham to order much more quickly.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** When the member for Victoria directed this question to me last week, no doubt the member for Mitcham was absent from the House—probably unsuccessfully defending another client. I do not want to repeat what I said, and I refer the honourable member to *Hansard*, from which he will see that I replied and gave some details of the find. In addition, the Minister of Mines and Energy, who is responsible for this area, made a statement about the find.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Who's he?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The member for Mitcham quite obviously does not attend to his duties in this House, nor does he read the newspapers very closely. The honourable member is perfectly right in saying that it could be of great significance to South Australia, and I join him in the wish that it will be. I refer him to *Hansard* so that he can brief himself on what details we have of the find at the moment, which details I gave to the honourable member for Victoria who represents the area, in reply to his question.

#### PRIVATE HOUSING APPROVALS

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Did the Premier see the editorial in this morning's *Advertiser* which suggested that new private housing approvals in this State are not yet showing the encouraging upward trend reported in other States, and can he say whether the position is as suggested by the *Advertiser*?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I was a little disappointed, because I believe the figures that again are demonstrated in the Australian Bureau of Statistics bulletin show that there has been a significant upturn in housing approvals in this State. In the June quarter this year, 1 623 new private houses were approved, compared to 1 452 in the June quarter of 1978. That is almost a 12 per cent increase, and I think it could be described as at least hopeful and a good indicator. In addition approvals for the latest month available (June 1979) were the highest to date this year.

#### ROAD GRANT FUNDS

**Mr. BLACKER:** Will the Minister of Transport say whether the Government will review the method of allocating road grant funds to local government areas to ensure that unspent allocations from metropolitan areas, or other areas for that matter, are reallocated to areas of greatest need? I have received letters from a number of councils in my area which have expressed concern at the indication in the 1977-78 Highways Department Annual Report. Appendix I shows that over half of the grants allocated to the metropolitan area remained unexpended at 30 June 1978. Some individual councils within this

district failed to expend any of the funds allocated during the year. In my electorate all local government areas, except Port Lincoln, are rural areas, and they are in urgent need of road funds. They are concerned that up to 49 per cent of the allocation to the metropolitan area is not being reallocated, and the expressed wish was that any unspent moneys be reallocated into the areas of greatest need.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The point the honourable member has made is associated with the Highways Department allocation of grants. Inevitably from time to time there are unexpended amounts at the end of any financial year. That relates not just to metropolitan areas, but also to the whole State. It varies from area to area, depending on the circumstances. The funds that are still in hand at the end of the year are used for the purpose of further allocations, and that is exactly what has happened on this occasion.

I have said before that I can understand and appreciate the attitude of those councils which have a lesser grant this year than they received last year, but two factors need to be set out clearly in this regard. First, the total allocation for 1979-80 is increased by about the same sum as the increase that the State received by way of the top-up on account of inflation of the Federal allocation. Our total commitment to local government has kept pace with inflation.

The second point, of course, is that, whilst I agree that many councils do not accept the fact, nevertheless it is a fact of life that road funds are determined on a needs basis, and it cannot and must not ever be accepted that, simply because a council received \$50 000 last year, for example, it must receive \$50 000 the next year, as well as the 7 per cent for inflation. It is not a handout to councils in that way. Indeed, the handout that councils now receive (and we are certainly delighted that it is now a fact of life) is a share of the personal income tax, payable on a pro rata basis for the first 30 per cent, and then the Grants Commission allocates the remainder. That has no strings attached.

Road grants are determined on the need in the particular area and as such must vary from time to time. It is ironical that the councils that write in complaining are those that have had reductions. Those councils that have received increased allocations do not seem to think it necessary to write in to say either, "Thank you for the extra money" or anything else, but that is human nature.

#### WINGFIELD DUMP

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Can the Minister of Health give any information concerning actions that may be taken to control pollution caused by the burning of rubbish at the Wingfield dump? For many years a problem has been caused by the burning of rubbish, oils and plastics at the Wingfield dump. The former member for Ross Smith raised the matter in this House several times, as I have done. The residents of the Districts of Price and Ross Smith are constantly complaining about the smoke and noxious odours emanating from the burning of rubbish, oil and plastics.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I am pleased to be able to say that in the near future regulations will be submitted to the Governor to ensure that appropriate powers exist to deal with this problem, which, as the honourable member has said, has been one of considerable concern for people, particularly in the north-western part of the metropolitan area, for many years. As he said, the former member for Ross Smith used periodically to bring the matter to the attention of the House when he was a member. I saw him

in the gallery earlier this afternoon, and I am sure that he would have been pleased to hear that one of the members of the present Parliament is still continuing to take some interest in this matter.

The regulations that will be put before the Governor for his consent will seek not only to deal with the pollution and health problems arising from the burning of refuse and other materials at the Wingfield dump but also to give adequate powers to deal with such problems in other parts of the State, in some rural areas, in country cities, and in other municipal council areas throughout the metropolitan area. I hope that, at the earliest possible time, following the implementation of the regulations, appropriate action will be taken to curb the amount of burning of noxious materials at the Wingfield dump. I hope that the regulations will be in force before the end of this month and that we will then be able to take appropriate action.

#### HOUSING TRUST RENTS

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Can the Minister of Planning say whether the Housing Trust intends to base the rentals on its commercial properties on turnover, and also say what right the Housing Trust has to seek this private information? A Housing Trust circular to tenants dated June 1979 states:

For the purpose of clause (z) (a) "gross receipts" means the total amount of money or moneys worth received by or on behalf of the lessee or any person or body (whether incorporated or not) without any deduction being made for costs, expenses and liabilities incurred by the lessee or such other person or body in connection therewith or otherwise.

The Minister would know that gross turnover does not mean a thing. It does not mean high profit: in fact, mark-up is the important factor relating to this aspect.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I think the honourable member is referring to a matter which was raised in a grievance debate in the House last Tuesday. I have asked for a report on this matter from the Housing Trust because I had no direct knowledge of it before the matter was raised by the member for Light. I have made some inquiries since then and discovered that it is not unknown for landlords leasing office and shop accommodation in the private sector to require this information. At this stage I would prefer to wait until I am in possession of a full report from the Housing Trust which I will make available to the honourable member.

*At 3.7 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

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

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 2 August. Page 340.)

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** When the last Supply Bill was in this House on 13 February I focussed my remarks on the disproportionate growth of the State Public Service. I pointed out that in the previous nine years the number of State Government employees had increased by 82 per cent, compared with a growth in the State's labour force of only 14.6 per cent. I emphasised that this exponential rate of growth was imposing a considerable strain on the private sector, which was facing very high levels of taxation to pay for the burgeoning

Public Service.

Those comments were made six months ago, on the eve of the new Premier's accession. It seemed at the time that they were taken to heart, for not long afterwards the honourable gentleman promised publicly to institute some order and management where it had been lacking. More particularly, he promised several times to hold the line on the number of Crown employees—to stem the increase by imposing ceilings at the then present levels. Of course, the Premier had a golden opportunity to do just that, and simultaneously to reduce the size of this Supply Bill, because the overall numbers in the Public Service were reduced in December and again in January, due to normal end-of-year retirements. In fact, in December last there were 3 800 fewer employees than in the previous month, and in January that number had fallen by yet another 2 800.

So far from holding the line at that level, as the Premier promised, and indeed as he indicated this afternoon had been done, the figures went up again, by 4 600 in February and by a further 700 in March. As at May, the date of the latest figures released, the total number of declared employees had grown by 3 800, or 3·8 per cent, in just four months.

In addition, in the same four months the number of declared State Government employees, expressed as a proportion of all employees in South Australia, rose from 23·26 per cent to 23·8 per cent, so even on the figures that are provided to the Bureau of Statistics by the State Government, the Premier stands condemned for failing to contain the growth of the State Public Service as he promised to do just six months ago.

What makes even these figures suspect is that it has come to the attention of the Opposition that several departments and statutory authorities have recently engaged employees without actually putting them on the publicly declared pay-roll. The Highways Department, for instance, is just one department that has added to its day-labour force, and its highway inspection service, by hiring staff on a day-to-day basis. In effect, these people have become permanent casuals, unable to be counted among the permanent staff for fear of disclosing further Government expansion. Indeed, I know personally of casual employees who have been told that their rather peculiar job status derives solely from the Government's wish to create the semblance of non-growth in the Public Service. Indeed, the Government is deceiving the community by allowing it to be thought that there is no growth when, in actual fact, there is. This all points to the fact that no change really has been effected since the Premier issued his promises at the beginning of the year. The public sector remains a swollen, economic dead weight on private sector production and available Government revenue.

Here, of course, is the rub, because the size of the Public Service bears directly on the availability of funds for other Government purposes and, in fact, determines the revenue-raising options that are open to the Government. The more people we employ in the State Public Service, the higher must be the taxation to support that, and the higher the taxation must be, the more everyone must pay. It cannot be said too plainly that, so long as the Public Service grows at a much faster rate than the private sector, this Government is telegraphing the message, loudly and clearly, that tax revenues inevitably must rise.

Of course, as we have heard, the Premier was reported as saying only yesterday at Simpson Pope that there was a suggestion that the South Australian economy might be about to turn the corner. He did not say that it had turned; in fact, he did not even say that it would turn. He said

there was a suggestion that it might turn, the most statesmanlike two-bob each way bet I have heard for a long time.

That suggestion, the Premier told his audience, was to be found in the latest employment figures for May, which have been canvassed this afternoon and which reveal an increase of 700 privately employed persons, over the previous 12 months. This afternoon the Premier totally misunderstood the point of the question he had been asked. I do not say that he was quoting a false figure: indeed, the figure is undeniably true, but it was a pity that he chose yesterday and again today to tell only half the story (actually, it was rather less than half). He could have said, for instance (and it would have been equally true) that, while South Australia created 700 new jobs in the private sector, the other States created 47 300. Our share of the total was less than 1·5 per cent. We have 9 per cent of the population.

He could have said that the total number of private employees in South Australia actually fell by 600 in the month from April to May, but at the same time rose by 8 700 in the other States. When comparing South Australia to Western Australia, he could have said that the private sector workforce in South Australia is now actually smaller than it was eight years ago, but in the same period it has grown by 22 900 in Western Australia and by 40 600 jobs in Queensland. He could have said that total employment in South Australia actually fell by 400 in the month from April to May, and by 1 900 in the past 12 months, compared to an annual growth of 62 900 jobs in the other five States.

All these things could have been said, Mr. Speaker, and all would have been equally as true as the Premier's remarks, but, if they had been said, the corner he says we are about to turn might have seemed considerably farther away. The fact remains that, no matter how the Premier tries to construe the employment figures, the private, productive sector of the South Australian economy continues to lurch under the increasing weight of the public sector on its back. This is not knocking South Australia as the Premier suggests: this is facing up to the realities of the situation, the fact that private sector employment is needed in this State, and that the private sector should be encouraged to create employment, not the public sector encouraged to expand.

Nothing has happened in the past six months to alter the substance or the force of the comments I made when Supply was last granted in this House. We have had promises made by the new Premier and broken. What is more to the point is that the fact that those promises have been broken has been hidden from the general public by the use of devious means to conceal the true facts about the present state of employment in the Public Service and in the public sector. With many misgivings, I support the Bill.

**Mr. BECKER (Hanson):** In supporting the Leader's remarks, I point out that the House should take note of the fact that, when explaining the Bill, the Premier said that Supply Bill (No. 2) sought \$270 000 000 to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent was received for the Appropriation Bill, together with the detailed Estimates of Expenditure for 1979-80 (the Budget). The Premier also made the point that the amount required was the same as that sought in the second Supply Bill in 1978-79. He implied that the Government could be holding its cost as far as the public sector was concerned.

I hope that members have listened when the Leader has pointed out the real truth about South Australia. I do not think that the Government is being honest with the people.



when it says that it is trying to contain costs. In April this year the Government was warned in a report in *Journal of Industry*. The report, headed "Climbing with the brakes on", gave a fair assessment of the situation in South Australia and the tremendous growth of the Public Service since the Labor Party came to office here. The report also made this point:

There is a need for a complete review of the cost structure of the public sector, with a view to promoting efficiency in the distribution of the taxpayers' money and ensuring proper accountability of all moneys spent. At present, there seems an absolute disregard for restraint in the dispersal of the taxpayers' money—except where public restraint is likely to be of political advantage.

I draw the attention of the House to that statement. We are reminded that 12 new positions have been created in the Public Service Board area alone. The board employs 200 persons and, for the financial year ended June 1978, the cost to the taxpayers was \$3 700 000, yet in 1970 the Public Service Board had cost the State \$418 000. We see there the real growth in that department alone. It is reflected right through the public sector, but the board must take some responsibility for the problems the State now has.

It creates the positions. It obtains the personnel for the various departments but, from what I can ascertain, it does not go through with the job specification. That is what is costing the taxpayers money in this State. We find that internal auditors are being appointed to do their job, but they never follow it through. If it happens at the internal auditor level, what must go on throughout the various departments?

Since 29 June 1978, the board has appointed four Directors at \$28 728 each per annum and one Director at \$26 393 per annum. On 14 September another position was advertised, namely, that of an Executive Assistant at \$28 728 per annum; and on 26 October 1978 one Assistant Director position was advertised, at a salary of \$26 393 per annum. The following positions were also advertised: on 8 February 1979, one Executive Assistant at \$36 901 per annum; on 8 March 1979, one Executive Assistant at \$32 494 per annum; 29 March 1979, one Projector Co-ordinator at \$28 728 per annum; 12 April 1979, one Assistant Commissioner at \$33 982; and on 22 April 1979, one Executive Assistant at \$33 982. We should like to know what was the justification for creating all those positions and whether the tremendous salaries are justified.

**Mr. Millhouse:** That's a fair salary.

**Mr. BECKER:** This is the top executive range. So, the Government has been continuing to increase numbers and saying that the numbers were being reduced, whereas it is putting some of its favoured sons in top positions. On 6 June 1979, the Public Service Board Notice advertised the position of Director, Policy, in the Premier's Department, at \$30 100 per annum. The duties of the position are as follows:

Responsible to the Director-General for providing advice on the formulation of Government policies and programmes, the review of existing policies and programmes and the co-ordination of policies and programmes throughout the Government and between Governments to ensure consistency with the Government's overall objectives.

The sum of \$30 100 is a lot to pay in that type of position as well. We can see that there is no real restraint by the Government, which is still committed to its overall policy, that the public expenditure policies of the State Labor Government will provide that Governments will regulate their financial position by raising tax rates rather than by cutting public expenditure programmes. That sums up the

whole point we are trying to make at this stage. The Leader has said that the public of South Australia is looking for good, honest, open government and for restraint within the public sector.

I remind the Premier of the report printed in the *Management Bulletin* in May 1979 of an address he made to members of the Australian Institute of Management. "There is now growing confidence in South Australia's economy" appears to be the Premier's total claim. The bulletin states:

This Government is not and will not be anti-business, and I want you to know that from the start.

That is fair enough. We appreciate that sort of sentiment, if the Government is still able to demonstrate it. It has not given any demonstration at this stage, certainly not by seeking the sum in the Bill. Here is the real crunch, as printed in the bulletin:

I may not go down in South Australian history as a Premier who was a great social visionary or political philosopher. What I would like to be remembered for, however, is my concern for sound management, and I think the Government's action during the past two months on problems such as the Public Accounts Committee Report on hospital wastage demonstrates that we mean business. I personally won't tolerate waste and inefficiency. And when I need advice from the private sector, as I did when I appointed Sir Norman Young, to help us on hospital management, I won't hesitate to seek that advice.

If the Premier has looked into that situation, why is it necessary to appoint so many people on top executive salaries within the Public Service? Why was it that, on 25 May 1979, in reply to the Deputy Leader, who was seeking information regarding the Public Accounts Committee's Report, which mentioned "the complete lack of effective systems of budgetary control to contain spending to real needs applies to most Government departments", the Premier went on in a most derogatory fashion to criticise the committee's statement? The Premier said that he would act on wastage, yet he said that the committee's statement was not correct. The committee's statement is correct. The Auditor-General has been reporting for many years about the inefficiency of internal auditing and about departments being unable to tackle the problem of proper and sound management. The Hospitals Department was only the tip of the iceberg.

We now have an inquiry into the Public Buildings Department for that very reason. Obviously, the Government is afraid that the committee could step into that area. If the committee wants to look into that department, it may do so.

**Mr. Tonkin:** I think I'd trust the Public Accounts Committee to have a more reliable report.

**Mr. BECKER:** That would be true. It will not leave anything out, and it will bring to Parliament's attention any problems or lack of control within that department, as it would in relation to any other department. It is ironic that the man who holds himself up in this State as being one who will not tolerate wastage or inefficiency, namely, the Premier, was the Minister of two departments that have probably cost the taxpayers more through inefficiency than any other Minister has done. That was when the Premier was Minister of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which is currently running deficits of \$25 000 000 a year. There has been no real attempt to curb those deficits. The operating expenses of that department have increased by 56 per cent in the past two years, and the price of water has increased 50 per cent over the past three years. There is no real incentive in that department to become efficient, and this is reflected in the water rates and sewerage accounts to property owners within the



State.

In the Public Buildings Department, over the past four years alone, the deficits have amounted to about \$232 000 000, which is not a bad sort of sum to spend on operating one department for four years. There must be room for efficiencies within these departments, and it is up to the Premier not to make hollow statements but to demonstrate his genuineness in this regard.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Minister of Health):** I move:

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

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** It is axiomatic to say that South Australians are vastly over-governed, and paying dearly for that questionable privilege in high taxation and Government charges. Over-government is not simply a matter of whether we have too many politicians (that seems to be one side of the argument). It is that the whole process of government has been allowed steadily to intrude into and control our lives to an extent far greater than ever before.

Indeed, under this Labor Government that intrusion has been dictated by philosophical belief—the belief that government is endowed with almost unlimited powers to enter into all manner of activities and enterprises for what is termed the public good, regardless of the effects that such intrusion may have on the freedom of individuals as producers or traders or even consumers. The machinery established to realise that belief is everywhere about us. It is to be seen in the Statute Book, in the flourishing of more and more Government departments, more and more licensing boards, and more and more officers of the Crown. It can be seen in an ever-increasing public sector. It can be seen in more and more public enterprises replacing private enterprise, in bigger and bigger bureaucracies, and in miles and miles of red tape.

It can be measured by the 32 000 additional employees hired by this Government in the last eight years, compared to an actual decrease in the number of private sector jobs in the same period. It can be measured by waste and inefficiency because, by definition and by platform agreed as recently as last February, this Labor Government is committed to higher and still higher levels of taxation to fund its empire building; by definition, this Labor Government, in common with many other socialist Governments of the past throughout the world, is prodigal by nature, not prudent.

This is why taxation revenues under this Government have risen by over 500 per cent since 1970, compared to a rise in average weekly earnings of only 200 per cent and in the rate of inflation of only 145 per cent in the same period. In other words, the Labor Government has increased its taxation revenue  $2\frac{1}{2}$  times faster than the taxpayers' capacity to pay and  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times faster than the changing rate of currency value; not a bad record for rip-off, Mr. Speaker. This specious belief that Governments are the only bodies that are able to solve the community's problems, and that nobody else is capable of doing it, can be measured by larger and larger capital borrowings and an ever-increasing public debt.

**Mr. Mathwin:** That is socialism.

**Mr. TONKIN:** It is, indeed; socialism of the old-fashioned, outdated kind, the sort laid aside in Britain. It was laid aside by James Callaghan before Margaret Thatcher's victory in the last election. It has been laid aside by Pierre Trudeau in Canada, and by Neville Wran in New South Wales, yet we find that in South Australia

we are still committed by the Government of this State to an outdated, outmoded collectivist system of socialism, which is increasing the public debt and our State taxes to finance services that the Government is prepared to offer, whether the community wants them or not.

Five years ago this State's public debt increased by only 2 per cent a year. Now it increases by 9 per cent a year, and the figure is still rising. As to the State debt, there seems to be a view taken by some Government Ministers that, because it is a debt owed by the Government, it is not our individual responsibility, but the State debt (the public debt) is, in fact, a debt owed by every member of the community through the Government. It is a charge on the community at large. Five years ago, 11 per cent of the State Budget was used to meet debt charges. The figure is now 14 per cent spent in meeting interest charges, and that figure is still rising.

Above all, the collectivist philosophy can be identified by its extremely naive assumption that bigger government is necessarily better government; that spending is synonymous with achievement; that the further progress of society can be realised only by extending the powers of the State; that for every problem that arises Governments can provide a satisfactory solution. The whole concept, to any thinking person, is laughable, because members of the community know full well that Governments do not have the answers, that bigger Government programmes do not necessarily solve the problems created by the original Government programme, but these simplistic assumptions have never been questioned by the South Australian Labor Government.

Clearly, it has never stopped to examine the direction in which it is taking this State. It has never stopped and thought that the taxation levels it imposes may well be so high as to kill the goose that lays the golden egg; that is, kill off the ability of taxpayers to pay. Every time this Government expands its activities, every time it intrudes into the private sector, it is, in fact, destroying jobs and therefore destroying not only the livelihoods of people but also their ability to pay.

It has never so much as thought that the last thing needed to deal with problems arising from the failure of certain Government activities is more Government activity. Obviously, none of these elementary assessments has ever crossed the collective mind of this collective Government, because absolutely nothing has been done to mitigate the effects of its disastrous policies on the development of this State.

Average taxation rates remain the highest in the country through the continued imposition of taxes that have been abolished or modified in every other State. Waste and inefficiency are occurring constantly, because nothing is done to increase accountability of public authorities or to strengthen the hand of the Auditor-General and the Public Accounts Committee. The value of spending programmes remains unknown, because single-line budgeting is retained in preference to cost-efficiency budgeting. Public money (taxpayers' money) is virtually thrown away on grandiose schemes, the ultimate purpose of which is to create Government monopolies and thereby restrict the liberties of the taxpayers themselves. There is no doubt that both private and Government monopolies are undesirable and should be opposed at all costs. Although private monopoly is totally opposed by the Labor Government and its members on the benches opposite, they are prepared to tolerate and, indeed, support the monopoly forced on the community by trade unions and the monopoly of Government enterprise, so they are seeing only one side of the question and can only further their own interests.

All of this (this restriction of the liberties of taxpayers, of individual freedom) is done in the name of "the public good", whatever that amorphous term may be, and with clear disregard for the individual good of the taxpayers in whose name this Government claims to hold office. For nearly 10 years, Labor's definition of progress, under this collectivist theory, has remained unchallenged; but those halcyon days are practically over, because events both here and abroad are exposing this brand of socialism for the harmful profligate spending spree that it really is. The events at home are known to every elector in the State. They know, if they choose to think about it, that South Australia, alone among the States, is on its knees. They know that our Government is bereft of any vision to develop this State's resources, to renew prosperity, or to strengthen confidence. They know the State is over-governed, and they know that they are paying for that over-government waste and extravagance with their own hard-earned cash. Just ask any resident whose property has been revalued recently what that has done to his rates and taxes, land tax and water rates. Ask those who are leaving the State permanently to find a place where they can afford to live and find work.

Apart from this, it is the events occurring in other countries that are now capturing the public imagination at home—events which show clearly that Labor's collectivist doctrine cannot lead to the land of milk and honey; events which show that big and excessive government can be called to heel by the taxpayers themselves. I am referring, of course, to the tax revolt that began 12 months ago in California in the form of Proposition 13, and the vigour with which many American States are now embracing the concept not only set down in Proposition 13, but of sunset legislation.

As members may be aware, Proposition 13 cut savagely into the revenue collected at county, or local government, level in the State of California. Before Proposition 13, the revenue collected in property taxes in California was \$10 billion a year. In the year after Proposition 13, this figure was reduced to \$3 billion, a massive reduction of 70 per cent.

On a State-wide basis (that is, State and county taxes combined), revenue collections before Proposition 13 were \$24 billion. After Proposition 13, they were reduced to \$17 billion—an overall reduction of 30 per cent. The instrument that forced these reductions, the so-called Proposition 13, was an overwhelmingly supported referendum proposal comprising four main parts: first, it cut the maximum property tax rate to 1 per cent of assessed value; secondly, it required that property values used for assessment purposes were to be those struck in 1975-76, even though the new law would not become effective until July 1978; thirdly, it limited future increases in assessed values to 2 per cent a year; and finally, it reduced the likelihood of new, substitute taxes being imposed by requiring a two-thirds majority in the State Congress for any new tax proposals.

It would be interesting in these circumstances to see how the Minister of Transport's legislation on the fuel franchise would go; it would not pass. Essentially, the battle lines that were drawn over Proposition 13 were no different from those represented in this Chamber. The Democratic Socialists prophesied doom and disaster. We heard some of it echoed in this Chamber by the member for Morphett just a few days ago, uninformed as he was. He was absolutely typical of the alarmist theories put forward by the Democratic Socialists. They claimed that, if taxes were cut, the State would virtually wither on the vine: schools, libraries, police services, firefighting departments, parks and gardens would all close; local welfare programmes

would cease; and thousands of jobs would be lost.

Is that not reminiscent of the remarks made on every possible occasion by the Premier and his predecessor: "Which services would you cut if we reduced State taxes?" That is the biggest red herring of them all, because the experience in California and in other countries has shown that services do not have to be cut. Those essential services remain. It is the non-essential services, the waste and extravagance, that must be cut. If members on the Government side believe that essential services must be cut, it is pretty obvious that they have their wires crossed completely and have no idea of the proper management of this State. In fact, one "independent, authoritative" study from the University of California at Los Angeles predicted that 450 000 jobs would disappear.

All of these alarmist predictions, of course, were predicated on a misguided assumption, indeed a philosophic conviction, that the only agent of progress, welfare, or change is the State, with its insatiable appetite for more and more taxes. On the other side of the argument (just as we are on the other side of the argument in this House), were the classical Liberals, who claimed that tax cuts would actually generate more tax revenue by increasing business activity.

Professor Arthur Laffer even went so far as to put a figure on it; he predicted that, in the first 12 months alone, "The expansion of business activity caused by the reduction in property taxes will yield an additional \$3 billion in revenue to the State." What actually happened, of course, is now being widely reported throughout the world, for the events in California are an undeniable vindication of the Liberal approach and a complete discreditation of collectivist socialism.

Members opposite can carry on all they want—the record is what matters. When one considers the record of the tremendous advances that have been made in California in the past 12 months, and sets that against the results of nearly 10 years of collectivist socialism in this State, the answer is clear for all to see, and the whining noises that emanate from the back benches opposite interminably can do nothing whatever to change the facts.

A total of 102 000 jobs disappeared from the public sector, but only 16 000 of these were retrenchments directly attributable to Proposition 13. The other 86 000 jobs disappeared due to normal attrition through retirement and voluntary resignation. If members opposite are worried about the 16 000, I point out that, in the private sector, in just 12 months an extra 552 000 jobs were created, more than enough to absorb all the redundant public servants and to create opportunities for many other people who had been out of work for years.

**Mr. Groom:** How many other States are following their example?

**Mr. TONKIN:** I wish the member for Morphett could contain himself and listen in patience, because if he is prepared to listen he may learn something, and he may even be able to become convinced and have some influence (not much, I will accept) on his leaders in this House—the Premier and the Deputy Premier—who might possibly be persuaded to see some sense in the interests of the well-being of this State.

The unemployment rate, traditionally higher in California than the national average, fell by one full percentage point in that year—considerably faster than that of the national average, or that of most other States. Personal incomes have risen in real terms, and retail sales have grown by a staggering 14 per cent in 12 months. At the end of June, 200 000 new homes were under construction, which far exceeded any earlier forecasts.

As predicted by Laffer, the State Government finished

the year with a surplus of \$2.25 billion, not with the yawning deficit predicted by some. Schools, police departments, libraries and all the other services that were alleged to be under threat have remained open and are managing by resetting their priorities to areas of real need. Almost everyone in California has been prepared to tighten the belt one more notch in the interest of the well-being of the State as a whole.

**Mr. Becker:** It has created employment.

**Mr. TONKIN:** It has indeed created employment, and nothing members opposite can say can refute that. South Australia is lacking in spirit and community pride because the present Government will not give direction and leadership. These indisputable facts confirm beyond any reasonable doubt that liberalism holds the key to progress and prosperity, and that socialism with all of its attendant taxes and regulations is only compounding our problems at present. That message has so far swept through more than 40 American states, which are considering following the Californian model. I am disappointed that the member for Morphett is no longer interested in learning that fact.

The Californian model has been endorsed overwhelmingly in the election of the Thatcher Government in Britain, and it is now gaining more and more public acceptance in South Australia. When we in the Liberal Party promise to abolish succession duties and substantially reduce land tax on the principal place of residence, people in South Australia now know that our policies will work.

Of course, reducing the tax burden is still only one-half of the reforms that are needed to eliminate waste in government, and to dismantle the unnecessary bureaucracies. The other Liberal policy that is taking America by storm is the introduction of sunset legislation, which places the onus squarely on the shoulders of statutory authorities to prove the need for their continued existence.

Just three years ago no State legislature in the United States was game to adopt sunset legislation. Then in 1976, Colorado enacted a law which automatically disbanded 13 agencies unless they could justify their continued existence. As a result, one agency was abolished altogether; two had their functions transferred to departments; two were amalgamated; one had its functions broadened and another had its membership increased.

I mention this in some detail because it demonstrates quite conclusively that the administration of sunset legislation is not simply the wielding of a big axe. On the contrary, useful, efficient Government agencies can actually be strengthened after close inspection of their activities, but by the same token useless, wasteful agencies get the fate they deserve—the only fate that is consistent with any responsible Government's obligation to account properly for the public funds in its custody.

As I say, the Colorado sunset legislation was not enacted until 1976, but since then another 25 American States have followed suit or have legislation presently before their Congresses. Furthermore, Senator Edmund Muskie and 42 co-sponsors have introduced a Federal Sunset Bill which has been unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, and now awaits final passage by Congress.

When one considers the combined effect of Proposition 13 and the tax revolt and sunset legislation, it is obvious that the writing is on the wall for the waste and extravagance throughout the world where these measures are being adopted and that the writing is also on the wall for South Australia. These measures will be synonymous with good government in South Australia. Inevitably, inexorably, the new-found respectability of Government

management on Liberal principles is gaining support with more and more people in South Australia. There is a growing and on-going revolt against high State taxation, and wasteful Government expenditure.

Electors in this State are demanding lower property taxes that accord with their capacity to pay, not with some theoretical notional value of their land. They are demanding the abolition of death taxes which break up families and put sons and daughters into debt for years. They are demanding greater accountability from the 250-odd statutory authorities in this State, and more prudent spending by Government departments, of what, after all, is the taxpayers' own money.

The Public Accounts Committee has demonstrated quite clearly to people the degree of waste and extravagance in Government spending, waste and extravagance which has been going on for all the years of this Labor Government's term of office. The people of South Australia are demanding, quite simply, that the Government in this State gets off their backs, out of their wallets, and out of their private business affairs. They are demanding an acceptance by this Government of the responsibility it has to set its own priorities for the spending of untied Commonwealth moneys. They have had enough of the whingeing that comes from the State Treasurer and his Ministers every time a specific purpose grant is replaced by untied funds that are his to spend as he likes.

In short, they are demanding the very prescription for good government that is promised by the Liberal Party.

We know, that our commitment to bring South Australia into line with all other States by abolishing succession duty and cutting land tax can be successfully delivered without adversely affecting the level of essential Government services provided to the citizens of this State. It is simply a matter of controlling Government spending properly. We know that, as in California, responsible taxation policies, of the type we propose, will direct urgently needed funds to the private sector. They will stem the flow of retirement capital from the State, and they will help to renew confidence by attracting essential, job-creating industries, and taking advantage of the tremendously exciting future that is ahead for this State if it wishes to take it. Our taxation policies will constitute the first of several major initiatives that will get this State on the move again under a Liberal Government.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport):** Earlier this afternoon the Minister of Labour and Industry answered a question of the member for Florey, although the document that he provided referred to a Ministerial statement. In that statement today the Minister tried to refute many of the allegations made in the letter I read to the House during the adjournment debate on Thursday. I have carefully examined the Minister's statement, and frankly I am amazed that the Minister has not bothered to investigate the six very specific allegations that I made in the House when I read that letter.

The Minister's statement has not reduced my concern about the waste and mismanagement at the Constitutional Museum site. There was absolutely no denial by the Minister of the six specific examples detailed in the letter from the worker on the site. The Minister has made no attempt to explain why the cost of this work has escalated by 65 per cent, or \$1 300 000, in the past 12 months. On 1 August 1978 the then Premier (Mr. Dunstan) announced that the renovation of this building would cost \$2 000 000. On 3 August of this year the Government announced, by way of an answer to a question I asked, that the building would now cost \$3 300 000 for renovations, and

equipment. So the cost has escalated by \$1 300 000 in that 12-month period.

The Minister attempted to whitewash the whole issue in exactly the same way as the Government attempted a whitewash in the case of the frozen food factory and waste in Government hospitals. I am sure that members in this House will not be fooled by any such whitewash.

I challenge the Minister to table in this House the timekeeper's timesheets for all of the men on the site, together with his personal diary in which he made appropriate notes, to substantiate the statements in the letter that I read to the House. Until the Minister has the courage to table those documents in Parliament I am confident of the claims made in that letter. Like the Leader of the Opposition, I believe that he will not table them, particularly the diary in which notes were kept by the timekeeper of some of the events that occurred on the site.

I take up now some of the specific points made by the Minister this afternoon. First, he claimed that the letter was anonymous, but that is wrong. The letter was initialled. I know the gentleman who wrote it, having met him and discussed the allegations that he has made. It certainly was not anonymous. Secondly, all the Minister said in the statement was that everyone involved was dismayed about the allegations. He did not deny the allegations. I will read to the House the Minister's exact words:

Since the author of the letter purported to appoint himself spokesman for the site, it is important to record that all of those officials and all of those representatives made clear their dismay at the publicity on behalf of themselves and of those who they have been duly elected to represent.

There was no denial by those people or the Minister of the six specific allegations. I will read to the House again from the letter what those allegations were:

(1) The shop steward labourer comes in to work late and walks off the job any time he likes and gets paid for a full day's work. Management does not do a thing about it.

(2) The shop steward labourer picks his own jobs and does what he likes by telling the foreman; again nothing is done about it by management.

(3) The shop steward labourer told (as in ordering) the timekeeper to get out of the office while he made a phone call. Once again management did nothing about it.

(4) The casuals, when they say they will work Saturday, either have the Friday or Monday off and get paid for it, and once again management has done nothing.

(5) Last Saturday the casual labourers took off the outriggers of a mobile scaffold so that neither the carpenters nor painters could use it to work on for this week.

(6) Last week the shop steward and the P.B.D. labourer came back from lunch 1½ hours late, very drunk and were endangering the other workmen's lives while working up on the roof in that condition. Normally that is instant dismissal, but once again management turned a blind eye.

Nowhere in the Minister's statement did he deny those six specific examples. I challenge the Minister to investigate those examples and come back to this House and tell us whether or not they are correct because, in quite deliberately sidestepping the key issue, the Minister has tried to create the false impression that the allegations were wrong.

I also point out that the Minister said today that the letter contains allegations against one of the workers' representatives and claims that management condoned various abuses of his rights. That is quite untrue. The Minister also said that the union concerned had made clear that it did not seek and had never sought any privileges beyond those necessary for the representative to conduct

his union affairs. Nowhere in the letter I read to the House was it claimed that the union had sought certain privileges for the shop steward. It did not claim that, and there is no point in the Minister's trying to deny such a statement. What the letter did claim was that the shop steward took certain privileges and no action was taken against him; the Minister certainly did not deny that.

I repeat my challenge to the Minister: that his statement this afternoon is completely hollow, unless he is prepared to take up that challenge. I am certainly willing again to stand behind the letter I read to the House, and in his statement this afternoon even the Minister made clear that troubles had occurred on the site, and that there had been industrial disputes and bans, not caused by my reading the letter to the House. In fact, it is interesting to note that the bans which have been imposed for some time have now been lifted because of the reading of that letter last week to the House.

**Mr. Slater:** Ha!

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** The honourable member scoffs, but of course they have been lifted because the issue has been brought to a head. It cannot be denied for one moment that the bans that will be lifted have been in force for many weeks. It was not the reading of the letter that caused the bans to be introduced; they were well and truly there before that.

The other subject I wish to bring to the attention of the House relates to a matter contained in the 1978 report of the Labour and Industry Department that was tabled by the Minister last week. On page 40, the latest figures for the number of new indentures started within this State is listed. For 1978, 2 742 new indentures were started, compared to 3 551 (about 800 more) in the previous year. In 1976, there were 3 380; in 1975, there were 3 266; and in 1974, there were 3 631.

Those figures highlight a substantial decrease, slightly more than 25 per cent, in the number of new apprenticeships which started in the last complete year for which figures are available. I understand that the figures available for the beginning of this year show an even further substantial drop in the number of new apprenticeships. This highlights the case I have been putting for some time, that there is an urgent need to review the apprenticeship scheme, and to introduce a new scheme in which the period of training is shorter, much more flexible and has a far broader base. Such a scheme needs to be introduced not only to overcome this reduction in the number of skilled tradesmen being trained but also to allow for ready retraining of people due to technological change. Again, I challenge the Government to do something about this important problem.

**Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** I wish to draw the attention of the House to the recently released report on open-space teaching compiled by the Western Australian team which has been evaluating its own open-space units for some years and which has released a succession of five other reports dated 1974 to 1976. In fact, it has been undertaking an honest evaluation of its own open-space teaching programme.

The open-space teaching units have not been innovative as far as Australia is concerned. The concept was copied from the United States, Canada and Great Britain where certain sections of the teaching fraternity received it with great enthusiasm, in the case of Great Britain, following a major national educational report in 1968. However, even in 1970 the Canadian Government and certain sections of the British teaching community in Lancashire in the north-west were already issuing cautionary comments about the widespread universal acceptance of open-space units.

They pointed out that good teachers and good students would get on well together in almost any teaching situation. They said that, if there were a large number of teachers in an open community with a large number of students, the need for excellence of teaching and compatibility would be very great. They also said that teachers, like everyone else, tended towards the normal and therefore to find the standards of excellence was the extreme rather than the norm. Therefore, it was unlikely that every open-space unit would be excellently staffed and, apart from that, if average teachers were placed in this unusual situation there was obviously a need for a vast amount of pre-training and certainly of lesson preparation and co-ordination.

In fact, the question has to be asked why open-space units were introduced in the first place, educationally or for other reasons. One finds in retrospect that there were two major reasons. One was that there was a possibility of some sociological improvement in the students, and the second was that the open-space units were regarded as a much cheaper form of building than the old-fashioned single classroom unit because there was less wasted space, less corridor space, fewer walls and, as a corollary, much less storage space in these buildings. It all meant less cost.

Whether these buildings and this new style of teaching were desirable educationally does not seem to have been a prime factor for consideration. The South Australian Education Department adopted open-plan construction for those reasons, and it also did analyses and teacher-questioning in the early stages of construction of these units to find out what teachers would like to teach in that surrounding. This probably is more than most Australian States have done, but there is still the question of whether the full educational impact was considered when open-space units were introduced in South Australia. I suspect that it was not.

Again, in retrospect, even over the past two years, the South Australian Education Department has not been convinced about the correctness of building the original style open-space unit. The client, the primary and secondary branch of the Education Department, has been asking the Public Works Committee to provide a variety of open-plan schools. For example, on 19 July 1977, the Reynella East Primary School design approach quoted changing educational requirements that necessitated a new approach to the design of a school. Already there was some change. It said that a number of departures from previous planning practice in open-space teaching areas had been requested by the client department in response to user reaction and current educational philosophy. The principal change arose from a reduction in the number of classes in any one open-space area from between six and nine to four (quite a reduction), on the premise that teachers at present work mainly in pairs, threes or fours in co-operative teaching programmes. That is a premise to which I do not hold, because traditionally teachers have preferred to work in ones and twos. One reason for the reduction in size was the same reason as that which had been given for the original construction of open-space units. The design approach stated:

Capital costs are reduced because the shorter spans allow the use of domestic forms of construction (e.g., gang-nail trusses and tiled roofs) and simpler heating and cooling arrangements. Running costs are also likely to be lower than with larger teaching units because of the improved natural lighting and ventilation possible with a narrower section and the individual control of heating and cooling equipment used in this format. In addition, the layout adopted provides both short-term flexibility . . .

That was one request. The various primary schools under

construction generally stipulated some form of design requirement. Many requests later, on 18 February 1978, the Renmark High School design stipulated:

The utilisation of a number of small buildings, while less economical in area than one large structure, enables maximum use to be made of natural light and ventilation. That was a key issue in the constitution of that school and was explaining away the fact that a lot of portables were being used. For the Happy Valley Primary School construction, the design approach of 24 August 1978 stated:

The design of the teaching areas continues the trend away from the larger six and eight-teacher open space units and consists of basic teaching units each with a 60-student space—that would be a two-teacher unit—

on either side of full class size wet and withdrawal rooms. The Port Willunga Primary School design approach of 13 September 1978 stated:

The design of teaching areas continues the trend away from the larger six and eight-teacher open spaces, to two-teacher units . . .

The department was not completely pleased about how the matter was proceeding because, for the Richmond Primary School, the same forward planning design is quoted as for Port Willunga and Happy Valley, as follows:

The latest planning practice in flexible space . . . The number of classes in any one "flexible space" is four, on the premise that teachers at present work mainly in pairs, threes, or fours.

We are back to the statement made two years previously, and that highlights the experimental nature of construction of primary schools in South Australia over the past several years, the fact that the Education Department is not consistent in its approach. Therefore, we have a variety of schools constructed with classrooms for from nine teachers down to one and two teachers, and justification has been given for each of them. I will resume this monologue on the same topic during the Address in Reply debate.

**Dr. EASTICK (Light):** I want to address myself to the new dog legislation and, if possible, to fortify the Government's resolve to uphold the decisions made, as contained in that legislation. I say that against the background that there has been much emotional comment outside. A number of letters to the Editor and a number of contributions to public debate require the Government to examine seriously the motives of those making these emotive statements. On several occasions letters to the Editor and other means of communication have suggested that the legislation which was passed by this House and which was acceptable to the Government and the Opposition in its final form would lead to the mutilation of dogs' ears by applying a tattoo.

Any member of Parliament who was responsible for the passage of legislation that would allow for mutilation of a dog's ear would not be worthy of being a member. To my knowledge, members opposite and on this side accepted the legislation that would lead to the introduction of tattooing because they had been adequately satisfied by the evidence that it would not lead to the mutilation of an ear, and that it was in the best interests of the dog population and the public that tattooing be an integral part of the legislation. I have spoken in this place in this way several times, and I do so again.

A tattooing arrangement, whether on the ear or on the flank, is not a mutilating operation against the dog. It is an operation that is used extensively in the animal kingdom. It has been used, abhorrently in the mind of many, in the human world over a period. Granted, there is a brief smarting or a brief period of pain at the time of tattooing.

All of us have experienced that situation when we have been vaccinated. The passage of the needle, particularly if we get upset about what we are entering into, can be more a matter of the mind than of a real experience. I say with conviction, after a long period of association with animal health, that the animal does not react unfavourably to a tattooing mechanism purely and simply because it is such a mechanism. Some animals may react to the fact that they are being held or that the needle will give them a momentary pain in the ear or flank, but the pain soon passes off, and it is the end result that is important.

The end result enables identification of the animal for life and it enables the other mechanism associated with the registration period so that the dog can be traced back to the owner, who in the initial stages has the responsibility to ensure that the necessary transfer papers have been completed and lodged if the animal has passed from his ownership. Likewise, any subsequent owner has the same responsibility to ensure that, as a responsible owner, he or she organises the transfer of that animal if it goes from his or her possession.

If animals cannot be clearly identified, the public will forever be concerned by a stray-dog population. Country members and those city members who live in the fringe areas adjacent to some rural enterprises will be constantly asked by their constituents when the Government or the Parliament will do something about the savaging of sheep, goats, poultry and so on. I am firmly committed, and I trust that the Government remains firmly committed, to ensuring that, in due course, the regulation relating to tattooing will become the law and that, by the introduction of the final requirement of the new dog legislation, people associated with the dog world and people who have in the past suffered because of the attacks of dogs will be able to rest assured that all that can be done has been done, and that South Australia in that sense will be a better place in the longer term.

I make this statement, because I am concerned that there has been a lobby, in some instances initiated in the local government area, to disturb the total requirements of the dog legislation. As I believe that there is no good argument for that, I have made my statement today.

I now refer to the salvation jane and beekeeper controversy currently with us, as I have done previously. I have indicated I accept the action taken by the Minister of Agriculture. I trust that was followed through yesterday at the Agricultural Council meeting, with South Australia indicating that it would not go along with the introduction of a biological control of salvation jane. There would be a complete breakdown in South Australia, indeed throughout the Australian apiary industry, if the action contemplated by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation were, with the approval of Agricultural Council, permitted to proceed.

Granted, some farmer groups in the country are concerned at the decision that has been taken. Last Friday, I was unhappy to hear the way in which the Secretary of the United Farmers and Stockowners attacked the Minister for the Minister's having taken the action he took. It is unfortunate that Mr. Grant Andrews, whose views on agricultural matters I understand and appreciate, took this opportunity, without appreciating all the facts involved, to attack the Minister, when the Minister had taken an action that will benefit a large group of people in a private enterprise situation, namely, that of apiary.

At a deputation that the member for Rocky River and I took to him last week, the Minister provided details showing that departmental cost-benefit studies revealed that salvation jane definitely had a cost-benefit advantage

under South Australian conditions. It would be completely out of order for any Minister of the Crown to attempt to take action against evidence showing a cost-benefit advantage in favour of a sector of the South Australian community. This matter requires further consideration. If it then becomes apparent that a change should apply, let there be that change, based only on all the local information, which can then be directed back to the South Australian scene.

In the meantime, I believe that the action taken has been responsible and that some of the criticism that has been levelled has been irresponsible. I trust that all parties to this whole matter will view the matter positively, and that the end result will undoubtedly be to the benefit of this State's apiary industry.

**Mr. WOTTON (Murray):** I take this opportunity to refer to matters relating particularly to my district and to some of the concerns I have in my district, particularly in relation to State taxation.

Land tax is an iniquitous tax, both in regard to the matrimonial home and the landowner, as has been said many times in the House. If the Government is genuine in acknowledging the importance of people owning their own home (and it says that it is), the people should be given some encouragement to do so; this relates particularly to young married people. Equally, if the Government is genuine in acknowledging the need to retain what is left of the uncleared natural vegetation and production areas of agricultural land (again, it says that it is concerned in this matter), it should start thinking about providing some assistance and, indeed, some incentives to allow landowners to do that. Land tax is causing concern, not only in my district but throughout the State. It is imposed by the persistence of the State Government with land valuation methods that fail to relate the prescribed values to the actual land use. Rates and taxes, calculated on this basis, are frequently manifestly unjust and operate against the optimum use of the land in the best interests of the community.

The Government should not just support but should also encourage landowners in their efforts to retain pockets of natural vegetation and productive areas of agricultural land that could fall, will fall, and have fallen in many areas under the auctioneer's hammer owing to the complete inability of the owner to meet his exorbitant land tax burdens. So, I believe this is an area in which the Government has to show concern, and not just keep talking about some of these matters.

The next matter relates to stamp duty, particularly on real estate transfers. I have received from a licensed land agent in my district a copy of a letter to the Premier on 31 July, as follows:

We write to you to express our concern regarding the effect of stamp duty charges on the real estate market. From the undermentioned table it can be seen that stamp duty costs on the purchase of an average home have risen at a much faster rate than the cost of the home, the agent's commission or the average weekly earnings over the past seven years of the writer's experience.

In 1972, the writer states that the average home price was \$12 000; stamp duty on transfer was \$150, agent's commission was \$520; and average weekly earnings were \$82.50. In 1979, the average home price was \$30 000, stamp duty on transfer was \$580, agent's commission was \$1 453, and average weekly earnings were \$207.20. Over seven years, that represents an increase of 150 per cent on the average home price.

It also represents an increase of 287 per cent in stamp duty on transfers; a 179 per cent increase on agents'

commissions; an increase of 151 per cent on average weekly earnings; and a 287 per cent increase in stamp duty on real estate transfers. I believe that the Government has been asked, on a number of occasions, to give serious consideration to this problem that land agents are experiencing, but it has refused to take any action. I ask the Government to look at this matter and to realise the seriousness of the situation.

A matter to which I have referred each year, and many times during the four years I have been in this place, relates to succession duties. South Australia is now (I guess we could call it) the disincentive State of Australia because of the Government's pigheadedness in refusing to repeal succession duties. South Australia will soon be the only State (although I believe New South Wales is a little uncertain of things at present) that can be proud of its ability to rip off well earned inheritances, set aside particularly for younger generations who, as I mentioned earlier, should be provided with an incentive rather than a kick at this time. This sounds a bit like a recording after a while, because I have said the same things about these taxes every year since I have been in this place, but I have done so without success. I have repeatedly called for more positive action by the South Australian Government regarding succession duties.

I was interested to read recently a claim made by Senator Geoff McLaren, a Labor Senator, who was reported in an article headed "The rich want succession duties abolished in South Australia", as follows:

Queensland hasn't got death duties. Well, neither has South Australia. What we've got are succession duties, a tax on inheritance. About 65 per cent of all estates in South Australia attract no duties at all. That doesn't include the cases where people have no property to pass on.

And there are no duties at all on estates passing to spouses. There are big concessions and rebates to children and relatives. Four out of five estates pay less than \$1 000 in succession duties.

The article later continues:

So, succession duties are a tax on the rich, not the poor. It's the rich who want duties stopped. So they can escape their responsibility of paying their share of necessary State services.

An article appeared in the United Farmers and Graziers publication replying to that, as follows:

Mr. D. T. Wedding said that . . . if Senator McLaren believed that succession duties were a tax on the rich then he was overdue for a retraining course in the subject. It was a fact that primary industry wanted these duties abolished but his statement that "it is the rich who want duties stopped" showed that not only did he not understand succession duties but also the financial position of farmers.

Mr. Wedding said Senator McLaren might also be interested in the fact that the Housewives' Association, South Australian Council for the Aged, and the Pensioners League and Country Women's Association had promised support in the campaign to have succession duty abolished. "I wonder whether Senator McLaren believes pensioners are rich?" Mr. Wedding asked. The claim that the Government would have to sack public servants if succession duty was abolished must be regarded as fiction and designed to play on the emotions of people in South Australia.

In 1976-77 total South Australian taxation amounted to \$314 000 000—succession duty formed only 6 per cent of this. Other States had found no difficulty in making up the revenue lost by either abolishing or reducing death duties. If the same could not be done in South Australia, then the Labor Party had no right to govern.

**Mr. RODDA (Victoria):** I support the comments of the

member for Murray about succession duties, about which I will say something later. With the Government we have on the Treasury benches, I do not think we can emphasise too much that those taxes are eating away at the capital assets of people who make a valuable contribution to the overseas and home income of this State. I commend the member for Murray for taking this opportunity to emphasise that point.

I refer now to the Repco reliability trial. I do not take issue about the matter of fuel shortages, which has a big question mark hanging over it. We have, in hindsight, seen many benefits come to the mobility of Australian citizens because of trials of this nature. The modern motor car is a pretty efficient piece of equipment which has contributed markedly to the progress and development of this country. The publicity given to the current trial has emphasised those points. Those who watched the drivers leaving Melbourne during the weekend and saw the farewell gathering were made aware of all those things. As one of the two or three representatives of this Parliament from the South-East, I had no idea when those cars left Melbourne that they were heading for the South-East. The publicity in our neck of the woods did not cover that. The peace was disturbed on Sunday morning by aeroplanes flying around and all hell being let loose, with dogs barking, and the reliability trial cars making their way through the district. I am growling not about that but about the damage that has been done to certain roads.

We have experienced a relatively dry season, but last weekend the South-East (and a large part of the rest of the State) received three-quarters of an inch to an inch of rain. Some of the roads selected for the trial are summer tracks. My phone ran hot yesterday, at my office and at home, with complaints from landholders and people affected by the damage done to roads by the cars in this trial. It would be common courtesy for the organisers of the trial to inform local government bodies through whose areas the cars were to pass of the route those cars were to use. There could have been liaison to prevent some of the unfortunate instances that occurred in the South-East over the weekend.

I understand that the trial cars left Mount Gambier and made their way to Bordertown via the border lane; they took a higgledy-piggledy course through the Casterton-Penola area, made their way to Comaum, and then went up the border to Frances and Bordertown. None of the local government bodies in the area knew that this entourage of cars was to traverse their areas. Also, they did not know the routes the vehicles were to take. Some years ago I can remember making strong representations to the then Minister of Education (I think the Hon. Mr. Loveday) for work to be done on a road used to take schoolchildren to Penola.

That route is used by cream lorries, and I must say that I received no report that the road was damaged. However, the reliability trial used this area. To the organisers, it is probably good that vehicles be tested under these conditions. The real crunch came at Bordertown, where there is a road called the Teetree Road. This road, which is some five kilometres long, is used as a summer track. In the winter, or at times of high rainfall, it is avoided like the plague. It is composed of graded clay. Over the weekend, Bordertown had quite a lot of rain, and at about 2 a.m. in the blackness, cars roared out of the Pooginagoric scrub and on to the quagmire of the Teetree Road. About 60 cars were bogged, although the leaders had so much pace that they skidded through. There was a long procession of bogged cars. The drivers jacked up the cars, took all wheels off, dug out the mud, and put the wheels back; 100 yards farther along the road, they found themselves in



similar strife. As reported in the press, one enterprising farmer with his tractor—

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** It wasn't you.

**Mr. RODDA:** I am sorry, it was not me; it was something I could have done with. I could have been asked to declare it later on. A lot of damage has been done to the road. If the people sponsoring this trial had thought about the situation (and it would perhaps have been common courtesy to inform the local government body, especially in the case of the Teetreek quagmire), they could have liaised with the council and decided on another route; this business would have been avoided, as well as the trouble it caused. Driving motor vehicles into a pughole is not a characteristic that one would want to see attached to a rally. If the fuel and energy crisis becomes bad enough, I do not believe that trial cars driven over such surfaces will contribute anything to the future of the motor car. I hope attention will be given to this matter so that the same situation does not occur again. If the track had been used on the Saturday, when the ground was dry, no damage would have been done. The road is used for a specific purpose and serves the people of the district. It may be some weeks before the council can grade the road. I do not envisage that the job will be big. When the summer comes, the road will have to be graded and rolled to enable it to be used for normal services as a summer track.

This situation points out that there is a need for local governing bodies to be informed about when such a trial as this is to be put on. I am not knocking it at all, because I think a lot can come out of it, but it is common courtesy to do this, and it would prove beneficial to all. The drivers did not benefit by going through the trauma of the Teetreek track. Perhaps Teetreek has found its way into the annals of motor racing by being an obstruction, but it has put a bit of a blanket on the Bordertown area. With those few remarks—

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg):** I wish to draw attention to the great need for redevelopment at the Brighton High School. I wrote to the Minister many weeks ago inviting him to inspect the school, but I have received no reply. An inspection of the school will show anyone, including the Minister, any of his assistants, or the higher echelon, the conditions in the school. I hope the Minister sees fit to take advantage of the invitation I made, and, through the school council, to look first-hand at the Brighton High School. An inspection will show a great lack, in the past (involving all Governments), of planning and the dire shortage of playing areas at that school. It is a Heath Robinson centre. The planning leaves a lot to be desired.

It appears that the Minister and his officials have punished the school. Over the past years the Brighton High School has had an outstanding parents' committee, which has done a great deal to help the school. I would venture to say that the school hall is the best in the State. Buildings at the school comprise: 13 classrooms in the main building and 21 modern erections; three laboratories in the main building, with an additional four wooden laboratories; five wooden art rooms; craft rooms, consisting of one home science centre and two woodwork centres; two wooden commercial centres; one wooden music centre; and one Commonwealth-type free-standing resource centre. In all, there are many wooden buildings in this school.

The original building comprised an east and south wing, erected in 1952. This contained 10 classrooms and a limited administration area. At present, one of the officers

of the school is housed in a cupboard under a staircase; a most dismal place for anyone in which to work. It reminds one of stories of the early nineteenth century, when children were put in places such as this for punishment. Within two or three years wooden rooms began to spring up outside. Several years after the erection of the main building, the north wing, comprising six classrooms and an additional laboratory, was added.

At the same time a free-standing woodwork centre, comprising two teaching spaces, and a free-standing home science centre, also comprising two teaching spaces, were added. Outside classrooms were added until comparatively recent times. The recent erection of a resource centre and school hall has added to the crowded conditions.

Enrolments at the school were at a peak in 1960, being 1 450. At present, there are about 1 080 students. This figure will increase with the removal of zoning, because the Brighton High School is well known and has an excellent reputation. Parents will send their children to that school because of its good reputation and because discipline is carried out by the staff. People in this day and age, I believe, think that children should have some sort of discipline. The retention rate at the school is sometimes up to 80 per cent between years 8 and 12.

The grounds were given by Miss Hackett to the Brighton council in 1935 as a recreation area. In 1938, they were given by the Brighton council to the Education Department for a high school. Councillor Sanders told the students in October 1952 that when the land was handed over to the Education Department the purpose of the gift would be retained, as only a comparatively small portion of the land would be taken up by buildings and most of it would be used for sports fields. The buildings now occupy 40 per cent of the total area; one football oval, one soccer pitch and one hockey oval cater for 1 000 students. The play area could be increased only by demolition of some of the wooden rooms which have been erected there.

There are no special facilities at the school; it has a very large Matriculation class that lacks any facilities. That is a shocking state of affairs, having regard to the success of this school. The building of the Commonwealth library (Resource Centre) and the new school hall has considerably improved facilities, but this has added to the congestion of single-storey buildings over the small area of land available. As a consequence, there is a restricted air flow from the eastern end which adversely affects the ventilation in the prefabricated rooms. The students would once either sit on the side lawn to eat their lunch or have easy access to the shaded area in front of the school. They are restricted now to shaded areas around the classrooms, and many sit on the bitumen during wet weather. Accommodation in corridors is also inadequate, and disciplinary problems invariably arise.

I would draw attention most strongly to the shocking inbuilt potential catastrophe which exists at the school: it is the fire hazard, since entry by the eastern end is blocked off. There are small thoroughfares between groups of prefabricated rooms, but access at the western end is impossible. In the event of a fire there would be a serious and shocking catastrophe in that school.

There are obsolete science laboratories which are extremely unhygienic. From the biology laboratory, the odour of mice kept for experiments and other things penetrates the rooms where children have to work. Time is wasted because of long distances between buildings, which have been placed where they can be sited, regardless of convenience. The lack of covered ways and luncheon areas is a problem, as is inadequate ventilation, which promotes fatigue of students and teachers. There is a lack of a



specific area for 180 Matriculation students, such as that provided at the Norwood High School. There is a lack of storage space for electronics equipment, sports material, surplus furniture and book stocks.

This is a problem to the committee and staff of Brighton school. It is high time that the Government did something about the situation, at least by the Minister's answering my letter, which I requested in a reasonable manner, or by his inspecting the school to see for himself some of the problems with which the teachers and students are faced.

The parents and staff have done a great deal to help themselves over the years, and the school hall is a magnificent building. All four of the traditional high schools in the metropolitan area which are older than the Brighton High School (Adelaide, Norwood, Unley, and Woodville) have either been rebuilt or had extensive facelifts in recent years. I request the Government to do something about the Brighton High School. I request that it have a development plan to be put into operation as soon as possible. I implore the Minister to answer my letter and to visit the high school with his departmental heads to see for himself the shocking conditions which prevail there and which are causing great concern to the teachers, staff, students, and the parents of these children.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** On 24 May, during his Opening Speech in declaring open the Third Session of the Forty-third Parliament, His Excellency the Governor referred to proposals for salinity control in the Murray River, saying that they would soon be presented to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works. That is a very major item of capital works in South Australia in the foreseeable future. I trust that we will soon see that reference before the Public Works Committee. Unfortunately, we have not as yet seen it, and I trust that the delay will not be for much longer.

One of the major projects to which I believe His Excellency was referring was the proposal in the Murray River salinity control programme to divert drainage waters from irrigation areas to a proposed basin at Noora, a basin where it is proposed that the saline drainage waters will be evaporated, and from thereon cause no further trouble to the salinity problems of the Murray River and the water users of South Australia. In referring to water users I am referring not only to the irrigators along the Murray River and the towns along it but also to the total water users of the river in South Australia, including the metropolitan area, the Iron Triangle towns to the north, and in fact all other regions of the State depending on the Murray River for water supply.

I wholeheartedly support the proposal to divert the drainage waters away from the Murray River valley to a proposed basin at Noora some 20 to 25 kilometres away from the Murray valley. It is an excellent move, because there is no other alternative to removing saline waters from the Murray valley if we are ever to come to grips with the salinity problem of the Murray in South Australia. Unfortunately, however, that proposal to move the drainage waters to Noora does not include the drainage waters from the Loxton irrigation area. At the moment, the saline drainage waters from the Loxton irrigation area are deposited on Katarapko Island. This is one of the very real disasters which have occurred in South Australia. I realise that the Katarapko evaporation basin was created not during the term of office of the present Government but earlier, and I still say that it is a disaster for South Australia and that it should not be perpetuated. Unfortunately, the scheme being put forward by the

Government does perpetuate that problem. Katarapko Island was one of the great natural areas of South Australia. Those people who saw the island in the days before it was turned into an evaporation basin would realise what I am talking about.

**Dr. Eastick:** That was before it became covered with Noogoora burr.

**Mr. ARNOLD:** Yes. Gum trees and other native trees more than 200 or 300 years of age have been totally annihilated because of the decision to place a basin on the Katarapko Island. Environmentally, it was one of the areas of South Australia that should have been protected at all cost. The damage that has been done to Katarapko Island, which was a natural environmental area that should have been retained, is an absolute disaster for this State. The scheme that is before us, highlighted in the Murray River salinity control programme, does nothing to overcome that problem. In fact, it perpetuates the problem at Katarapko Island, and I believe that it should be closed down and that the irrigation drainage waters from the Loxton irrigation area should be added to the waters coming from Berri and Renmark to the Noora Basin. A report on the matter states:

River salinity due to overloading Cobdogla basin could be reduced by redirecting some of this drainage to Berri basin. This would be done in conjunction with the proposed rehabilitation of the Berri-Cobdogla comprehensive drainage scheme.

That work is already under way and in fact the Cobdogla basin is not really a salinity problem to the river at the moment, because we not only have the small Cobdogla basin but we also have the Loveday basin which, in the main, remains below pool level of the river. Any of the evaporation basins that can be contained below pool level do not create a real salinity problem. This is not so with Katarapko Island. The report continues:

It has also been suggested that the Loxton drainage system be connected to Noora to reduce environmental damage at Katarapko Island basin. This would cost about \$3 000 000. An alternative means of encouraging revegetation would be to upgrade the control works and operate the basin at a lower level. This would cost only \$50 000. Upgrading control works at Katarapko Island basin is therefore recommended.

It has been recommended that this work be undertaken for \$50 000 with no other consideration than that of salinity. No consideration whatsoever has been given to the environmental aspects of Katarapko Island. That is not good enough, and the Government should re-examine this situation to include Katarapko Island in the total Noora drainage system. If we do not include the Katarapko Island basin, we will be perpetuating the problem, a course that cannot be justified in the eyes of anyone. Until that basin is included in the overall scheme, the proposal is far short of being satisfactory. I urge the Government to reconsider the proposal, so that the drainage waters from the Loxton irrigation area can be put into the Noora basin along with the waters from the Berri and Renmark irrigation areas.

In South Australia, we have an obligation to put our own house in order so far as salinity control work is concerned. The Government has been in power for nearly a decade, and time and time again we have had reports and recommendations placed before us for consideration, yet little has actually been achieved in the form of capital works to solve the problems. On 24 May, I asked the Minister of Planning whether he had done other than express in the media disappointment at the decision of the New South Wales Government to increase irrigation water allotments by 10 per cent across the board in that State. The Minister concluded his lengthy reply by saying:

I am aware of the problem about salinity in the Murray River and will try to do whatever I believe is necessary to hold the line, but it is not a matter for headstrong action without reflection. I propose to deal with the matter in a considered way.

The Government has been considering it now for nearly 10 years, and I think more than just a few people in South Australia are starting to become a little impatient. As I have said, we must put our own house in order if we are to look to Victoria and New South Wales to carry out the necessary salinity control works in those States to reduce the problem throughout the Murray River system as a whole.

**Mr. WILSON (Torrens):** In the late 1950's and the 1960's Australia was the greatest sporting nation on earth, per capita. Our athletes performed on the international stage in such a way that we were proud to be Australians.

**Mr. Millhouse:** How can you possibly support that claim?

**Mr. WILSON:** In fact, when we competed in the Olympic Games we did extremely well, per capita, compared to the great giants of Russia and the United States.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Why do you say we were the best in the world? It's absolute nonsense.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** It's nationalistic mumbo jumbo.

**Mr. WILSON:** Since then our athletes have fallen on harder times, and I remind those members interjecting of the names of the people who were pre-eminent in those days. These are only a few: names like Dawn Fraser, Herb Elliott, Russell Mockridge, Lew Hoad, Ken Rosewall and Jack Brabham. You can go right through the list. Since those days our athletes have fallen on harder times. It is obvious that, if we are to regain some of that prowess we had on the international field, much more support must be given to the training of athletes, particularly in giving them an opportunity to compete overseas against international competitors.

That brings me to the question of a national sports lottery. On 21 July, the Federal Minister for Home Affairs (Mr. Ellicott), announced that he would hold a conference in Melbourne to discuss the question of a national sports lottery. He said that in fact the Federal Government agreed in principle with that proposal and that other States had shown an interest in the matter. He said that he would have a conference with the Victorian Minister of Youth, Sport and Recreation, Mr. Dixon, and the New South Wales Minister of Sport and Recreation, Mr. Booth, to discuss a sports lottery. A report in the *Advertiser* of 21 July stated:

The meeting will look at ways the Federal and State Governments could co-operate in the establishment and operation of a sports lottery. The meeting is expected to look at the types of lottery available, how much money should be sought and when it should start.

On 24 July, a report in the *News*, under the heading, "We'll ignore lottery meeting", stated:

The South Australian Government still is opposed to a national sports lottery and will not be represented at a special meeting on the matter in Melbourne tomorrow. State Recreation and Sports Minister, Mr. Bannon, said South Australia would not be rushed into supporting the lottery.

He sent a telex message to the Federal Home Affairs Minister, Mr. Ellicott, today informing him of South Australia's attitude. Mr. Bannon told Mr. Ellicott he wanted more details about the proposed lottery before discussing the matter at a properly convened Ministerial meeting.

I believe that that is a head-in-the-sand attitude on the part

of the South Australian Government and, in particular, on the part of its Minister. The Minister was not even prepared to go to that meeting, despite the fact that he was invited to do so nearly a week before. If the Minister had attended that meeting it would have meant that the Ministers of three States in the Commonwealth were prepared to discuss the details of a national sports lottery, not necessarily agreeing to it, but at least discussing the details of such a lottery. In response to the public furor that was caused by the Minister's comments, which greatly upset sporting bodies, the Minister last week made a statement in this House, ostensibly in answer to a question.

**Mr. Slater:** What do you mean by saying "ostensibly"? There was a question.

**Mr. WILSON:** It was a statement, a speech, in the House, ostensibly in an answer to a question. First, the Minister gave his opinions, not necessarily based on fact, as to why a national sports lottery would not be accepted by the Government in South Australia. That may be all right. If the Government had cogent reasons for not wanting a national sports lottery, that is its business, but the Minister was not prepared to go and find out the details of the scheme before making a decision.

As I have said, the meeting was not designed to give approval to a national sports lottery. It was merely an informative meeting where opinions from the States could be advanced to the Federal Government and later a Ministerial meeting could be called to discuss a detailed programme. In his speech in the House last week, the Minister opened up with the usual harangue about the Whitlam Government. He gave us the old story of what that Government had done for the sporting people of South Australia. He gave the history, but said nothing about why he did not attend the meeting in Melbourne. Then he made extraordinary allegations against people. First, he attacked the Federal Minister for Home Affairs, Mr. Ellicott, and said that the Federal Government had seized on this proposal as an idea for getting itself off the hook. He had no basis for making that statement.

Then he made an extraordinary attack on one Mr. George Harris, whom he accused of touting the scheme around the States. Never mind the fact that the Federal Government and Mr. Harris had discussed the matter and were trying to provide information on which the States could base a decision! He made an unwarranted attack on the integrity of Mr. Harris. He mentioned the Carlton Football Club, of which Mr. Harris is President, and went on to say that Mr. Fraser was the No. 1 ticket holder at the Carlton Football Club.

**Mrs. Adamson:** Quite gratuitous.

**Mr. WILSON:** Yes. What that had to do with why the Minister would not attend a meeting on the national sports lottery, I fail to see. Not content with that, he attacked Mr. Dixon, the Victorian Minister, on the basis that all the Victorians wanted to do was find money so they could conduct the Olympic Games at some time in the future. That had nothing to do with the fact that a national sports lottery would be allocated on a per capita basis to the States.

He then mentioned his Party colleague in New South Wales (Mr. Booth), and said that Mr. Booth was very unhappy about the scheme. That may well be but at least Mr. Booth had the interests of his State at heart and went to the conference to find out what the scheme was all about and to make his own contribution to the discussion.

Now I wish to deal with the last thing the Minister mentioned, the only reason that he gave in his speech as to why he did not go. That was that he was notified on the Friday before the meeting. He did not say that he had

prior engagements for that day. He did not give any other reason for not attending. He was really saying that he was piqued at not having been given notice at the same time as, say, Mr. Booth.

National sports lotteries are conducted in several countries, such as Italy, West Germany, Great Britain, and Canada. In Canada, \$30 000 000 a year is raised by the national sports lottery, and there is little doubt that the fine performance of the Canadians at the recent Commonwealth Games and the Olympic Games is in no small way due to the amount raised by the lottery in that country.

**Mr. VENNING (Rocky River):** At present, the State Minister of Agriculture is attending the Agricultural Council meeting in Perth, and one matter to be discussed is the biological control of salvation jane. I am pleased that our Minister went to that conference with the idea that he would do everything in his power to see that biological control of salvation jane did not take place, contrary to what some other States may wish to do. I suppose we must thank Mr. Sinclair, the Federal Minister, for delaying the procedure of allowing this control to take place until further information was acquired, particularly by South Australia, and by the other States.

Last week, assisted by my colleague the member for Light, I introduced a deputation from some of the "heavies" in the North of the State, the landowners. They were not beekeepers but were people who realised the importance of the bee industry. They also realised that they lived in the driest State in the driest continent. We all get sick of hearing that, but we need to be reminded of it. These people live in the northern part of that State, the driest part. I know that in a good year there is plenty of feed around. However, in those areas where rainfall is usually fairly low, any feed is good feed. I am not surprised that they should be concerned. When they came to the Minister, they had a petition with more than 2 500 names of people from the northern areas.

They were also concerned that biological control of salvation jane would affect the bee industry, not only from the point of view of honey. I do not know a great deal about the bee industry but I know that salvation jane helped them to maintain their hives during a lean period. I know that we must maintain an industry in the difficult times; in better times it looks after itself. It is important that salvation jane be retained in these areas. The growers also know the significance of pollination of crops, of dry land lucerne, so there again the bee industry is important, not only to the apiarists but also to those with other crops.

Today my colleagues have mentioned the abolition of death duties, and stated how the policy of our Party for some time has been that, in Government, we would phase out those duties. I said when I came into Parliament in 1968 that, if I assisted to get rid of death duties, I would be pleased if I achieved that and nothing else. I wonder whether I will see succession duties abolished. With a Labor Government in office, what price the abolition of succession duties? We have seen abolition of road maintenance charges, and we must say "at what price?" Many people will be paying more, and many have not been contributing to the destruction of main roads. The ones who did the destruction will get out lightly and people overall will pay much more than they have paid previously, so I say, "At what price, with a Labor socialist Government in South Australia, the abolition of succession duties?" Some say that we will get rid of them first and face up to our problems later. Knowing this Government, again I would say, "At what price?"

At present, along the waterfront of Australia, shipping

is held up. It is a shame to think that Australia, the best country in the world, should have to contend with some of these problems. I have said in the House previously that we are an isolated country, and in the past we have been concerned about our isolation. I have recently returned from overseas and I am pleased that we are isolated, because we are distant from many countries which have problems that they cannot solve. Our only problems are those created by unfortunate union action from time to time.

The Wheat Board has sold all the grain produced in last year's record season, but it cannot get rid of it; there will be a carry-over in Australia. What are these union boys doing about it? What is the Minister of Labour and Industry (Jack Wright) doing about it? What is Bob Hawke doing about it? What is anyone doing about it? The industry is allowed to stagnate, and that is a shame. I read Malcolm Fraser's comments the other day in making his annual report on the state of the nation. He said:

The Federal Government can thank its lucky stars for the rural sector. The much maligned farmers are responsible for what measures of recovery there have been in the economy in 1978-79. There has been a boom in many rural industries, notably grain, beef and wool. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics recently forecast that farm returns are headed towards a record of \$10 000 000 000, 43 per cent higher than last year, with agricultural exports expected to reach \$5 800 000 000—a very important contribution to our balance of payments.

The Prime Minister made those comments about an industry that we know is doing what he has said. Other industries in Australia could be doing as well but, because of industrial unrest and strikes throughout the country, the rural industry at present, as Mr. Fraser has said, is carrying the burden. This is a shame. Australia has everything going for it, and it is a pity that Australians did not wake up to themselves.

I wish that this Government, which has been elected by the people, would do what it can in this State towards unravelling the mess on the waterfront. I know what happened here last year when the strike against the loading of live sheep took place. Our Minister said, "It has nothing to do with me," and off he went to the Gold Coast on holidays. We know that the farmers themselves eventually loaded the sheep. It is a pity that the farmers did not take more action in connection with the strikes now taking place. There has been a demarcation dispute in Western Australia, and it is interesting to note the following comments:

For many years people employed on the waterfront have been governed by a specific portion of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act in which clear definitions of "wharf" and "waterside worker" and "stevedoring operations" are set out and manner of settling disputes is stipulated.

By notice in the Commonwealth *Gazette* G26 of 3/7/79 the Waterside Workers Federation indicated that application had been made to alter their rules relating to eligibility for membership which would, if approved, lead to W.W.F. coverage of all persons employed "adjacent to a wharf or within a port area" including people involved on shore-based loading equipment, silos, weighbridges and all equipment used in receiving, storing, stacking and counting of goods. That is what the problem is all about—a demarcation dispute amongst unions, and this State's primary producers are suffering because of it.

**Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles):** A couple of weeks ago, the *Advertiser* contained a report of considerable interest to this Parliament, because it will profoundly affect the Government; yet, we have heard nothing about it from the

Government. I think that members should hear about this report, and I hope that Government members will respond to what I have to say. The report, which appeared in the *Advertiser* on 27 July under the heading "South Australian union to oppose Australian Labor Party in State polls", states:

One of South Australia's biggest trade unions will stand an independent Labor candidate at the next State election.

The candidate is to be fielded by the Australian Government Workers Association. The reason for this decision is that the association feels that its members have been discriminated against by the Australian Labor Party in preselection ballots, and has decided to take matters into its own hands. This decision, obviously, will have a serious effect not only on the A.L.P. but also on the union because, under A.L.P. State rules, any organisation which contests an election against any member of the A.L.P., or which supports a candidate who is contesting an election against the A.L.P., is automatically expelled from the Party. Obviously, this decision by the A.G.W.A. must have been taken after the deepest consideration. Obviously, the union has been brought to the brink of desperation to take such a step.

**Mr. Wilson:** That's because they can't vote.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** Yes, they feel they have not been getting a fair go. In fact, Mr. Morley, the union secretary, says:

We now have too many pie-in-the-sky merchants rather than the down-to-earth old-time union official who knows what the man in the street is talking about.

I wonder whether he was referring to the Minister presently on the front bench (the Deputy Premier), to the Minister of Health, or to other Ministers or members, when he talked about pie-in-the-sky merchants whom the Labor Party has endorsed to represent it in Parliament. Mr. Morley continued:

The union's 25-member council would choose a "bright, young progressive Australian" from among the union ranks or its officials.

That statement is interesting in itself because, presumably, the union wants to stand a candidate who will contrast with those candidates who have been preselected by the A.L.P. It raises the question whether the union thinks that, far from being bright, young progressive people, the A.L.P. candidates are dull old reactionaries. Admittedly, there may be a quota that falls into that category, and there are then the pie-in-the-sky merchants. So, all in all, it seems that the union is not pleased with the kind of people the A.L.P. has been endorsing.

Mr. Morley said that he was looking for candidates to represent the union and be Labor-oriented—progressive, free thinkers who will not be manipulated by a Party machine and put their hand up every time the whistle blows. We see in front of us a group of people who put up their hand every time the whistle blows. They put their hand down when the whistle blows. They do exactly what they are told. They obey Caucus to the letter, and it seems to me that members of the union are not too pleased with this.

**Dr. Eastick:** They act like Pavlov's dogs.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** They do indeed. Not only do the people of the State not enjoy the spectacle of people jumping when the whistle blows, but it seems to me that members of the Government's own Party do not like it. Being fed up with it, they have decided to do something about it. Mr. Morley said (and this also is significant), in referring to the association's platform for its candidate:

It is expected to include a tougher "law and order" stance than present A.L.P. policy.

It is no secret that South Australians are concerned

about the Government's law and order policy, or lack thereof, as they perceive it. The members of this union are those who have to implement some of that policy, and they do not like what they are being asked to do; they do not like the kind of treatment they are getting. This decision by the A.G.W.A. is significant on two counts: (1) they are fed up with the way they have been treated and they do not like the kind of candidate who has been endorsed; and (2) they are not too happy about the Government's policy. So we can see what could be described as a rift in the lute. There has already been a rift in the lute in that the Secretary of the shipping section of the Federated Clerks Union, Mr. N. T. Peterson, said in September that he would run as an independent Labor candidate for Semaphore at the next election in opposition to the endorsed A.L.P. candidate, who is the State Secretary of the Federated Storemen and Packers Union, Mr. George Apap. It is well known that Mr. Apap is one union official in South Australia who is feared by both employers and employees. It would be interesting to know which members of the Government are going to back Mr. Peterson and which members are going to back Mr. Apap, because there could well be members on the Government side who would not be at all pleased to see an extreme left-winger come into their Party. They know that the ideological composition of the Government would be affected by Mr. Apap's inclusion as a member of the Government Party.

**Mr. Wilson:** I wonder whether the Premier is very happy about it.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** Yes, I wonder whether the Premier is very happy about Mr. Apap, or whether he would rather back Mr. Peterson. The *News* picked up that story that same night in an article which states:

The move has shaken the A.L.P., and the union's State secretary made it clear his union and officials are not afraid of A.L.P. expulsion.

The report states later:

"We won't be looking at swinging seats, we will be looking at Labor seats," he said. "I don't think the A.L.P. will take action against the union over this. Our union pays around \$9 000 a year in affiliation fees to the A.L.P. There's no way they'll expel us and lose the money—their bank balance isn't big enough for that."

Now we are learning more about the A.L.P.—it is running into financial troubles. If the A.L.P. cannot afford to lose \$9 000 a year, which, when you break it up, would, I suppose, be \$1 000 for each of nine of its safe seats (and that should not be too hard to raise), it must be running pretty close to the wind. So, that is another interesting fact that has emerged from the decision by the A.G.W.A. to contest the election. To my mind, apart from the fact that there is clear division in the ranks, the important aspect of this decision is that there is a deep concern within the Labor Party about the Government's policy on law and order.

On Monday 2 July, four Tailem Bend justices of the peace called for a review of what they described as "lenient sentencing and parole procedures for violent crimes in South Australia". The press article states:

They say an erosion of "law and order" has followed an apparent lack of adequate penalties from South Australian courts.

Mr. Morley was asked to comment on that statement and was reported as follows:

He said: "One of the things which annoys me is that there are mandatory punishments for things like drink-driving where, if you are charged twice, you go to gaol. But you can kill or rape somebody and get away with it a couple of

times."

So Mr. Morley certainly endorsed what the justices said, despite the fact that the Attorney-General and his Party did not endorse it. Similar remarks were made by the Police Association Secretary, Mr. Tremethick, who I understand is a former President of the Trades and Labor Council. The report is as follows:

He pointed out that defendants could today appeal against the severity of sentences. Mr. Tremethick further explained: "A sentence in our view should mean what it is. If a court sentences, for example, a man to 12 years gaol it appears the court has taken a very serious view of that offence. But under normal circumstances, that man would get off on good behaviour *per se* in two to three years."

**Mr. Keneally:** Would you like an extension of time?

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** I would, because I can see that members opposite are very interested in what I have to say. They have probably been given instructions that they should switch off and stop interjecting, because they do not want it to be known that they are very sensitive indeed about this matter. I have touched them on a raw spot, and they cannot wait for me to sit down.

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

**Mr. BECKER (Hanson):** It is a pity that the member for Stuart did not rise, because I thought he was going to move for an extension of time for the member for Coles. We would have supported his application. I think that the member for Flinders would have supported it, too. That would have provided the benefit of this debate. An issue that concerns me is the Minister of Health's attitude towards our Federal Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. BECKER:** I knew that that would provide great mirth for members of the Government. I am not one of those who do not make representations to Canberra if they think there is an opportunity to make them. I do not use this establishment to make scurrilous attacks on the Federal Government.

I thought I should bring to the attention of the House a statement which was made by the Federal Minister for Health yesterday, and which was reported, as follows:

It was regrettable that the South Australian Minister of Health should choose an organisation such as Regency Park Centre for Physically Handicapped Children for a game of political football. Minister for Health, Ralph Hunt, said today. Mr. Hunt, speaking in Adelaide today, said he was referring to recent comments by Mr. Duncan [South Australian Minister of Health] in regard to the question of funding the centre. "Let me say that my department is endeavouring to assist Regency Park to ensure that the accounting procedures it uses adhere to the accepted principles of deficit funding. The Commonwealth Government has not reduced the level of funds it provides to the centre under the deficit financing arrangements. However, the Commonwealth Department of Health has sought a detailed explanation of some of the components of the Budget estimates. One such item is the number of staffing hours per fortnight.

My department and I stand ready to assist in bringing about a speedy and acceptable resolution of the matter. I would only hope that Mr. Duncan might adopt a like approach rather than seeking to gain political capital. I have the highest regard for the services that Regency Park provides to the handicapped. I am confident that Regency Park will provide the information that is required by my department in order to fulfil the requirements of the deficit

financing.

That gives us a fair indication of what has happened on the Federal side. I found it deplorable when the Minister of Health made a statement in the House on 31 July (page 221 of *Hansard*), as follows:

It was interesting, when I went to Regency Park on Monday, to find that the basic cause of retrenchments made at that time was that the Federal Government had instructed Regency Park to cut back the number of hours of professional services being provided by 78 a week.

So, it was the Fraser Government that was responsible primarily for the difficulties into which Regency Park was getting before the retrenchments occurred. This sort of thing will continue unless we can get the Fraser Government to change its policies and start showing a bit of heart and sympathy for the sick people of this country.

If ever there was an ill-informed statement and an abuse of a Federal authority, that is one example. The Federal Minister has explained what the problem is and has said that it is up to Regency Park to comply with the Federal Government's request. Most members would have received a document called *Crippled Children's Association of South Australia, Newsletter*, Vol. 4, No. 34, dated June 1979. Under the heading "More cuts on way", it states:

The association will be operating on a standstill budget during the 1979-80 financial year. This action has been found necessary because of the cutback in State Government grants last financial year and a recent warning from the Health Commission of little change likely in the situation this year. The commission has written to the association, indicating that it can't expect good news in the coming State Budget. The commission suggested that the association avoid expansion programmes and the employment of additional staff.

The South Australian Health Commission obviously wrote some time ago to the Crippled Children's Association, warning it of what might happen in the future. The article continues by saying that the Minister of Health would be visiting the centre on Monday 30 July and would have discussions with the President, the Administrator, the Finance Manager and the Chairman of the Finance Committee.

It was interesting to note, as the story broke in the press, that not one of the executives I approached was prepared to discuss the matter. That indicated to me that, following the meeting on Monday 30 July, some intimidatory tactics might be applied by the South Australian Minister of Health in this regard. It is deplorable; everyone should be doing all he can to assist Regency Park. It is now up to Regency Park to make moves to the Federal Government. I hope the association does that quickly and informs the public of South Australia when the matter is resolved. Then, everyone can continue to support, and have confidence in, that organisation.

Regarding hospital funding, I was impressed to read, in the report of the Guerin committee set up by the Government to assess the Public Accounts Committee's report into the financial management of the Hospitals Department, that for the six months to December 1978, costs per occupied bed day were reduced by about 9 per cent at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, 5 per cent at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and 8 per cent at the Flinders Medical Centre, compared to the equivalent period in 1977. This reduction, after allowing a conservative 10 per cent for inflation, could represent a saving of \$25 000 000 in 1978-79 at these three hospitals alone. An article in the *News* on 30 July, under the heading "Hospital slashes spending by \$4 400 000", states:

The Royal Adelaide Hospital has slashed spending by

\$4 400 000 in the past year, and more cuts are likely this year. When one reads the article, one finds that in actual fact the hospital increased its spending. Those who report on matters like this should be a little more careful, because the only real saving at the Royal Adelaide Hospital was \$1 000 000, and it was made in salaries and wages. Other costs continued to increase. Of course, inflation was not considered, and it is a hypothetical figure. One can argue about inflation (and this is a tactic used by the Government) in real terms and money terms. Everyone is becoming confused about the issue. I believe there is a deliberate campaign to misinform the public. It must be borne in mind that the costs of the Royal Adelaide Hospital increased, yet claims were made in its report by the Guerin committee (which was set up at considerable expense by the Government to try to discredit the Public Accounts Committee inquiry into hospitals) to the contrary. That reflects the attitude of the Government in trying to interfere with the workings of the Parliament. This Parliament should not tolerate such interference.

It is important to remember that, in its general comments, the Guerin committee stated:

However unpalatable it may be, it must be accepted that the general thrust of the committee's criticism is right. The members of the Government and their supporters who have been critical of their colleagues who serve on the Public Accounts Committee should bear in mind what the Guerin committee has said. The Public Accounts Committee was set up by the Parliament for the benefit of the taxpayers of this State and it must be given every support. Full credit to the courage of the members of the Government who served that committee very well.

**Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder):** I would like to speak about small business, in South Australia particularly, and to quote from a paper delivered by Dr. Brian W. Scott to the *Advertiser* and accounting bodies seminar in Adelaide on 16 February this year. The title of the paper was "Accelerate or Stagnate". It is known that, if there is no acceleration and progress, stagnation results. I suggest that small business today needs impetus and thrust to be given by Government to assist in the acceleration of small business because of its importance.

Regarding a definition, the Wiltshire Committee defined small business as follows:

... One in which one to two are required to make all of the critical management decision without the aid of internal specialists and with specific knowledge in only one or two areas.

Usually, Governments throughout the world have a different assessment. For example, for taxation or research grants, etc., in the United States a small manufacturing business is taken to have 250 or fewer employees; in the United Kingdom, 200 employees or less; and in Japan, 300 or less. The "100 employees or less" definition is the most commonly used in Australia. We accept small business as an organisation with at least 100 or less employees. Dr. Scott said:

Small business in Australia [excluding those involved in primary production] and we know the importance of primary production, numbers between 250 000 and 300 000.

Recently, I heard an officer from the Small Business Advisory Bureau in South Australia say that there are about 360 000 small businesses in Australia. Therefore, as South Australia has about 10 per cent of the population, it could have between 30 000 and 36 000 small businesses. Dr. Scott continued:

As such they account for more than 90 per cent of all business enterprises in Australia. About 75 per cent of small businesses are sole proprietorships or partnerships. Small

businesses employ more than 40 per cent of the total work force and are responsible for nearly 32 per cent of the total value added by the private sector. More than 65 per cent of the retailing work force is employed in establishments with fewer than 50 employees, and seven of every eight retailing businesses in the country are unincorporated. Almost 50 per cent of the factory work force is employed in small business. More than 40 per cent of factory production comes from such business.

A book recently produced, which resulted from work done by Professor George Meredith, of the University of New England, and teams from the University of Newcastle, was entitled *Small Business in Australia*. From the information collated by these teams, Messrs. Johns, Dunlop and Sheehan have produced this book. Some of the information reveals the following:

1. A small business is usually a sole proprietorship, a partnership, or a registered company, but a large number of smaller businesses are not incorporated. Most popular is the partnership.

2. Most small business falls into the lower size ranges. About 61 per cent of small manufacturing firms and nearly 89 per cent of small non-manufacturing firms have fewer than 10 employees.

3. More than 80 per cent of small business enterprises have as their chief executive officer either the original founder of the firm or a member of the founder's family. More often than not the small business is a family type of enterprise.

4. Small businesses tend to service relatively limited markets, often localised.

5. It is normally found that small businesses are more flexible and adaptable, capable of coping with rapid fashion changes and alterations in the product mix than larger firms.

6. Small businesses tend to be relatively more important in rural communities where they often make a crucial contribution to isolated and specific community life.

I have mentioned these facts to bring to the attention of this House the importance of small businesses, yet a small business is faced with many difficulties. I suppose one could simplify the employment situation in Australia by saying, "There are some 360 000 small businesses and, if they employ only one more on their staff, that would take up 360 000 employed people." That is a simplification and it would be very difficult to attain. However, I believe that, if small businesses were able to overcome many of the difficulties which confront them, or if small businesses were aided in their difficulties, they would be able to employ more people.

One of those difficulties is to obtain finance at a reasonable rate of interest. Larger business seems to be able to raise finance in a much easier way than small business can do. I speak now particularly of a business with 10 or fewer employees. The proprietor finds that all profit must go back into the business to enable it to exist, let alone develop. The proprietors or managers receive much less per week than the employees. If finance could be made available in a much easier way to small business, it would be an added advantage.

The Small Business Advisory Bureau in South Australia advises small business, but when looking at the schemes for obtaining finance to develop or expand, or even to maintain, those businesses, one sees that there always seems to be a hitch, and difficulty is experienced in obtaining finance. In my electorate some two years ago, the member for Light and I endeavoured to help a small business to obtain some finance. It had letters from financial institutions saying that money would not be made available to small business in country areas.

Small business is one of the backbones of country areas,

and I appeal to those in Government for everything possible to be done to reduce the additional costs that prevent small business from expanding. I believe that in the metropolitan area there are about 7 000 small businesses which employ fewer than five people. We must look after this type of enterprise, and would appeal for a greater emphasis to be given to assisting small business financially and in reducing the difficulties which prevent them from expanding as they should, thereby giving them the possibility and the ability to employ more people in this State.

**Mr. BLACKER (Flinders):** This afternoon I asked the Minister of Transport a question about road grants being made available to local government areas. The Minister gave an explanation, for which I was thankful. However, the point that he answered did not relate to the question. The councils in my electorate have told me that in previous years allocations to metropolitan councils have not been completely spent. The Minister went on to explain that these replies had come in since the most recent allocations. That is not the case. The letters to which I referred have been on my file since May, and they are not in any way connected with the recent allocation by the Highways Department. Because 49 per cent of the money that was allocated for road grants in the metropolitan area was not spent in 1977-78 (I understand that there was a similar proportion in the following year), the rural councils in my electorate asked that this money be reallocated and put into areas of greater need.

The Minister explained that the road grants were made only on a needs basis. I seriously question the people responsible for allocating those grants if that is so and if half of the grants to councils in the metropolitan area are not being spent. Somewhere along the line there is an anomaly and a need to look at it to try to reallocate the funds available so that those in greatest need have some benefit.

**Dr. Eastick:** Only 77 councils got an allotment this year.

**Mr. BLACKER:** The member for Light has raised the issue, and most of the councils in my area are rather aggrieved at the situation. The District Council of Tumbly Bay suffered a 41½ per cent reduction in its road grants. The District Council of Lincoln had a 40 per cent reduction, and several others had reductions from 8 per cent to 19 per cent. Only one council on Eyre Peninsula received an increase—\$160 000 came out of the blue, and I understand that is to upgrade and seal the Lock-Elliston road. There is 100 km of road, so I am rather cynical about how far that money will go. It might seal the first couple of kilometres, but as for the rest I am not too sure. That specific grant was not asked for except, perhaps, by way of a general conversation, not in the original requests for road grants as normally presented to the commission.

I refer now to the Institute of Public Affairs' most recent publication *Facts*, in which appears an article headed "Why Inflation Still Matters". There has been much controversy about the Federal Government's policy and the determination to control inflation. We find that the Federal Opposition and the South Australian State Government are somewhat cynical about the Federal Government's determination to control inflation. That publication states:

Australia's annual rate of inflation has fallen from a high point of 17 per cent reached in 1975 to its present level of around 8 per cent. This has been a most welcome development.

Some people say that we can live with high levels of inflation. What nonsense!

The following table shows the extent to which a higher

inflation rate erodes living standards, making necessary costly programmes (such as the indexation of wages and taxes) to maintain living standards.

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

**Mr. BLACKER:** Before the dinner adjournment, I was referring to a report in the Institute of Public Affairs Bulletin *Facts*, and I wish to give figures of the projected annual inflation rate up to the year 2000 and the effects it will have on basic commodities. I was also referring to the effect inflation was having on our cost of living. When we consider the value of the purchasing power of the 1979 dollar in the year 2000, if we had a 2 per cent inflation rate between now and 2000, the value of \$1 would be 66 cents. On the other hand, if the inflation rate was 5 per cent, the purchasing power of the 1979 dollar would be 36 cents and, if we had a 10 per cent inflation rate, the value would be 14 cents. If we look for a comparison of the price of a newspaper in 2000, assuming that the price of the newspaper is 10 cents today, at 2 per cent inflation it would be 15 cents, at 5 per cent inflation 28 cents, and at 10 per cent inflation 74 cents.

Probably the commodity with which most people can relate better is the price of 12 bottles of beer. In the year 2000, assuming that the cost is about \$10 now, at a 2 per cent inflation rate the price will be \$15, at a 5 per cent inflation rate it will be \$28, and at a 10 per cent inflation rate the price will be \$74. We can also make a comparison regarding the price of a luxury car in 2000. The example given is a luxury car, because it is estimated to be worth \$30 000 now. At an inflation rate of 2 per cent the price in the year 2000 will be \$45 000, at a 5 per cent inflation rate it will be \$83 700, and at a 10 per cent inflation rate it will be \$222 000.

These figures show the effect that inflation has on our community. At an inflation rate of 10 per cent per annum, not much more than the present rate, it would take less than eight years for the value of a 1979 dollar to be cut by half. At the same inflation rate, a family living on \$10 000 after tax in 1979 would require \$74 000 after tax in the year 2000 just to maintain their 1979 living standard.

It is all very well for people whose incomes are regularly adjusted to the inflation rate to say that inflation does not really matter, but what about the people most seriously affected by rising prices, such as retired people living on their savings and the single unemployed? High inflation is most damaging to the disadvantaged and the least secure. Many people, such as pensioners, the married unemployed, etc., have their social security benefits indexed by the Federal Government to protect them from inflation. The higher the inflation rate, the higher the indexation factor and the greater the amount of taxes required from the community just to maintain the living standards of welfare recipients.

Still referring to money, I refer now to the Government's attitude in some of its own construction. In Washington Street, Port Lincoln, many thousands of dollars have been spent on upgrading the local court, and directly opposite the court the Agriculture and Fisheries Department has seen fit to put up a tin shed. It emerged from nowhere. No application was made to the council for a building permit. There was none of the normal requirements applicable to any other citizen: the shed just appeared. The council was quite uptight about this. I will quote part of the newspaper editorial, headed "Let's not be too fussy". With heavy irony, the editor states:

What's wrong with a nice bright shiny tin shed right in the centre of our highly regulated city? After all, it is being built by the same State Government which made the regulations it



breaks, so it's sort of all in the family. And it kind of sets off the beautiful courthouse over the road, which the State Government recently renovated at considerable cost and restored to its original architectural beauty. Many of the provisions of the Building Act, to which normal mortals must adhere rigidly, were enacted in the interests of public safety. Now we have a safety-conscious Government which wants to ban the blameless road trains from the city, exercising its apparent right to ignore the Act entirely.

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

**Mr. GUNN (Eyre):** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on matters that have been causing me concern. I am sorry that the Minister of Health is not present this evening. Nevertheless, I am sure that he will read with interest what I say. I again had the honour at the weekend to accompany the Leader of the Opposition on a tour of the facilities at Coober Pedy Hospital, and the people who have the responsibility of providing the health services in that part of South Australia again impressed on the Leader the urgent need to upgrade facilities and provide additional beds at that hospital.

As I am sure the Minister knows, the Coober Pedy Hospital is the only centre providing any major health facilities between Alice Springs and Port Augusta and, as we have an increasing population (that is one of the few parts of South Australia that is prospering, with people showing the true spirit of free enterprise by going there and building something for the State), it is essential that the people be given reasonable health care. Not only are the existing services overtaxed, but they also do not provide the facilities to service the local community and travelling public. When mishaps have occurred, there has not been enough room at the hospital. I am sure that the Leader, with his medical knowledge, agrees that the problem will get worse.

There is plenty of space on the site and all that is necessary is that the Minister and the Government take the decisions. I understand that the matter has been brought to the attention of the Minister and his officers several times, and the people administering the hospital want to know what plans the Government has so that they can make their plans accordingly. I hope that in the next few days the Minister will tell not only this House but also the people of Coober Pedy, particularly the secretary and the board of the hospital, exactly what plans the Government has.

I understand that the Minister may be making a tour of that area soon. If he has not made a decision about the hospital, the need for action will be brought to his attention quickly. We will no doubt immediately be given the old catchcry that there is not enough money but we do not want to hear that, because money can be found when the Government sees fit, such as the wasting of \$800 000 on the foolish Royal Commission, when we all knew what the outcome would be before the decision was handed down. It was a complete waste of taxpayers' money.

The second matter in the health field that I wish to draw to the Minister's attention is the critical shortage of trained nursing staff at Indulkana. I know that the Minister has been to Indulkana, but normally it has been to campaign against me. However, he has not been successful in that or in providing the facilities that are urgently required. At present, two nursing sisters provide a service to the local community. There is an urgent need for at least an additional sister to be appointed, preferably someone with considerable experience, so that there will be sufficient staff to take some time off. I am sure that the Minister is aware that, in a situation such as the one at Indulkana, it is

necessary to have someone on duty at all times.

Therefore, my constituents in that part of South Australia and I would be most grateful if the Minister could have urgent action taken to increase the nursing staff by one. Currently, there are two trained sisters with, I think, one Aboriginal assistant.

Earlier, the member for Rocky River spoke about the Government's policy in relation to the abolition of death duties. It would appear that again South Australia will be the odd man out. We will be the only Australian State that will have legislation on the Statute Book which forces people to flee and take their investments to Queensland, Western Australia or Tasmania, with people there gaining the benefit. It is no good the Government's running away from its responsibilities in this field. It is all very well for the Minister to say that they have not abolished death duties elsewhere in Australia.

I examined the *Taxpayer*, which contains a section dealing with death duties of various kinds. I will give the position in each State and the Commonwealth. Regarding the Commonwealth, if death occurred after 20 November 1977 no duty is payable on assets passing to members of a family, as defined. Legislation has already been passed to repeal the law if death occurs after June 1979. In New South Wales, there is to be a one-third reduction in the duty payable if death occurs after 31 December 1978, and from that date no duty if the estate is valued at \$10 000 or less. There is a scheme of arrangement under which a one-third rebate (1979 or later) applies. Whether the deceased was a resident or not, if death occurs after 31 December 1978, a duty rebate of one-third applies. Duty under the companies death duties provisions is also reduced.

In Queensland, this duty was repealed for estates of persons dying on or after the end of the 1976 calendar year. In Western Australia, as from 1 July 1977, assets passing to a surviving spouse are exempt. If death occurs during the 1979 calendar year, a 50 per cent rebate applies, with no duty if death occurs in 1980 or later. In the little State of Tasmania (still, unfortunately, in the hands of a Labor Government), the 1978 Budget contained a promise that on assets passing to children there will be a 50 per cent rebate if death occurs in 1979, and, if later, a full rebate will eliminate duty on their part. In the Northern Territory, from 1 July 1978, when the Territory became independent, the only death duty chargeable on Territory assets was that imposed by the Commonwealth, and this has now been abolished. In Victoria, considerable changes have been made, and I have not been able to find the exact ones. However, I understand that there is a scheme of arrangement whereby death duties will be abolished altogether. What concerns me most is that, where the beneficiary is a son or daughter of a deceased person who leaves a \$60 000 house, the duty is \$10 500, plus 2½ per cent excess on anything over \$60 000. It is my view, and that of all fair and reasonable people in the community, that that type of impost is not only unfair, but unjust. If a person works hard, owns a house and motor car, and has small savings, it is his right to leave that estate to whomever he wishes. It has nothing to do with the Government, which has no right to plunder that estate. If we want to see people have confidence in their State, it is about time we did something about this impost.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** Where did you get that belt?

**Mr. GUNN:** It was given to me. I am pleased that the Minister has interjected. He is not interested in listening to me; he is more interested in continuing to tax the people. He has no regard for people in the community who are trying to get on and to improve the welfare of the State. It would be better if he concentrated on the Stuart Highway.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time



has expired.

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I take this opportunity to raise matters of concern to me. I refer, in particular, to the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, whereby the people of all States, particularly in South Australia, should be arguing and trying to have some change made to the agreement. At present, the money made available to the majority of young people who qualify, according to their income, is available only if they wish to buy previously unoccupied premises, whether a home unit or a free-standing house. These people, who are in the lower-income group, are thus being pushed out into the back-blocks, the extremities of the metropolitan area where there is the highest transport cost, and where it is difficult for them to get their children to school. Yet in the inner metropolitan area, many established homes are available for sale. Now, because of the Residential Tenancies Act, many strata title properties are available as home units that have been previously occupied.

Under the terms of the agreement, the money cannot be made available to young couples who want to live in the inner metropolitan area. I believe that circumstances have changed recently in relation to fuel costs, and we, as a State, should be the first to go to the Commonwealth Government, and get the other States to back us, to have the agreement changed so that we can make money available to young couples to buy established properties in the metropolitan area at the low interest rate beginning at 5½ per cent or 5¼ per cent. The States get the money at less than 5 per cent, and are allowed a small percentage for handling the money, and the State Bank, or whatever the banking institution is, is also allowed to pick up a small percentage for handling the money.

Under the new agreement, beginning on 1 July 1978, the States have the right to add to the interest rate an extra ½ per cent a year until the interest rate being paid by the home purchaser reaches 1 per cent of the long-term bond rate. Even if these people end up in the highest income group in Australia, because of promotion over the 30-year period, they will receive a concessional interest rate subsidised by the taxpayer. We are saying to this group of people who, we admit, need subsidised money and to be helped with the interest rate, "Because your income is low, we'll make money available to you, but you must go out to the back-blocks."

Another problem is relating to this matter. Our public transport system is expensive to operate. We are having difficulty in making it pay; yet, from the outer fringe areas, in particular, from my area and from the southern area, the buses are packed. There is standing room only. Some days, 30 people from the Hills area are standing in corridors of buses, with no hand straps. Eventually, there will be a catastrophe. Within the inner metropolitan area thousands of properties are available now for purchase that could be upgraded if people wanted to do so. At least, they could obtain a home nearer their work, for those working in the inner city area. It would also be nearer to schools, many of which have empty classrooms.

Classrooms are waiting to be used. We would not have to build new schools in the outer fringe areas. The libraries, halls and the playgrounds are there, in many cases, yet we are forcing these people out into outer areas where we have to spend more money to create the services for that community. I would back (and I am sure any politician would back) an approach to the Federal Government to have that agreement changed. I know that money is available under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement to purchase established homes at an interest rate of 6½ per cent, but only a limited amount of

money is available. It was not until recent times that applications for loans were again invited from people who qualified for that category. If a person has previously applied under the new homes conditions for a loan and then wants to change that application to an established home loan application, he has to start afresh, and there is an 18-month waiting period before he qualifies.

I believe that that is unprincipled, and that if a young person is within the correct income group and wishes to transfer an application for a loan to buy a new home in a fringe area to an application to buy an established home, he should be given a priority because he is changing from one list to another and has already been waiting.

I know that the housing industry will argue that if we do that it will not get as many contracts to build new homes. I think that is true, in the short term. What I know the Housing Industry Association would understand (and so would the Real Estate Institute) is that there is a large pool of homes on the market waiting to be purchased, in most cases at lower prices than an equivalent new home can be built for. Thus, the builder cannot get contracts because people are setting out to buy established homes. In many cases people are taking bridging finance or second mortgages that they cannot afford, but are prepared to take that gamble because they get cheaper transport and are nearer to the work place than if they were forced into a home in the back-blocks of the metropolitan area.

My next point relates to the petition I presented to Parliament today. In my area, and 50 other centres of South Australia, there is a problem with a little beast—the millipede. Some years ago, when this matter was first raised in this House, everybody was very jovial about it and thought, "There is no problem, it won't reach my home, or my electorate." I presented a petition today bearing 3 800-plus signatures. Those signatures came from many areas of the State, and there are not many millipedes around at the moment. I invite anybody from the metropolitan area to go home and start digging in their garden. If they find 10 or 20 millipedes, look out when the spring arrives because the millipedes will be on the march again in about four or five weeks.

In the metropolitan area, in the foothills, Walkerville, West Beach, Henley Beach, Tea Tree Gully, Campbelltown, Brighton and Glenelg, they will be out in their thousands this year. They were in those areas in significant numbers last year, and in many country centres. When they do move, we will get a massive number of complaints. The Federal Government said that it is prepared to put half of the equipment and labour required into a programme of research into this menace, to ascertain whether there is some method of biological control. The State Government has said "No" until now.

I know that the Minister of Agriculture has made a submission to the Government, through Cabinet, that it include in this year's Budget \$30 000 for the beginning of an investigation into a scheme to control millipedes. I know that the Budget, if it is not finalised, will be finalised this week. I hope that it has not been finalised and that Government members will say to Cabinet that we do have a problem, that the millipedes do intrude on a person's quality of life, and that they are a nuisance if they get into your food, clothes, bed, or the ears and noses of babies when they are sleeping. They are a menace that no household should have to suffer indefinitely. This Government could start to make money available for a research programme to find whether there is a biological control for this pest. If we fail, we can say we have tried, but until we have tried we cannot say that it is impossible. We have done this with other species of pests that have attacked profit-based crops. We should protect our quality

of life and I ask the Government to take up the challenge and make the \$30 000 available, at least this year so that the project can get started. Then we can ask the Federal Government to match that amount. I hope the Government notes the two points that I have raised and that we get some result.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 31 July. Page 259.)

**Mr. GROOM (Morphett):** I want to congratulate the mover and seconder of this motion for their excellent contributions, particularly the mover, who made a fine contribution for his maiden speech. I also want to congratulate the newly elected or appointed (I am not sure which) members of the shadow Cabinet. I think there have been at least one or two resurrections. Nevertheless, I congratulate those new members on, I think, their appointment to the shadow Cabinet. I extend my commiserations to the member for Alexandra; he did not have transport taken away from him, but he was moved to agriculture. I cannot quite get the distinction, but nonetheless it is evidently there.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** Intestinal fortitude.

**Mr. GROOM:** It might be a little bit of intestinal fortitude. I also congratulate the member for Hanson, who will be the new waste and mismanagement watchdog. I think that that probably is an appropriate title for the honourable member to bear. In fact, if he is looking at waste and mismanagement he might start with a number of members of the Opposition shadow Cabinet—

**An honourable member:** He might look in the mirror.

**Mr. GROOM:** He might do that, but if he was going to start anywhere with waste and mismanagement he might look at the 14 members in the shadow Cabinet as compared with the 13 members of Cabinet. I think that even 13 would be a waste for honourable members opposite. According to the *Advertiser* report of 20 July, the Leader, when announcing his shadow Cabinet, said, "This team will win." I cannot really see, in all seriousness (and I mean this) how the Leader can leave out people like the member for Light and the member for Fisher. Members opposite talk about the fact that they are individuals and not tied to a Party vote. Let us look at what happened with their Cabinet appointments. Evidently the member for Fisher did not make the shadow Cabinet, because he told the truth. According to newspaper reports, he said:

I cannot think of any reason why I have been sacked, although it has been said to me since the decision was taken that it is not wise to express yourself in the strongest terms in the Party room or in the shadow Cabinet.

The member for Fisher obviously did not make these utterances in public; he made them in private, in the Party room. He has evidently been sacked for telling the truth. Have a look at what happened in the Legislative Council. Mr. Geddes, who was a member of the former shadow Cabinet, saw the good sense in the Government's Santos legislation and, because he voted with the Government on that Bill, he was sacked. I think that, if anything puts down the suggestion that members opposite are not tied to a Party vote, it is these two examples, particularly in the case of Mr. Geddes, because he said in the *Advertiser* of that morning that he had been sacked because he had voted with the Government on the Santos Bill. I think it is

shameful. It is a pity that these things have to occur. How the Leader of the Opposition expects to win the next election when he leaves out members of the calibre of the member for Light and sacks the member for Fisher for telling the truth, I do not know.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** What about the member for Coles?

**Mr. GROOM:** The situation of the member for Coles is interesting. The first report was that she had been offered a place in the shadow Cabinet and had declined. I do not think that is the case. I do not think she was offered a place in the shadow Cabinet at all and, if one looks at her views, one can see why. I am grateful to the member for Henley Beach for raising the matter about the member for Coles. In her column, printed in the *News* last week, the member for Coles, talking about little M.P.'s starting early, said that, if children coming into Parliament House discover that they are sitting in the Premier's seat, they beam all over and, if they realise that they are on the Opposition side, their faces fall. She added, in brackets, "And who can blame them". What is the member for Coles saying publicly about her colleagues? If she is saying things like that publicly, what is she saying in private? I do not think she was offered a place in the shadow Cabinet at all.

**The Hon. G. T. Virgo:** What about the member for Goyder?

**Mr. GROOM:** He did a good job for local government, and evidently he has been appropriately rewarded for the efforts he put in, and is back on the back benches! The member for Hanson can laugh, but he was in the shadow Cabinet previously. It is quite evident that there is a very strong discipline within the Liberal Party, except when it comes to the matter of leadership, and that is when the divisions are apparent. Be that as it may, I congratulate those new members of the shadow Cabinet who have been appointed to their respective positions. I think the reason why the shadow Cabinet comprises 14 is that the numbers must be kept up to ensure that the member for Davenport does not take over as Leader of the Opposition.

The main thing that I want to mention during this debate, apart from those preliminary matters, is the shambles into which the Fraser Liberal Government is leading this country. On 6 December 1975, before the 1975 Federal elections, Mr. Fraser said that he would cut inflation by 11 per cent to about 4 per cent, so he was conceding that inflation had been about 15 per cent. In actual fact, he was a couple of per cent out; inflation was about 13 per cent in 1975. However, he said he would cut inflation by 11 per cent.

**Mr. Gunn:** It was about 18 per cent; he knew it would be cut by something.

**Mr. GROOM:** I think the member for Eyre should go back and study the reports and the Bureau of Statistics figures. I know he has difficulty in understanding these figures; however, inflation did not exceed 13 per cent in any one year under the Whitlam Government. If one looks at the recent—

*Mr. Gunn interjecting:*

**Mr. GROOM:** The honourable member can get up and defend the record of the Fraser Federal Liberal Government, which he does. Let him have the Prime Minister campaign in Eyre at the next election and see how he gets on. I am sure he will extend to the Prime Minister an invitation to campaign. Nevertheless, the Prime Minister made an election promise that he would cut inflation by 11 per cent. Let us have a look at his record almost four years after that utterance. I might add that, on 14 February of this year, Mr. Robinson, I think, said that inflation would be down to 6 per cent—a great prediction! He said that the Government had turned the

corner. What has happened is that the recent C.P.I. figures released in July this year indicated that Australia's inflation rate was about 8.8 per cent, which was a rise of 0.9 per cent on the previous year. What was an indictment of the Federal Liberal policies came through in a *Financial Review* article on 26 July.

**Mr. Gunn:** You should have sat down 10 minutes ago.

**Mr. GROOM:** The member for Eyre can carry on. I know it is painful for him to listen to accounts of the poor performance of the Federal Liberal Government, but it shows that the underlying inflation rate in Australia is about 10 per cent. That is because (and the *Financial Review* pointed this out) the world parity price of oil was not taken into account and added to the figures and the abolition of 40 per cent medical rebate.

**Mr. Gunn:** What about—

**Mr. GROOM:** I will come to that, because it is a rip-off. Members opposite, when they attend these public meetings (I think someone has called them Liberal Party meetings), or meetings to protest about taxes, should bring up the matter of the millions of dollars being ripped off the Australian taxpayer. Australia has an underlying inflation rate of about 10 per cent. From the C.P.I. figures, it is apparent that, due to excellent management, the South Australia Government has been able to peg inflation to 8.2 per cent, which is the equal lowest of all States. That indicates that the Fraser Government is not properly controlling the economy, because it had four years to reduce inflation, and all it has actually succeeded in doing is reducing inflation by about 3 per cent in four years and doubling the unemployment figure. What sort of record is that? It is a very poor record.

If one looks at the Budget deficits (and there was much criticism about the Whitlam deficits during the period 1972 to 1975), one sees that Fraser has outstripped all previous deficits. The 1975-76 deficit was about \$3.5 billion; in 1976-77, it was \$2 700 000; and in 1977-78, it was about \$3.3 billion, yet it was estimated at \$2.2 billion. That is not bad! I think I remember that the Federal Treasurer did not do very well in maths at school. During that year he was only \$1 billion out in his estimates, which is not bad! He has improved on that this year. The estimated Budget deficit was \$2.7 billion and the actual deficit will be about \$3.5 billion, so he has actually improved by seven hundred million dollars.

*The Hon. J. D. Corcoran interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Premier must not interject when he is out of his seat.

**Mr. GROOM:** When Mr. Howard announced that the Budget would overshoot the mark by about \$700 000 000, he said that the result would be unsatisfactory. The previous year, when he was \$1 billion out, he said it was a matter of disappointment. What sort of economic management for Australia is that? The Prime Minister has been parading on his record. When he was facing an election in 1977, he said that Australia's economic situation had turned the corner, and said that predictions that unemployment would go past 400 000 were out of date. His record in relation to economic management is absolutely appalling.

Perhaps Liberal Party philosophy is reflected in an utterance by Mr. Lynch, who said, in August 77, that the level of real wages paid to young people should be lowered to reduce youth unemployment. That sums up in a nutshell the Liberal Party's philosophy towards young people. The Liberals think young people are overpaid. They are going to peg their wages back and through some mysterious way they think that will promote other young people to be employed at lower wages. I cannot rationalise that sort of philosophy. Nevertheless, I think that is representative of

the policy they adopt towards young people. They make promises at election time that never seem to bear fruit. On 28 November 1975 in the *News*, before the December 1975 election there was a big promise (and it was on the front page of all the newspapers) that the Liberals home deal for young people was to be a vote catcher. The promise was that one dollar would be given for every three dollars saved over a period of three years, to a maximum, I think, of \$2 000. That was splashed all over the front pages, but there was a three-year qualifying period. That means that someone who started saving in January 1976 did not become eligible until January 1979, and then there is a nine-month waiting list. That takes it to Christmas of 1979 for someone who started saving in January 1976. That was an election promise intended to be a vote winner.

I know that many young people in the community fell for that. What has happened since? In June 1978 there was an announced 23 per cent cutback in funds available for public housing, and it was estimated in South Australia that this would reduce the number of houses being built by 400 to 500. In fact, the funding for public housing had been cut back to the 1972 level. On 23 April 1979, despite the promises to reduce interest rates so as to encourage young people to own their own home, there was a .5 per cent increase in the bond rate, which increased the payments that young people were required to make.

In 1978 Mr. Fraser announced that cheaper home loans were on the way. He said that reductions in interest rates would flow from the Budget, which would mean a cut in home loan repayments for thousands of Australians. However, that did not take place: cheaper home loans were not on the way. What actually occurred was an announcement in April that the bond rate would be increased. In that announcement of 23 April 1979 Mr. Howard went on to say that market forces were expected to push up interest rates on home loans and business overdrafts as the new Government rate took hold. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Hayden) called on Mr. Fraser to resign over the Liberal Government's handling of the economy. He went on to say:

This gross incompetence in economic affairs is matched only by his failure as a national leader.

That sums up the feelings of a great number of Australians towards Liberal Party policy. For the first time a younger generation is in a position to see Liberal Party policy unfold. Members opposite, and particularly the honourable member for Davenport, continually go on about the fact that it is wages, workers compensation and long service leave in the building trade that are adding to the cost. In fact, it is none of those things.

**Mrs. Adamson:** Well, what is?

**Mr. GROOM:** A young couple borrowing, at current interest rates, \$21 000 on a 40-year first mortgage and \$5 700 on a 15-year second mortgage (which is about the standard requirement for young people to borrow if they have to take out a second mortgage) are borrowing only \$26 700, but they will ultimately repay a total of \$77 338, almost \$51 000 more than the principal loan.

On a \$38 000 home (including land), it is estimated that the interest rate just to develop and build that house accounts for something like 10 per cent of the purchase price. That is because developers have to pay interest rates of about 18 per cent per annum to develop a building allotment.

The extent to which this interest component adds to the eventual cost of the house depends on the number of allotments included in the development and the rate at which they are developed and sold. Provided that the developer can sell the houses, allowing for a construction period of about 12 months, the high interest rates add

about 10 per cent or, in round figures, \$4 000 to the cost of a \$38 000 home, which is probably equivalent to the wage component that was required to build that home in the first place.

The extent to which interest adjustments add to the cost of repayments can be indicated by the latest building society rise of .5 per cent, because it is estimated that that increase in interest rates has added between \$4 500 and \$5 000 towards the cost of a home in terms of repayments. That is considerably more than the wage component, even allowing for workers compensation and long service leave. That is considerably more than those costs in building the house in the first place.

This is borne out by the fact that the housing industry in its June 1979 edition tried to show what Government costs were involved in a package house and land costing \$31 000. They estimated \$1 500 for pay-roll tax, workers compensation, long service leave, and apprentices' long service leave. That really is exaggerated. Even their figures indicate that it is not this sort of cost that is causing the problems in the building trade: it is high interest rates. The simple answer for the Federal Government is that it ought to subsidise interest rates for young people instead of putting them up. All it is doing is lining the pockets of the finance companies, which gain considerable profits by way of interest adjustments. Honourable members opposite, for propaganda purposes, continually say that it is wages and long service leave. That may be good politics, but ultimately they have to tell the people the truth, and the facts about the repayments on home loans are irrefutable. They have only to go to the banks to obtain the calculations if they are really interested in telling the people the truth—that the high interest rates in our society are particularly causing the problem in the building trade.

*The Hon. G. R. Broomhill interjecting:*

**Mr. GROOM:** I did mention the cut-backs that have placed funding back to a 1972 level, and I think it is shameful. The member for Henley Beach is quite correct in what he says. When Mr. Fraser came to office he said, as reported in the *Advertiser*, of 25 September 1976:

Good industrial relations were important, if not vital, to economic recovery.

If in 1976 he placed so much importance on good industrial relations, I should have thought that he would be promoting the same today, but he is not. He is promoting confrontation with the trade union movement for cheap political purposes. One of his best proponents in South Australia on this issue is the member for Davenport, who has a very poor sense of what amounts to good industrial relations. The member for Davenport carries on time and time again and hides the real distinction between preference to unionists and compulsory unionism. The member for Coles is another who peddles this misconception that preference to unionists amounts to compulsory unionism, but it does not. Compulsory unionism has never been the State Government's policy.

**Mrs. Adamson:** And black is white if you want to say so?

**Mr. GROOM:** I suggest that the member for Coles should start looking at some of the case law on this topic, and some of the legislation applying in other States, because the South Australian Industrial Commission found—

**Mr. Dean Brown:** Have you looked—

**Mr. GROOM:** The member for Davenport should know that there is already a preference clause in the South Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Act, but the Industrial Commission has pointed to a defect in that clause, in that it permits preference to be given not to a specific union but only to a member of a union. It would be ludicrous, say, in the retailing industry, where there is

only one union organising, to give preference not to one of its members but to a member of a building union such as the plumbers' union.

If this defect were allowed to go unremedied, gross industrial mischief would be created as a result of not rectifying the situation. Such a provision was passed by the Menzies Government. The sort of amendments envisaged by the Industrial Commission brings the South Australian situation into line with that existing in the other States and in Commonwealth matters.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** When you say "Industrial Commission", is the commission now proposing this change, or is it the State Government?

**Mr. GROOM:** The defect that the commission pointed out was that, unlike the Commonwealth legislation, preference could not be given to a specific union. The honourable member should know that. The Commonwealth Act has had a preference to unionists clause since 1947, and the present provision was inserted in 1956 by the Menzies Government.

If Sir Robert Menzies thought that granting such preference amounted to compulsory unionism, why did his Party not rebel at that time? Permitting clauses giving preference to unionists has nothing to do with compulsory unionism, and the High Court has repeatedly pointed that out. In the *Uniroyal* case in February 1978 or 1979, the High Court specifically rejected the proposition that the preference to unionists clause amounted to compulsory unionism, and that is not the only case. There was a 1947 case (the member for Playford would know that better than I would) which held specifically that the Commonwealth's provision did not amount to compulsory unionism.

There are many such decisions. Notwithstanding that the preference clause appears in Commonwealth and other State legislation (Western Australia has power to grant compulsory unionism in awards where it so desires), the member for Davenport and his colleagues continually misrepresent the situation about preference to unionists and compulsory unionism. Honourable members should remember that a union must apply to the commission, which then considers the application on its merits. It is a tragedy for industrial relations in this country when honourable members opposite have to peddle the sort of nonsense that they do, and mislead people.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** There was not too much preference under the SURS scheme: either one joined the union or one did not get a job.

**Mr. GROOM:** The honourable member knows nothing about good industrial relations, and that sort of interjection again supports what I am trying to say. The member for Davenport is another person who carries on about land tax as if it is the most iniquitous form of taxation. Most people pay between \$20 and \$50 in land tax.

**Mr. Becker:** Rubbish!

**Mr. GROOM:** Wealthy members of the community undoubtedly pay more; I do not dispute what the honourable member says. I know that he supports the wealthier members of the community.

**Mr. Becker:** \$72 land tax two years ago.

**Mr. GROOM:** That may be the case. Even if it was \$100 in land tax, how is its abolition really going to assist people substantially? Why did the honourable member not tell people who came to the public meeting (it was described to me as a Liberal Party meeting) at Henley Beach that his Government ripped off the Australian taxpayer to the tune of \$1 billion in extra excise revenue as a result of the switch to world parity oil pricing? I agree that Australians are generally over-taxed: that is not in dispute. What

members opposite do not look at are the reasons why Australians are an over-taxed society.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. GROOM:** How can members opposite justify the switch to world parity oil prices? That has penalised the people who voted for the Liberal Party for many generations, especially the farming community. That community will wake up and realise that the switch to world parity prices was just a tax slug and nothing else.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** They will vote for the Country Party.

**Mr. GROOM:** They might vote for the Country Party, I think that they might vote for the Australian Labor Party or perhaps they will prefer the Country Party.

**Mrs. Adamson:** Or the—

**Mr. GROOM:** The honourable member for Coles should indicate whether she supports this ripping off from Australian motorists of \$1 billion in extra taxation last year by the Federal Government. I would be interested to hear her answer to that. Probably Australians would not feel so badly about the switch to world parity oil prices if the money raised were spent on oil exploration. In fact, that is not occurring; those funds merely go into general revenue in an attempt to reduce the Commonwealth deficit. The increase is a blatant tax slug. No explanations or colouring over by members opposite will hide that fact from the Australian community. One has only to see how many oil wells have been drilled in Australia in 1978.

**Mr. Russack:** What about 1974-75?

**Mr. GROOM:** If the honourable member wants those figures, I have them, but they will embarrass him, I can assure him. In 1978, 52 exploration oil wells were drilled in Australia, yet about 7 000 were drilled in Canada and about 50 000 were drilled in the United States of America in that year. The camouflage that has been used to impose world parity oil prices on the Australian people is that Australia must do more to produce oil. In fact, the estimated number of exploration wells to be drilled in 1979 is less than 60, which at the best possible result is only eight more than in the past year.

Clearly, the Federal Liberal Government has no intention of putting into oil exploration the extra revenue of \$1 billion received from imposing world parity oil prices. This is merely a blatant tax slug. Members opposite clearly support that situation, and it is a tragedy that they do. Every time there is an OPEC oil price increase, the oil companies receive windfall profits, but that profit is not being ploughed back into the Australian community. What are the oil companies doing with their unearned profits, which are being paid for by the average Australian motorist?

**Mr. Becker:** It is used to pay off all Gough's debts.

**Mr. GROOM:** After four years? If that is the best that the honourable member can do, he should take that argument to the electorate.

**Mr. Russack:** From where did you get your drilling figures?

**Mr. GROOM:** I refer the honourable member to the Oil in Australia Institute of Petroleum figures and the 7 July report in the *National Times*. The honourable member, to his embarrassment, will find those figures there. The tragedy is that Opposition members do not tell the truth, in that they are deliberately misleading constituents in South Australia for blatant Party-political purposes.

They protest about land tax. From my experience the average Australian pays only between \$20 and \$50 a year, so how can any change in that tax substantially affect their situation in the light of the massive tax increases that are being imposed on the Australian people at Federal level?

The member for Hanson need only obtain a copy of the Taxation Commissioner's annual report to find out who pays all the income tax in Australia: 60 per cent of all income tax revenue raised in Australia comes from wage earners, and 20 per cent is paid by small self-employed people.

The remaining 20 per cent is paid by public companies, which include oil companies that are making mammoth windfall profits. The Australian taxpayer is overtaxed because the Menzies Government and successive Liberal Governments have deliberately imposed a burden on wage earners and small business people, who collectively are paying 80 per cent of income tax raised.

**Mr. Becker:** Do you want your family trust to pay more? How much does it pay? You've got on it, and you know you have.

**Mr. GROOM:** Come off it! Every decision that has been made in successive Budgets affects the wage earner and small business person. Honourable members opposite can carry on as they like. However, their Party's policies deliberately impose a burden on the wage earner and small business person. Australians are over-taxed simply because of those basic facts.

**Mr. Becker:** Family trust holders like you.

**Mr. GROOM:** The member for Hanson can carry on in any way he likes. I readily admit that my wife is a beneficiary in a trust set up by her grandfather, and I do not begrudge that situation at all.

**Mr. Becker:** I bet you don't.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae):** Order!

**Mr. GROOM:** Very well. She will inherit when her mother, who is a life tenant, dies. Then, my wife will certainly get the benefit of an inheritance due under that trust. I hope that the member for Hanson, if he wishes to carry on like this, will explain how he was able to purchase his last motor vehicle. I will not be too oppressive in relation to that matter. The honourable member has contacts and knows how to get a cheap brand-new car. A lot of people at Chryslers well know that the member for Hanson turns up every 12 months or so. However, be that as it may.

As the member for Hanson has referred to it, I will raise the following matter. At the same time that the Prime Minister is squeezing the wage earner and small business person, off he goes in his luxury jet which carries 50 persons. I have forgotten the amount paid for that jet, but certainly it was \$15 000 000 or \$20 000 000. Off the Prime Minister went recently for his seventeenth overseas trip at the taxpayers' expense. This is the same man who said formerly that Australia would not have a tourist as its next Prime Minister.

Despite that, off he went on his seventeenth overseas trip, with 50 others, probably with his camera over his arm, ready to take his snap shots. Of course, the Prime Minister must have comfort. He cannot travel like every other ordinary Australian. He must travel in the comfort to which he is accustomed. What would the money used to purchase the v.i.p. jets have done for our pensioners who have been squeezed as a result of the Federal Government's policies? That money would have made a great difference to them in pension increases. The other important matters that I wish to raise relate to my electorate.

**Mr. Becker:** Good: the round house.

**Mr. GROOM:** I agree that that is an important matter. I wanted particularly to refer to the Patawalonga channel, as that is an important development in my district. The State Government announced in May that \$250 000 would be spent on improving the entrance to the Patawalonga outlet and that the work would involve the dredging and

deepening of the channel.

**Mr. Becker:** Are you pleased about it?

**Mr. GROOM:** Of course I am pleased about the announcement. It will benefit considerably the area and the boating fraternity. The importance of the Patawalonga outlet is that it is the only facility on the Adelaide coastline south of North Haven that provides for the sheltered launching and retrieval of boats. The haven gives protected mooring to about 174 shallow craft, and the public boat ramp is used by about 500 boats on a normal summer weekend. So, the outlet is important not only as a recreation facility but also as a launching site for rescue craft.

I know that this problem has persisted for many years and that no cheap and easy solutions are available. The Government has chosen this solution on the best advice available to it. I make no apology for it spending \$250 000, because it will be beneficial not only to the area generally but also from a tourism point of view. That work is still being done. It is an important development, which I am pleased to say I have promoted during my time as a member of this House. It is a project on which I have made numerous representations to the Government and on which I have had consultations with local groups and Glenelg council. This important development will benefit the area and ensure that it develops in a good manner in the years to come. I am sure that, in conjunction with other developments taking place at Glenelg, this project will add to tourist facilities.

The other matter to which I refer briefly is the new recreation area that is to be developed at Bombay Street, Oaklands Park. This is a joint enterprise between the Marion council and the State Government. As Oaklands Park is lacking in facilities, I am extremely pleased to have been instrumental in making representations to get this project off the ground. The project, for which the State Government has allocated \$43 000, involves a 600 metre cross-country cycle track, which has a number of obstacles and which is practically completed. There will be a smaller track to enable the younger generation to use the area.

This area will serve a number of electorates, because it is the apex of the Ascot Park, Brighton and Glenelg Districts, all of which it will benefit significantly. Apart from the cycle track development, which will indeed be important, it will comprise some challenging playground equipment, including flying foxes, a steep slippery dip, and other recreation facilities, such as barbecues, and so on. I am particularly pleased that this project, which stemmed from discussions that I had with the Marion council's recreation officer, has got under way.

Initially, we had planned merely to bulldoze the area and to make a bicycle track cheaply. However, it was apparent that the scheme would benefit the area if some other substantive development took place. I am pleased that Marion council's members supported it. That development, which we intend to open later this year, will benefit a number of districts in addition to my own.

Although there have been other developments in my area about which I am pleased and which have occurred since I have been a member, they are two of the main developments to which I wanted to refer. Finally, I congratulate the member for Norwood on his fine contribution in his maiden speech.

**Mr. RODDA (Victoria):** It is always a pleasure to participate in the Address in Reply debate, which is one of those institutions of Parliament that has long afforded an opportunity for members to express some of those things that are dear to their hearts and to the hearts of other people. It gives one an opportunity to participate in a

broad spectrum of discussion in this place.

I want to be sufficiently charitable to commend the member for Norwood, who moved the motion. Although I do not agree with the context of that new member's speech, I commend him for the way in which he delivered it.

In his Speech, His Excellency the Governor referred to the death of four distinguished South Australians. The late Mr. Leslie Harding, my predecessor in this place, served here for nine years. He gave great service to this State as a citizen in many ways prior to entering Parliament later in his life. He had the distinction of being a First World War veteran, serving with the 27th Battalion with, as his colleagues, Sir Thomas Playford and the father of the present Premier, the late Mr. Corcoran. The late Mr. Leo Travers, the late Sir Baden Pattinson, and the late Stanley Hawker, were very well known to me. They, too, made great contributions to this State and served with distinction in this House.

A distinguished and loved officer of this place who passed away was the late Mr. Bill Harrison, who was a messenger in this place for about 22 years. He served four of those years in a temporary position before serving on the permanent staff for another 18 years. He was the centre hall messenger and, as most members will know, he was the father of Mr. Bob Harrison. It is interesting to note that between the two of them, they have served this Parliament for about 42 years, which is a very commendable service record with the staff of Parliament House. It was also mentioned that Mr. Peter Host has retired. Ever since I have been a member, I have found him to be a very fine member of the library staff who was only too willing to help. I wish him well in his retirement.

The previous speaker dealt with the reasons for South Australia's troubles. As I see it, there are three major problems that are worrying South Australia. Those problems are the economy, South Australia's industrial stability, and law and order, including public safety. All of these problems lie very responsibly on the shoulders of this Government. Every thinking South Australian wonders about his future, despite what has been said by members opposite; the member for Napier had many things to say about this, and I will refer to his remarks later.

The scenario for the South Australian economy is not terribly enthusiastic and is not greeted with much enthusiasm by investors. Several weeks after this House debated the Santos legislation, I attended a conference in Victoria. There was an overseas visitor at that conference who had a map of Australia with a large red ring around South Australia and marked within that ring were the letters "k.o." I referred to those letters and asked whether they stood for "knocked out". He said, "No, keep out". That was the way he, as an investor in this country, viewed South Australia. He had heard about the Santos Bill and the things this Government was doing to people who invested in this State. Irrespective of the merits of that legislation, that was the attitude being expressed by a person who was interested in investing in Australia. He saw Australia as an excellent place to invest in, but South Australia was sitting on the map with a red ring around it and the letters "k.o." That is what he thought of the custodians of Government in South Australia. He was branding me, if you please, with some of the odour that he attached to this Government.

The Government of South Australia is smoke-screening on the development of mineral resources and the uranium issue in this State. The \$50 000 000 investment in exploration at Roxby Downs is a most encouraging sign, despite the map I have referred to. The way the Government has approached this matter and the way

questions have been answered can be described only as featherfooting. I assure the Minister at present at the Treasury bench that we could not expect these people to spend such a vast amount of money and then at the end say to them, "Right-oh boys, thank you very much".

**The Hon. D. W. Simmons:** Even you people think you have a chance to get on the Treasury benches.

**Mr. RODDA:** Everybody in this place thinks that way, and why shouldn't they? Members should not enter this House expecting to sit in Opposition for the rest of their political lives. Some of us probably have that staring us in the face, but there are people on this side of the House who will be on the Treasury benches in the not too distant future. The map with the red ring and the letters "k.o." marked on it is not a good thing for South Australia, and I hope the Minister will take heed of what I have to say to him.

The industrial climate is set by legislation in that area. The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill, which will be introduced shortly with a stroke of the Minister's legislative pen and the indiscriminate use of his numbers in this place, will further bolster the attitude of that international investor when he considers his map with the red ring and the letters "k.o." marked on it. I am sure that legislation such as that Bill will ultimately kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

As to law and order, Adelaide is no longer a safe place to go anywhere at your leisure, as we have done in the past. We have seen some shocking crimes committed in this State. The bodies of young women have been found stretched across the country side, cast aside like old shoes. That is a desperate situation, and one we are all sorry about. I am not casting aspersions on the Minister when I say that, but there is great disquiet in the community. Members of the public are speaking out strongly against the light sentences that are being handed out to criminals. I am sure all my colleagues have received strong outbursts from their constituents on this issue. We have seen justices of the peace at Tailem Bend publicly expressing what many South Australians are thinking.

Loose living, the dropping of moral standards, pornography, the mobility of the motor car, and a period of public softness seemed to surface in the Dunstan era, and gave South Australians something to think about and, perhaps, answer for. To this end, I acknowledge that South Australia has an excellent Police Force. The Judiciary has come under public criticism, so it was pleasing to hear two judges speak out recently about some of the limitations with which they are faced. I am sure that the Minister and his colleagues will act to correct some of those things. The member for Napier said things about people on this side.

**Mr. Wilson:** They were not very nice, either.

**Mr. RODDA:** No, they were super-critical. He spoke of the Norwood by-election and said:

Let us look at what the Liberal Party had to offer against the Australian Labor Party in the Norwood by-election. There was really nothing. As I have already stated, that Party carried out a scare campaign on succession duties, and the results showed that in only two areas, Joslin and Kensington Park, was there a swing of any significance, possibly because people in those areas had more wealth to preserve.

I do not know why members of the Labor Party trot out that hackneyed old phrase about the wealth to preserve. When one looks at the question of succession duties, one sees that that person does not have to have a big home. If there is full equity in it, it can involve a big slice being taken by succession duties. I spent some time with the candidate for Norwood in the by-election, and we met people who faced that situation. They do not live in Joslin

or Kensington: they were scattered generally through the District of Norwood. I thought the member for Napier was stooping fairly low when he made the odious reference to our candidate. He said he looked like a tailor's dummy.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** I thought he was flattering him.

**Mr. RODDA:** He was whistling in the dark if that is what you call flattery. We started out with the position that the former member enjoyed a 10 per cent majority, and we did very well in the by-election.

**Mr. Hemmings:** In the end result you didn't.

**Mr. RODDA:** If you win by one you win. We certainly pegged back the 10 per cent. There was plenty of action by the Government in Norwood, and questions about tailors' dummies went down like a pricked balloon.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae):** Order! I cannot hear the honourable member.

**Mr. RODDA:** The tailor's dummy will be back there, and he will not be sitting in a tailor's window. I noticed that the member for Napier decided to give me a rap about the wine tax. He knows that in Opposition one is effective only to a certain degree. As reported at page 231 of *Hansard*, the member for Napier said:

Where was the shadow Minister of Agriculture when the scandalous treatment of the grapegrowers was going on? He was doing nothing. In every instance in which the rural community is being slugged by the Federal Government, it has been the Minister of Agriculture, with rural industry groups, who has taken up the cudgels on behalf of that section of the community.

**Mr. Wilson:** What about the scandalous treatment the member gave the Town Clerk at Elizabeth?

**Mr. RODDA:** That is certainly a case of the pot calling the kettle black. Expecting the shadow Minister to salvage what the member for Napier is growling about is asking too much. That is enough for that member: it was a lot of sour grapes, and I think the Labor Party was pleased when the Saturday night of the by-election came. The member for Napier made sharp remarks about the shadow Cabinet but, speaking of my successor and despite the things that have been said about him, I am sure that he will do well in the Agriculture portfolio. He is a vigorous young man and knows his way around the agriculture fields. Perhaps he will get back, with interest added, some of the things he has said about lack of action in the wine industry.

In paragraph 4 of his Speech, His Excellency refers to a small surplus. Again, on the matter of succession duties, which has also been dealt with by several colleagues, Senator McLaren seems to be rather a shining light in defending the Government's attitude on those duties. In *Farmer and Grazier* a few issues ago he spoke about soaking the rich. I do not want to be unkind, but I think he said that there were only about 2 200 estates in South Australia and only a minimal number was of any substance. He said the rich, including rich farmers, were getting it in the neck. It was only a matter of time before he had to face up to what farmers thought about him. In the latest issue, Mr. D. T. Wedding, Chairman of the Joint Death Duties Committee of the United Farmers and Graziers, stated that Senator McLaren's letter in the June issue was fascinating. He said the response from politicians and public servants had been that information was not available, yet Senator McLaren had been able to extract and be up to date on those figures. Mr. Wedding also stated:

More importantly, however, the succession duties are a tax on the rich.

He points out (and this would apply to our Norwood people):



I was given a couple of examples but one will suffice. Last week I was told by an 18-year-old city girl that she has to pay \$875 in succession duties, and her mother is a pensioner. The girl's father died prematurely and left the family house to her. Her gross weekly wage is \$113.90, and that is her sole source of income.

That girl, a working person, as the member for Morphett would say, is not rich, but that is the kind of money she must find. It will take a girl, receiving that sort of money and maintaining herself and her mother, a long time to find. Another letter is by Mr. S. J. Mann, President of the Taxpayers Association of South Australia, who, referring to Senator McLaren, states:

The arguments put forward by him for the retention of duties in South Australia shows a typical "Custer's last stand" attitude adopted by him and many members of the Party he represents . . . absolute rubbish, for during our recent campaign our association was given many examples of the innocent, ignorant and less wealthy members of the community being hurt.

To these unprotected people the prospect of being faced with a significant death duty bill less than six months after the death of a family member can be extremely traumatic.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Can you give examples of this?

**Mr. RODDA:** Senator McLaren, with the 2 200 estates that he highlighted, would be amongst the examples that the honourable member could examine, involving the trauma of high taxes and associated problems. I invite the honourable member to get in cahoots with his senatorial colleague, and he will find out where those examples are. He will do that at his and the Government's peril.

As regards people leaving this State, many farmers have sold out, and properties are for sale. They are getting out before they get into this situation.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Do you know many of them?

**Mr. RODDA:** Yes.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Can you name any of them?

**Mr. RODDA:** That is their business. During the last session, a journalist, who was preparing an article on this matter, approached me and, in turn, I approached 12 of these people. I think that six were in Queensland and four were in New South Wales, and the other two were in Western Australia. They were not prepared to discuss this matter for the good reason that they had left money in their properties here. Some of their friends were proposing to sell out, and they saw no point in going public on it. They made no secret of the fact that they had left the State because of the savage impost of capital taxation. His Excellency did not refer to the equity capital that is leaving the State.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Why should these people be so secretive about it?

**Mr. RODDA:** If the member for Henley Beach reads the *Stock Journal* of last week, he will find that 79 South Australian properties were for sale; opposing that, 49 interstate properties were flamboyantly displayed for purchase in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Why are they for sale?

**Mr. RODDA:** Because of the savage impost of this Government's succession duties.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** I don't think that's true.

**Mr. RODDA:** God help South Australia if that is the honourable member's attitude. These people have left the State, and millions of dollars has left South Australia. The member for Coles spoke about this matter in the Address in Reply debate last session and in an adjournment debate and got the pooh-hoo from the Government, which said that she did not know what she was talking about. I have

had some personal involvement in assisting with the administration of farmers' settlements. The member for Morphett would be familiar with the problems these people have had. They have had difficulty in getting settlement. Some of these properties are sizable. Finance is not readily available to buy a big property, and it is not uncommon to see properties subdivided, which is when the trouble starts.

We see the new farmer going on to his property, and he is in strife in restocking it. The equity capital moves out, and borrowed capital finances the purchase. There is also the purchase of stock, and we have seen the price of livestock increasing so much that farmers have not been able to stock their properties.

I will now say something about the problems experienced in a couple of cases in which I have been asked to assist. In one case, a property on Eyre Peninsula was subdivided and the sale was executed in about September 1978. Arrangements were made to purchase a property in Queensland on 17 March. The harvest was duly completed, the clearing sale was held, and the family moved to Queensland. The survey was done, and the transaction and conveyances were started. A district council is required, by regulation, as soon as it receives the documents to forward eight copies to the Director of Planning, who goes into a long huddle with the various interested bodies about whether the subdivision should proceed.

When that is completed, the papers are returned to the council, which must certify that it approves of the subdivision and that the land in question is contained wholly within its area; this takes about eight weeks. If it happens, as it did in this case, that the regular monthly council meeting has just been held, there might be a wait of three weeks before the next council meeting. In all, in this case, 11 weeks was involved. In the meantime, 17 March had arrived, and in Queensland there were no funds to meet the big payment for the property. Bridging finance had to be obtained, and the Queensland banks, which are no easier than those in South Australia, required some collateral. Some mortgages had to be entered into, and these people were five days late. The Queensland vendors could have foreclosed, but they did not. The matter was settled, involving, I understand, a high lawyer's fee and a considerable amount of interest. The sale was concluded on 5 July.

It was an old survey, and the surveyors were called in and, once the matter reached the Registrar-General's office, the examiners found certain things wrong with the documents. What delayed it was the sighting of the last and final bridging mortgage, which had to be flown down from Queensland and which got caught up in the postal strike at the Redfern Mail Exchange. Meanwhile, interest had been charged at about 14 per cent. This South Australian family ended up paying about \$7 000 in bridging finance and interest.

The other people were from my district, and they had a similar experience. They went for vendor finance for the bridging loan, at 14 per cent, for three months, increasing to 18 per cent, and they had a couple of months on that rate. Those are some of the difficulties people are finding on selling their properties and leaving the State. It is little wonder that they do not want to be interviewed. My advice is that those people who have properties for sale sell, get their documentation, put their money in the bank, and then buy land in other States. I am not blaming the departments. We all know that conveyancing and the examination of titles and surveys, especially old surveys, all takes time. In the West Coast case, I believe it is the first time the property has been sold since it was taken up



in 1906. When people go looking for subdivision datum marks, etc., they have to go a considerable distance, and it involves time.

This matter is causing a lot of trouble and concern to people, so they are moving. I know there are three, four or five properties in my district that are being sold, and some of them are quite sizable. It is bad to see people with expertise leaving the local area and going to places that they do not know, because there will be pitfalls for them because of that. There is nothing wrong with South Australia—it is a very good place to live.

Regarding the matter of law and order, it was interesting to see in "Voice", which appears as a supplement to the *Advertiser*, that a young lady called Catherine Bodner, who attends Annesley College, said:

What is our world coming to? Whatever happened to law and order, effective punishment, and respect for the society we live in? It's gone! Our world is becoming a nightmare to live in. A rape here, a murder there, and tomorrow another robbery. I can't even walk to and from the shop at night any more, for fear of being attacked.

What have I done, along with the rest of the community, to deserve this? Obviously a certain proportion of the community ask for what they get, and maybe they deserve it. Our world is being led into a state of disaster, due to the feeble judgment of people in high office.

That is probably a bit rough on lots of people in high office. That girl echoes a feeling that is abroad in the community. She continues:

This disaster is compounded by those people who say, "Don't listen to your parents, do what you want to do. It's your life and your parents can't stop you."

This young person goes on to say:

If criminals have to spoil the lives and freedom of others, then their lives should also be spoiled.

That is the old eye for an eye and tooth for a tooth approach. Unfortunately, that attitude is becoming rife in the community. I think that this young lady is echoing a sentiment that exists throughout the community today. She continues:

However, today, the law is so hopelessly weak, perhaps even corrupt, that innocent people have to endure while the criminal is treasured like a hero.

I do not believe that we have corruption here, but I do believe that what this girl is saying is something that the Chief Secretary and his colleagues have to take due cognisance of.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Do you agree with that?

**Mr. RODDA:** It is not a question of what I agree with.

**Mr. Slater:** What paper was that in?

**Mr. RODDA:** The *Adelaide Advertiser*.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Do you agree with those sentiments?

**Mr. RODDA:** The sentiment expressed by that young lady is an example of the view being expressed in the community today.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Do you agree with what she is saying?

**Mr. RODDA:** I agree that what she is saying does echo the sentiments that are concerning the people of this State today.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Do you agree with them?

**Mr. RODDA:** I am sure that the member for Henley Beach, if he does not take some notice of them, will be in a lot of trouble.

**Mr. Groom:** You're not—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Morphett is interjecting out of his place.

**Mr. RODDA:** The Address in Reply speech made by a member is important to his electorate. One should not

cease one's remarks without saying something about the electorate one represents. It is about two years since the last redistribution of electoral boundaries under the one vote one value system. Country members are piling up many miles servicing their districts. I found during the Norwood by-election campaign that members of Parliament were falling over one another. If they did not turn around quickly they were canvassing in Gilles. It makes a country member envious, considering the territory he has to cover. It is becoming increasingly difficult to service country districts under the new boundaries.

My next point is directed to the Minister of Education. The Lucindale school is the only school in my district that has had little upgrading since I have been the member for the district. The member for Henley Beach and myself have 15 years on the clock serving in our districts. That school is staffed by a wonderful group of people, and the parent body takes a strong interest in the school. I cannot urge too strongly, even bearing in mind the stringencies the department has had to face, that this is a school in need of upgrading. It is the old timber structure, and it is kept as best it can be, but signs of wear are showing and it is due for improvement. It is heartening, as the Premier said the other day, to hear of the coal find at Lucindale. This may be a blessing in disguise, and we may have to build a big school there if that coal find is of the order we think it is. I cannot emphasise too much the need in respect of that school.

Mount Burr, which is now in my district, also has a timber frame school building. The people there have expressed strong remarks about the condition of that school. I draw the Minister's attention to the condition of the school. Lucindale school had a couple of rooms upgraded and a fine community library was installed last year. That is giving fine service to the district, and I commend the Minister for that having been done. There is a school in the offing at Penola, that I understand will be completed during the coming year. Penola residents will obtain many advantages from that school and are happy about its being built. The Penola district received funds in the last Budget.

The Hon. Mr. Casey went to Penola, where he had discussions with the Mayor, officers of the district council, and me about the need for a community centre in that town. The people are very grateful for the money spent there. The foundation is down for a fine building which will take the form of a dressing room, showers, etc., at the oval. That is the beginning of a sporting complex. I understand that a stadium is to be erected in connection with the school, using a lot of public money. The Minister of Community Development had discussions with me about Penola and Nangwarry. The people of Penola and Nangwarry are grateful for the reception and consideration they have had from Mr. Bannon. The citizens of those towns are pleased with the reception they have had from the Minister. Next Friday at Millicent we will witness the opening of the new assembly hall, which cost about \$220 000. The Government supplied about \$115 000, I think, with local input being about \$75 000, and there were other amounts of money involved. It is a fine building. A similar building has been constructed at Kangaroo Inn. This is greatly appreciated by the people in my district.

Regarding fishing, a complaint was put to me at Beachport, which is a great area for tourism, as the Minister well knows. Some people from my district, who were spending some time at Beachport, got themselves into hot water by netting in what proved to be a prohibited area. The net was confiscated (I understand it has since been returned). Their complaint was that the sign was

incorrectly sited. These people, following the signs, set a net and found later that the sign had been turned around. They were in trouble because they had cast the net in a place south of the stone obelisk, in a prohibited area, which was, I understand, a marine reserve. This kind of thing causes difficulty. The people concerned were unhappy about the situation, and I point out that problems can occur.

I believe that a Government has a duty to govern and an Opposition's role is to criticise constructively, but also to give credit where it is due. In regard to capital improvements in centres such as Bordertown, Naracoorte and the other places I have mentioned, I express the thanks of the people. The main concerns at present are in relation to the economy, the industrial stability of the State, and law and order. I hope that the Government will accept what I have said and will see that my comments are kept in mind for the sake of the people of South Australia, and for the sake of good Government. I support the motion.

**Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart):** I would like to comment briefly on some points raised by the honourable member, and I shall not do to him what the previous member for Ross Smith did to one of his colleagues some years ago. The honourable member talked about farmers leaving South Australia to go interstate. Members on this side of the House do not deny that this is happening. The truth is that farmers in South Australia are selling highly priced land in South Australia and moving interstate where the price for land is lower.

**Mr. Rodda:** Not when they have to pay \$7 000 premium to get in there.

**Mr. KENEALLY:** The member for Victoria knows that what I say is true. The price of land in South Australia is high because farmers here are prepared to pay the price. The price of land depends on what farmers are willing to pay. Land in South Australia is not left untended and is not unproductive. People are buying land in South Australia. The question that the honourable member should answer is why farmers are prepared to pay a higher cost for land in South Australia than they are willing to pay in northern New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia, the areas to which, I understand, farmers from South Australia are moving. The honourable member will be quick to point out that I am no farmer, but my rejoinder is that my information has been obtained from farmers and farmer organisations.

It is almost incumbent upon me, in view of the trend that this Address in Reply debate has taken, to mention briefly the shadow Cabinet and the reason why I believe the Leader of the Opposition has been able to get away with such a scandalous redistribution of shadow Ministry positions. If one looks at the number of shadow Cabinet members and the number of Liberals in this House, one will see that there are 11 shadow Ministries up for grabs and 18 members of the Liberal Party, so that seven Liberal Party members do not get into the shadow Cabinet. When the Leader has such power to wield over his colleagues, it is not likely that there will be many criticisms. When one looks at the first 11 members of the shadow Cabinet—

**Mr. Wilson:** Who is the twelfth man?

**Mr. KENEALLY:** I think it would be a twelfth woman. The credibility of the members of the shadow Cabinet would be somewhere less than that of the seven dwarfs, and I think the ability and intelligence of those members would not measure up to that of the three stooges. I would be prepared to bet that the seven back-benchers, given half the chance, would be able to wipe off the front bench altogether, and perhaps even off the map.

Most members on this side of the House have been in this place, and in Government, for a long time. All members opposite, except the member for Victoria, have had no experience in Government. Members on this side know what is needed to make up a Government front bench, and we have the best in Australia, as is generally conceded throughout most of the States, if not all the States, and certainly by the media. There are no signs that members opposite have what it takes to make a front bench. The Opposition experiences trouble in making up a shadow Ministry.

With the few minutes left before I seek leave to adjourn this debate (and I will turn to the weighty matters tomorrow), I would like to mention briefly the speech of the member for Mitcham, which could be described as a valedictory. He has said goodbye to the House in what he might believe to be his last major speech. I think some members of the Opposition will join him, although they might not be aware of it at the moment, unless they can convince their Federal Leader, Mr. Fraser, to show some sense in his economic policies. I will continue in this vein tomorrow.

I would like to congratulate the member for Norwood on his speech in this debate. I thought his speech was competent and as good as had been anticipated. He follows a very illustrious tradition in Norwood, and members on this side of the House feel confident that he will be able to fill the boots of Mr. Dunstan adequately. Since the very sad departure of the former Premier (and I am sure all members will wish him well in his bid to regain good health), it has been shown that no matter how good one is—and I think the former Premier is as good as one can be—one is not indispensable. Certainly, the member for Norwood will be able to do the job adequately and, to the chagrin of members opposite, the new Premier is a magnificent Premier. He has moved into that high position as to the manor born. I doubt whether members opposite want to challenge that statement in an early election. I am sure if that was the case, they would be shattered.

**Mr. Wilson:** Are we going to have one?

**Mr. KENEALLY:** It might surprise the member for Torrens to know that I am not privy to when the election will be held, but I suspect it will be held in perhaps March or April 1981. If that is the case, a lot of Opposition members will spend about 12 months longer in this House than they anticipate at the moment. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Chief Secretary):** I move: That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** I will resume on the topic that I was discussing in the grievance debate during the Supply Bill, when I was referring specifically to open space school development in South Australia. I was commenting that the attitude of the South Australian Education Department towards open space units was not absolutely clear even at this stage. After some nine or 10 years of experimentation, we still have some schools being constructed with a multiplicity of classrooms in the one open space. Probably one of the most recent developments would be the proposed improvements and extensions at Highgate Primary School, where there is a central resource centre with seven single unit classrooms, with some flexible planning so that the classrooms can be adapted to double unit classrooms, very much like the old

schools that were being constructed 40 to 60 years ago. The wheel really has turned full circle, apart from the fact that we now have magnificent resource centres incorporated into our schools.

I stress that South Australia has managed as well as any other State in Australia has done in the administration and development of open space teaching. In South Australia there are many excellent open space schools where dedicated staff have made an excellent job of adapting their teaching and bringing the students along. The report to which I referred earlier, the national study of open area schools, with N. J. Angus as the main compiler, published by the Australian Government Publishing Service in Canberra in 1979, highlights that South Australian schools are as good as any open space schools so far as results in the mathematics are concerned.

Even allowing for that, across the length and breadth of Australia there is no question that in the cognitive skills (mathematics, English and reading) it does not really matter whether the open unit comprises a double classroom or four, six or eight classrooms under the one roof. The difference in cognitive skills is quite pronounced. I will just illustrate to the House—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member knows that he cannot display exhibits.

**Mr. ALLISON:** The single-teacher classroom, without exception, has a better cognitive result than do the two, four, six, eight, or nine-teacher units, and that is very significant. It highlights the problems that teachers have in open space, and since we have over the past nine or 10 years constructed so very many open space units with between two and nine-teacher units, obviously we will be stuck with them for quite some time. It is just not possible to build walls into every one of those units, nor is it possible to replace them easily. I put to the Minister and to the Education Department that, given so many open unit schools in South Australia, we should continue to look at the very best way of operating them effectively.

In reports that were put out in Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States of America about 10 years ago, it was stressed that excellence of teaching, compatibility of staff, a well-structured, a well-ordered lesson, a well-established curriculum, where staff and students know where they are going, were essential if students were to improve their reading, writing and arithmetic skills.

As I pointed out earlier, one of the reasons for the construction of open space schools was that children were alleged to improve sociologically: they would be better adjusted students. About two years ago I raised this subject, and the Minister of Education was extremely critical of my point of view. Therefore, I thought it rather significant that a former Federal Labor Minister for Education (Mr. Kim Beazley) recently expressed his personal view in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 31 July 1979 and quoted several Western Australian children who expressed their views about open space schools. Here are some of the problems that most of them wrote about:

"There are various problems," they wrote, "most of which are due to noise. They include, inability to concentrate. Movement of other pupils. Quiet and loud activities in the same area at the same time. Difficulty of keeping your mind on your own teacher when another teacher is talking about something else (or yelling at some other kids). Inadequate screens between areas."

As Mr. Beazley says, these points sound very practical, even if they are not expressed in the language of educationists: at least the children know what the problems are. Teachers the world over would recognise that these problems have been present even in an ordinary

classroom without distraction of someone else teaching in close proximity without any screen between one class and another. The aims that were first set out for open space teaching were far too vague, says Kim Beazley, who states:

How vague can you get? These schools were supposed to cater better for the individual differences of both pupils and teachers. Pupils can learn different ways and teachers can adopt various teaching styles.

If one has heard anything more vague than that, I would be surprised. Teachers and students are able, as I understand it, to adapt to various teaching styles irrespective of whether they are in an open unit or in a single teacher class. It is possible to foster teacher co-operation and to provide scope for different social arrangements for pupils and to provide a more pleasant stimulating environment for pupil learning, and it is possible to allow for a change in educational practice in the new open space style of teaching according to Kim Beazley. Equally, he says, it is possible to do all of that in the old-fashioned style of teaching, and that teachers were just not consulted about the designs of new schools: it was assumed that they had no opinions worth gathering because they had never experienced any form of teaching in the new design of school. That was true in most of the States but, in South Australia, at least some teachers were consulted to obtain their opinions before we went *holus-bolus* into open space.

The point has been made that open space teaching requires staff of exceptional dedication and skill and that open space teaching can offer far more distraction to both student and teacher than can the old traditional single classroom.

It is probably significant that Queensland came out ahead of all other States in the 1976 Australian Council for Educational Research test of 10-year-olds and 14-year-olds, which test was conducted by Keeves and Bourke. Queensland's teaching was, of course, extremely traditional in the old single-classroom teacher style. I therefore ask the present Minister of Education to pay great attention to any request he receives from open area schools.

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

**Mr. SLATER (Gilles):** In the time allocated to me in this debate, I wish to refer to the national sports lottery, to which the member for Torrens also referred this afternoon. The sports lottery has been proposed for the financing of Australian sporting competitors in international competition. Contrary to what the member for Torrens said, I support the remarks of the Minister of Community Development, who is also Minister of Recreation and Sport, that this State would not be stampeded into participating in the proposed lottery. We need to know more specific details before we can accept it as the cure-all for the financing of Australian sporting competitors in overseas competitions.

The member for Torrens made some rather outlandish remarks. He said, first, that Australia was at one stage the greatest sporting nation in the world. I would qualify that statement a little. Of course, we have had our successes in years gone by. The honourable member also mentioned individuals. I think he referred to Dawn Fraser, Herb Elliott and Jack Brabham. Of course, Jack Brabham was a professional competitor in the motor racing field. I do not intend that we should support those sorts of operation in a national sports lottery. Jack Brabham is a professional competitor who has had great success in his sport, and I take nothing from him in that regard. Indeed, he is still doing fairly well with advertisements relating to the motor industry.

So, it seems that the view expressed by the Minister of Community Development has been vindicated by a recent Melbourne meeting which was attended by the Federal Minister (Hon. R. J. Ellicott) and representatives from New South Wales and Victoria and at which it was decided merely to conduct a feasibility study into a sports lottery.

The member for Torrens was a little critical of the Minister for not attending that meeting. He also criticised the Minister for the remarks he made regarding a Mr. George Harris. I understand that Mr. Harris was the person who purportedly made approaches to each State's Minister on behalf of the Federal Government, claiming that he would be the entrepreneur or sponsor of the national sports lottery. It is fair for me to say that I consider that to be a rather bad start in relation to the national lottery.

**Mr. Wilson:** What's that got to do with the Minister's going to the conference?

**Mr. SLATER:** It has a lot to do with it, as we wanted to know which specific proposals were to be discussed at that meeting.

**Mr. Wilson:** Well, go and find out!

**Mr. SLATER:** We know what has happened since then: they are waiting to conduct a feasibility study. If anyone is to participate in a national lottery, surely it should be conducted not by a private individual but by a lotteries commission. When an individual approaches the Minister, purporting to represent the Federal Government, one is entitled to be a little suspicious.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** I think you've convinced the member.

**Mr. SLATER:** I hope so. He was critical of the Minister for not going to the meeting. We will find that the sports lottery will not be acceptable to the other States. There was no indication that Western Australia, Queensland or Tasmania were interested, either. I agree that sport certainly needs financial assistance at a national level. This requires funding and, of course, it requires the Federal Government to face up to its responsibilities and not to unload them on to a national sports lottery.

Last year, in a motion before this House, I condemned the Federal Government for its allocation of \$1 300 000 to sport in the 1978 Budget. This condemnation was supported by the Australian Sporting Confederation, which represents most sporting bodies throughout Australia. There has never been a clear indication from the Federal Government about its policy for sport and recreation which could be used as a guide for sporting organisations or the sporting community generally throughout Australia for planning. Sport and recreation have been relegated to a fairly minor role by the Federal Government; those areas of responsibility have been lumped together with other portfolios in the Federal Ministry. It is also worth mentioning that the Federal Government receives about \$30 000 000 annually in revenue from sales tax on sporting goods and equipment. This amount does not include sales tax on recreational vehicles, bicycles or boating equipment. It can be seen from those figures that the Federal Government has not shown any particular interest in reimbursing to the sporting community the money it receives from sales tax on sporting goods.

It is true, as the member for Torrens said this afternoon, we did have a good record in regard to sport in past years. Time does not allow me the opportunity to give all the reasons why we have declined in this regard. However, it is true that we have waned considerably in international competition over the last few years. One reason for this is the fact that overseas competition has become keener.

Other countries have access to facilities and scientific equipment which is not available to Australian athletes. If Australian athletes are to compete on an equal footing, money has to be forthcoming. I do not believe that money should be forthcoming by way of a lottery. Federal and State Governments should allocate more funds to sport and recreation in an endeavour to stimulate competition on a national level.

In the event of a national lottery being conducted, one would expect it to have a serious effect on the fundraising of sporting bodies at a local level. Many junior and amateur sporting bodies in South Australia finance their day-to-day activities through small lottery competitions, not necessarily to finance Olympic or international competitors but simply to provide funds for their particular sport at a local level. I have been associated with a number of these sporting bodies and I know, as every member of this House should know, that these small clubs, through their fundraising activities, are able to provide limited facilities for the participation of men and women in their particular sport.

I am concerned that a large national sports lottery may have a detrimental effect on the small fundraising activities of local clubs. I believe local clubs in South Australia, through their minor lotteries, raise about \$4 000 000 a year. That is a substantial sum, and I would not like it to be depleted by a national sports lottery that would take money away from these local clubs.

**Mr. McRae:** It would go to professionals.

**Mr. SLATER:** It would go to the more elitist sections of the sporting community and to those who are fortunate enough to be chosen for international competition. There are other aspects of sport that should be spread evenly to those persons who are not quite up to that standard. All of these small clubs work very hard for their sport and give voluntarily of their time to provide facilities for sport. It would be most unfair if a large national lottery had this detrimental effect on these people. It appears that most of the other States have not shown a great deal of enthusiasm for the proposed national sports lottery, no doubt for the same reasons as those expressed by the Minister. No doubt they desire to have more specific details of the proposal provided by the Minister of Home Affairs, Mr. Ellicott, before they participate in the proposal for a national sports lottery.

It will be interesting to know the results of the feasibility study. I take it that that feasibility study will take about 12 months and then we will be in a better position to know what is proposed, whether a Commission will be set up to establish the lottery or whether it will be promoted by a private entrepreneur (I should hope not).

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

**Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles):** I am pleased that my colleagues have enabled me to continue with the subject I raised this afternoon, namely, the decision by the Australian Government Workers Association to stand a candidate against an Australian Labor Party candidate at the next State election. It appears that the reason for this decision is twofold. First, the union feels that its members have been discriminated against in election ballots and, secondly, it feels that the Government is soft on law and order.

**Mr. Whitten:** How do you feel about it?

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** I will tell the honourable member; if he listens, he may learn. Everyone seems to be out of step except Johnny, Johnny being the Labor Party, not the Minister on the front bench. I am referring to Johnny in the Upper House, the Attorney-General. He was quoted

in the *Advertiser* of 25 July as defending court penalties. He said:

Public disquiet over sentencing by South Australian courts is caused by people not understanding the legal system. That is interesting, because someone who presumably would understand the legal system, namely, a judge of the Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Sangster, is reported in the *News* of 23 July as saying:

I can speak only about what happens in this court, and in this court, in my opinion, there is much that could and should be done to improve matters.

The judge was referring to widespread disquiet among South Australian people over excessive leniency to criminals, and rightly so Mr. Justice Sangster believes. Mr. Justice Sangster was making recommendations in respect of the Crown. The report states:

Mr. Justice Sangster said Crown Counsel should participate in sentencing processes. "At the present time we hear only the prisoners' arguments on sentencing" he said.

In other words, Mr. Justice Sangster was going as far as he could in agreeing with those members of the community who had expressed disquiet. He acknowledged that they had a case. Mr. Morley was not very pleased about what the Attorney-General of his Government and his Party had to say. In a letter in the *Advertiser* of 27 July, Mr. Morley said:

On reading the Attorney-General's defence of court penalties ("The Advertiser," 25/7/79), I was appalled at his order of priorities. It appears to me that his main concern is the criminal and the effect of imprisonment on the person being sentenced.

I can assure the Attorney-General that the vast majority would refute his article in its entirety.

Here we have a respected member of the A.L.P. talking about his own Attorney-General.

**Mr. Whitten:** He isn't a member of the A.L.P.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** Has he been expelled, or is that awaiting him when his union stands its candidate? Has he been blackballed on the quiet? Perhaps we do not know about it yet. Perhaps the member for Price has knowledge that Parliament and the people do not have, that Mr. Morley is not a member of the A.L.P.

**Mr. Whitten:** He's not a member of the A.L.P.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** That is on the record. Presumably, he cannot be expelled, but if members of his union support the candidate who stands at the next election (and the candidate may stand in the District of Price) they can be expelled.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** Mr. Speaker, listen to them baying like hounds when the fox they are pursuing turns around and attacks them. They do not like it a bit. No wonder they are sensitive: they have every reason to be sensitive. They are vulnerable in their safe Labor seats at the next election. In at least one seat, a candidate from the Labor side will stand against them, and he will be very much opposed to the way in which the Government is running this State.

Not only do the judges call for new power, but the people of South Australia believe that Mr. Morley and his union members are right in believing the Government to be too lenient. In the *Advertiser* of 24 July appear the results of a Gallup poll, with the following comments:

Eighty-five per cent of Australians believe gaol sentences should be lengthened for crimes which cause other people serious bodily harm. Also a large majority—70 per cent—says the death sentence is sometimes justified . . . Analysis of the latest poll by States showed that the highest figures in favour of the death sentence occurred in Western

Australia (76 per cent) and South Australia (74 per cent). That is significant, because it indicates that people in this State have a higher degree of concern than do those in other States about penalties, sentencing procedures and about law and order generally.

**Mr. Arnold:** They have every reason to.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** Indeed they have. If the members of the union that is supposed to administer the Government's policies, namely, the prison officers, are as concerned as Mr. Morley says, concerned to the point that, they are prepared to face expulsion from the Party in order to take their case to the people—

**Mr. Whitten:** Don't you think they should talk to Mr. Sangster?

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** They can talk to whomever they like. It appears that they will take their case directly to the people. They are fed up with talking to the Government, because they have got nowhere. This is significant. It should be noted that this union is a respected union, and it is fed up to the teeth. Who can blame them? Three cheers for Mr. Morley. I admire his courage and that of his members, because they are obviously going to go to bat, and they do not mind the threat of expulsion. They are prepared to stick by their criticisms that the A.L.P. has been endorsing what they describe as pie-in-the-sky merchants.

It would be interesting to know which of the members on the Government benches could be identified as pie-in-the-sky merchants. We have our opinion on this side, but presumably Mr. Morley and his members would know the Government members far better than we do. They have formed their own judgments and have decided that they have had enough.

**Mr. Arnold:** And the courts reflect—

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** Yes, they reflect the attitudes of the Government of the day. The Attorney-General has said that the Crown should have the right of appeal against any sentences considered to be too lenient. Why has it taken him so long to realise that? This matter has been talked about for more than a year. The former Attorney-General talked about it, but did nothing about it.

**Mr. Whitten:** It was in the Mitchell Report.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** Yes. The fourth report into the substantive criminal law recommended a vast number of recommendations, among which was the abolition of the right of an accused person to make an unsworn statement to the jury; that was recommendation 127. That report was published on 22 March 1978, so the Government has had ample opportunity to do something about it, but it has done nothing. The Evidence Act has been before Parliament since then; it would have been easy to include that recommendation in the amending Bill, but it was not done.

**Mr. Keneally:** Why didn't you move a private member's Bill?

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** I thank the honourable member for suggesting it, I should be delighted to do so, because it seems that the Government is exceptionally tardy. One can only ask the reason why. I think that many South Australians are concluding that the Government is indeed soft on law and order.

We can only look at the evidence before us. The decision of Mr. Morley's union has highlighted the opinion held by South Australians, and it will be interesting to see, as we move into the next State election, just exactly what does go on in those safe Labor seats—in Peake, Price and Semaphore.

**Mr. Groom:** Coles.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** No, Mr. Speaker. Coles is far from being a safe Labor seat.

**Mr. Wilson:** A pie in the sky.

Motion carried.

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** Perhaps the biggest piece of pie in the sky has just walked into the House.

At 10.2 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 8 August at 2 p.m.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!