

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 17 October 1979

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 202 residents of South Australia praying that the House would legislate to ban and destroy the worst pornography, enforce tighter restrictions on all forms of pornography, remove restricted pornography from newsagents and delicatessens, and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act were presented by Messrs. Rodda, Bannon, Becker, and Evans.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: HOTEL HOURS

Petitions signed by 363 residents of South Australia praying that the House would oppose any legislation to permit hotels opening their bars on Sundays were presented by Messrs. Dean Brown and Evans.

Petitions received.

PETITION: DOG CONTROL

A petition signed by 174 residents of South Australia praying that the House would amend the Dog Control Act so that it will truly reflect current attitudes of dog owners in South Australia was presented by Mr. Bannon.

Petition received.

PETITION: ABORTION

A petition signed by 75 residents of South Australia praying that the House would not amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act in a way which would further restrict a woman's rights in regard to abortion was presented by Mr. Langley.

Petition received.

PETITION: MILLIPEDES

A petition signed by 279 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to implement a programme for the control of the widespread infestation of millipedes was presented by Mr. Evans.

Petition received.

PETITION: UNION MEMBERSHIP

A petition signed by 114 residents of South Australia praying that the House would not legislate to make it easier for persons to be forced into trade unions or associations against their will, and repeal any existing legislation which enables unions to force subcontractors into union membership against their will under threat of loss of employment was presented by Mr. Goldsworthy.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION AND GIFT DUTIES

A petition signed by 305 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to adopt and announce a programme for the phasing out of succession and gift duties in South Australia as soon as possible was presented by Mr. Evans.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: POLICE WEAPONS

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The principal concern about police handguns is to provide effective weapons for patrol officers operating throughout the 24 hours in the metropolitan area.

These officers will be fitted out first, and it is not expected, or intended, that every policeman throughout the State will suddenly appear wearing an exposed holster and handgun. The need to wear such equipment obviously depends upon the duties involved, and credit should be given to the discretion of the Police Commissioner to direct that officers wear an exposed handgun only when and where it is considered absolutely essential.

I have had discussions with the Police Commissioner on the type of jacket to be used. It is intended that the style, material and colour of the jacket will be the subject of a study and recommendation from the Uniform Committee, which consists of representatives from the Police Association and the Police Department. The committee is currently considering a new uniform material and colour, and the jacket will be in keeping with the colour and style of any new uniform design. The Police Commissioner is not in favour of a colour and style which reflects American trends, but requires that the jacket conform to Australian uniform patterns.

QUESTION TIME**BANK OF ADELAIDE**

Mr. BANNON: Will the Premier say why the Government rejected a proposal by a group of leading South Australian businessmen, including Mr. Uhrig, Mr. Kean and Mr. Hayes, for the retention of a separate identity for the Bank of Adelaide, particularly as it is understood that the report of the independent accountant commissioned by the previous Government to assess the proposals, Mr. Allert, supported the viability of this option?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The matter, I think, was made quite clear in the Ministerial statement that I made in this House last Thursday. It is absolutely imperative that members understand the conditions that applied. At that time, it was not a matter for the Government to reject or to do anything at all with such proposals made by members of the community. I repeat, for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, that the decision on the Bank of Adelaide merger has been made by the shareholders; it was always to be made by the shareholders, and the shareholders' meeting was the only proper place in which that decision should be made. While I understand the desire of the Leader and his Party for Governments to intrude into the business of public companies and also intrude into matters that are properly the province of shareholders, I will not be part of it.

The various propositions that were put forward by members of the community, who were rightly concerned about the bank and its future, were considered. Many schemes were considered by Treasury officers and were listened to by me. In fact, there was no way that the Government had any right to accept or reject any of the propositions. I took the duty upon myself because the bank board had its hands tied by the terms of the lifeboat agreement which, in fact, had been entered into with the concurrence of the former Premier. Because of that, I took it upon myself to make certain that the shareholders of the Bank of Adelaide knew that fallback positions existed. That was done quite clearly in this House last Thursday.

SCHOOL VISITS

Mr. LEWIS: Does the Minister of Education or his department oppose the practice of any country or city school arranging an annual exchange? Could such exchanges be a useful part of the education of the students participating in the scheme, as well as being useful to the schools they attend, in developing better understanding between the country and city communities involved, thereby alleviating the divisions that have been developed and encouraged by our political opponents?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: To the best of my knowledge, this practice has been going on for several decades. I know of a number of exchanges that have been going on for 20 or 30 years, under which schools in South Australia exchange, on an annual basis, with interstate or intrastate educational institutions. The exchanges are generally funded by the parents, with students billeted out at no cost to the billetees. The billetees assume the responsibility in alternate years, and to my knowledge during the past few months, for example, a party of youngsters from Traeger Park Primary School at Alice Springs, including 10 Europeans and 10 Aboriginal children, was sent to the South-East of South Australia at a cost of several thousand dollars, raised by schools and service organisations.

Brighton High School has a regular trip around the State, on which it sends its excellent team of musicians to entertain schools, and that trip is organised on a billet basis. There is no doubt that the educational benefits of such long-term exchanges are extremely high, both to the students and to the staff who accompany them. The Education Department has had no objection to this style of exchange over the past two or three decades, and the present Government certainly would encourage them.

However, perhaps I should make one proviso. Staff, principals and parent organisations in the schools concerned should have the final right to make the decisions, because, if we had too numerous or too prolonged a series of visits, there may be some adverse implications for the normal academic educational benefits which children expect from going to school. Other than that, I think the advantages of occasional visits on an annual basis would far outweigh any disadvantages.

BANK OF ADELAIDE

Mr. WRIGHT: Will the Premier now release the report by the independent accountant, Mr. Allert, on alternative proposals to the merger of the Bank of Adelaide with the A.N.Z. Banking Group? If so, when will he do so; if not, why not? The Premier told the House yesterday that the course of action which the Government had taken relating to the Bank of Adelaide was based on the evidence of the

report of a special adviser appointed by the former Premier. Quite clearly, the report is a key document in this affair. The Premier told the member for Hartley, in answer to a question yesterday, that he would consider whether the report could be made available to members. As the report is obviously such an important document in this matter, and as he has now had time to consider the full report, I ask that it be tabled. It was significant that, in answer to a question by the Leader, the Premier did not deny that the report supported an alternative scheme.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It seems that Opposition members are determined to try to make as much political capital as possible out of the unfortunate demise of the bank. They are taking every opportunity to screw as much political advantage out of it as they can, regardless of the welfare of the people, and the shareholders and depositors of the bank. I am happy to say that depositors' funds are entirely safe. I remind members of the Opposition that the shareholders, at their meeting on Monday, voted overwhelmingly in favour of the merger, and that in this House on Thursday I indicated quite clearly that fall-back positions existed. I certainly would not have introduced the subject of possible fall-back positions were I not convinced that they were viable.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Deputy Leader said that the Allert Report is a key document in this whole affair, but he is in error in so stating. That report was prepared for Treasury for the guidance of the Government in deciding whether or not to put forward the fact that fall-back positions were available. I put forward very clearly in my statement that fall-back positions were available. In answer to the Deputy Leader's question, the matter is still under consideration.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Water Resources say what action he is taking to protect and, in the long term, to improve the water quality of South Australia's lifeline, the Murray River? I am concerned, as I am sure many members would be, that New South Wales recently has been contemplating issuing another set of licences for up to 1 000 hectares of land to be irrigated from the Murray River system. It appears that New South Wales is not concerned about our State and its long-term reliance upon the Murray River system for irrigation, as well as for industry, and in particular for the residential section of the community.

This is one example of how we in this State should be concerned. What action does the Minister intend taking to ensure that we have better quality water in future and, in particular, to protect the river as it is at present?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I am most concerned, particularly at the action that has been taken recently by the New South Wales Government. On 5 October, I sent a senior officer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to Sydney for discussions with the New South Wales Water Resources Commission to determine what was the overall intent of that Government. On 10 October, a hearing was held in Burke, by the Western Land Board, to consider an application for a further 1 000 hectares of irrigation diversion from the Darling River. Unfortunately, our representation to that hearing was unsuccessful.

That board has granted the additional 1 000 hectares of irrigation diversion from that river, but the matter of far greater concern is that we believe that it is intended that a

further 10 000 hectares be applied for for diversion from the river system in New South Wales. This will have an enormous detrimental effect on South Australia's water supply. Although South Australia has its applications of water under the River Murray Waters Act Agreement, there is no way in which we can live on the actual allocation. If South Australia had to live only on its allocation, without additional diversion flows from Victoria and New South Wales, the salinity levels in this State would be such that the water would be useless for human consumption in the metropolitan area and in other parts of the State, and for irrigation diversion.

South Australia faces a most serious situation. We will continue to oppose every additional application for further diversion licences in Victoria and New South Wales on the basis that South Australia has not granted any further diversion licences during the past 10 years. Regarding water quality, we believe that there should be a moratorium on all water diversion from the total Murray River system. We believe also (and I believe this strongly) that Victoria and New South Wales have a moral obligation to South Australia to ensure that our share of the Murray River water is supplied to us and that we receive it in a quality sufficient to enable us effectively to use it for the benefit of South Australians.

The honourable member would also be aware that the proposals under the Murray River salinity control programme will be proceeding. They will be presented to the Public Works Standing Committee for consideration tomorrow and the original proposal, as put forward in the Murray River salinity control programme, will also be referred to that committee, with a proviso, namely, that additional works, which will encompass a separate system that will take the drainage waters from Loxton to Noora via a separate pipe, be considered later by that committee. As soon as this Government came to office, I had an urgent investigation carried out from a cost-benefit point of view as to the best way and the feasibility of including the Loxton drainage waters in the Noora proposal. It proved that the most economical way of approaching the problem was a separate line and not a redesign of the existing proposal.

Therefore, as it worked out in that way, it in no way will hold up the proceeding of the original Noora proposal to include the drainage waters from Bullyong Island, Fishers Creek and the Berri evaporation basin. The South Australian programme, as previously outlined, will continue with the approval of the Public Works Standing Committee, and the State Government will continue to oppose further irrigation diversions in Victoria and New South Wales.

BANK OF ADELAIDE

Mr. TRAINER: Will the Premier say whether the Government has received a report from the Corporate Affairs Commission into possible breaches of the Companies Act by the board of the Bank of Adelaide and of possible breaches of F.C.A.'s trust deed? If it has, will the report be tabled in this Parliament, and, if not, will a full report into these matters be sought from the Corporate Affairs Commission?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: To my knowledge, the Government has not received a report other than the report that was initiated by the former Attorney-General, now the member for Elizabeth. I understand that he asked the Corporate Affairs Commission to institute an inquiry into the affairs of the Bank of Adelaide, and also F.C.A., although I am not certain of that. My information is that,

after a preliminary report was brought down by the Commissioner, the then Attorney-General instructed him to cease his inquiry. What his reasons for this were, I do not know. However, that is apparently what happened. I understand that the merger and the scheme of arrangement will now go back to the Corporate Affairs Commission. It will be examined and, if a report is to come, I have no doubt it will come in the usual way.

PRIMARY PRODUCTION TRANSPORTATION

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Transport consider reintroducing the provision regarding 40 per cent of load mass above manufacturers' specifications for the transportation of primary products? Experience has proven that, when the provision was in force, a very good safety record obtained, road wear was kept to a minimum because of the speed restrictions, and in many instances it meant a saving of one trip in three or four from the place of production to the point of storage. Many constituents have approached me on this matter, as fortunately there is every indication of an above average harvest and the need to conserve fuel. I therefore ask the Minister that this question be given every consideration.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The short answer is "Yes, I will certainly consider it." In fact, I am doing so now. I am at present having discussions with various organisations and parties concerned, and I hope to be able to make an announcement within the next few days, probably by the middle of next week. What the member for Goyder has said is correct: a speed restriction of 50 km/h applies to the cartage of those products. As the honourable member said, the safety record of the primary producers concerned is excellent. I will be pleased to inform the House within the next few days of the Government's decision.

BANK OF ADELAIDE

Mr. DUNCAN: Will the Premier say whether the Government will appoint a special investigator under sections 169 and 170 of the Companies Act to investigate alleged breaches of that Act by the board of the Bank of Adelaide and F.C.A. and, if not, why not? This is not the same question in substance as that asked a short while ago by the member for Ascot Park, who I understand was seeking an internal inquiry by the Corporate Affairs Commission. I am seeking the appointment of a special investigator, because I believe that the loss of about 700 jobs as a result of the amalgamation of the Bank of Adelaide is a very serious matter that is of great public concern to the people of South Australia. I therefore seek from the Premier an undertaking that a special investigator will investigate the matters that I raised in this House last night.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I repeat yet again for the benefit of members of the Opposition, who seem determined not to get the message, that the whole matter, which has now been voted upon by a meeting of shareholders, will go for consideration by the Supreme Court and will be considered also by the Corporate Affairs Commission. If there is any indication that an inquiry is necessary, I should imagine, first of all, that it would be the prerogative of the Supreme Court to hear the necessary evidence to satisfy itself, as one would expect it to do, that the scheme of arrangement is satisfactory and, if anything comes out of the investigation by the Corporate

Affairs Commission that would warrant the appointment of a special inquiry, I have no doubt that that recommendation would be made in the report that will be made.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs say whether the Government intends to introduce amending legislation to extend the hours of shop trading for shops and, if it does, when it is expected that this legislation will be introduced? Will the Minister also say whether the Government intends to abolish the principle of restricted trading hours as we now know it?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Government does not have in process any legislation to alter shop trading hours now operating in South Australia. However, a number of people have requested the opportunity to put a case to me. The former Minister of Labour and Industry knows only too well, because I brought it to his attention, of the number of serious problems that have occurred with the existing shop trading hours and particularly the operation of those hours by large stores that have artificially divided their stores. I expect to look at these problems in the next few weeks and I will certainly tell the House when legislation is planned.

BANK OF ADELAIDE

Mr. O'NEILL: Does the Minister of Industrial Affairs agree with the Premier's statement in this House yesterday that perhaps a substantial number of jobs will be lost as a result of the merger between the Bank of Adelaide and the A.N.Z. Banking Group? If so, how many jobs does he believe will be lost, and, if not, what is the basis of his disagreement with the Premier?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I understand that the Premier was grossly misquoted by the honourable member when explaining his question. The Premier said yesterday that there could be a possibility of jobs being lost under certain alternatives that might be proposed or adopted by the shareholders. I understand that the A.N.Z. Bank certainly gave an undertaking that no jobs would be lost if that merger went through, and I expect the A.N.Z. Banking Group to uphold that undertaking.

AID FOR KAMPUCHEA

Dr. BILLARD: Will the Premier state the Government's programme of aid to Kampuchea and the recommended avenues through which aid for Kampuchea might be distributed? I am in possession of an open letter bearing the letterhead, "Australia-Vietnam Society, 35 Daly Street, Kurralt Park", which bears the signature "Lynn Arnold, M.P., President", and the date "24 October 1979", which is still one week hence. In part, the letter says:

The present sufferings of the Indo-Chinese people are largely due to the immense bombing attacks carried out for many years in Indo-China by conservative Governments. The same Governments are now either refusing to send food or are sending only minimal aid to Indo-China.

Mr. Payne interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. BILLARD: The letter continues:

Two years ago, the Dunstan Labor Government generously supplied the Australia-Vietnam Society with

penicillin and other medical supplies to assist the people of Indo-China. Such medicine and food are urgent needs in Kampuchea. The quickest way to get the food and medicine to the Kampuchean people is to send donations direct to the Vietnamese Government, which has the best distributing agencies in Kampuchea.

We are asking trade unions and members of Parliament in South Australia to help save the lives of hundreds of thousands of Kampuchean people. We would be very grateful to receive a donation from you. Cheques may be made out to the Australia-Vietnam Society, which has the strongest links with the Vietnamese Government and will ensure that the aid is sent quickly and directly to the suffering Kampuchean people.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The matter would be almost funny if it were not so serious a subject. In answer to the first part of the question, let me say that the official response to the Kampuchean tragedy has reflected the very grave concern with which all State Governments and the Federal Government, regardless of political complexion, view the scene in Indo-China. Already the State Governments of New South Wales and Victoria have contributed \$150 000 and \$10 000 respectively. Only yesterday, I donated, on behalf of South Australia, \$10 000 to the organisers of the local appeal.

The Commonwealth Government has already undertaken three steps in its own relief programme. The first of these was to distribute 3 500 tons of rice through the world food programme. The second was to send a chartered plane-load of supplies for distribution by OXFAM, the Oxford Committee for Famine Relief. The third was to announce, only recently, that an additional \$2 000 000 would be available to the International Red Cross agency, to UNICEF, to the World Food programme (which is an agency of the United Nations) and to the Thailand Government for the relief of refugees within its borders. In addition, a further 1 200 tons of rice is to be made available forthwith.

Regarding the second part of the question, I cannot state too strongly that it is the unanimous opinion of my Government, of the Federal Government, and of every reputable relief and charitable organisation, that aid to Kampuchea should be sent only via the International Disaster Emergency Committee of the Australian Council for Overseas Aid. This body incorporates the Red Cross, Austcare and every other non-political, *bona fide* relief organisation. Moreover, it is the only avenue for the distribution of aid to which contributions will qualify for tax deductions. I believe that the Australia-Vietnam Society is not affiliated with the Australian Council for Overseas Aid.

This matter is serious. The plight of the people in Kampuchea deserves the strongest support from all citizens of South Australia, but I emphasise that that support should be given in a proper and meaningful way and should not be tied in in any way at all with any suggestion of politics.

BANK OF ADELAIDE

Mr. KENEALLY: If the Premier was not so funny, he would be tragic. Is the Premier concerned about the blow to business confidence in South Australia, as indicated by public statements from prominent businessmen such as Alan Scott and Colin Branson, caused by the Government's vacillations on the Bank of Adelaide and A.N.Z. Bank merger?

It was reported in the *Advertiser* this morning that the

prominent Mount Gambier businessman, Mr. Alan Scott, who was the fourth largest shareholder in the Bank of Adelaide, would not "invest another cent in South Australia". Mr. Scott was quoted as saying that his companies would now invest in Western Australia and in Queensland because "their Premiers told Mr. Fraser where to go". That is somewhat ironic.

Mr. Scott went on to say that he was disgusted with the Premier and asked, "What is the point of investing in South Australia if the Government has not got any confidence in South Australia?" In addition, Mr. Colin Branson told Monday's meeting of investors in the Bank of Adelaide, "We are being led to the sacrificial altar so as to save the integrity of the directors."

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The question of loss of confidence resulting from the Bank of Adelaide take-over has concerned not only me but also the former Premier, the member for Hartley. Indeed, it is a matter that concerns us all. It is well known that Messrs. Scott and Branson were both proponents of an alternative to the merger between the Bank of Adelaide and the A.N.Z. I can only say that one can understand their attitude.

I return again to the key to this issue, namely, the vote of the shareholders at a properly convened meeting, which was convened under the aegis of the Supreme Court, and at which an overwhelming majority of the votes supported the merger with the A.N.Z. Bank—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Once again, for the benefit of honourable members opposite, who seem to be extraordinarily dense about this whole business, I repeat that the shareholders had been made aware that there were fall-back positions. I understand that, at that meeting, the fall-back positions and alternatives were clearly outlined by the speakers. There is no basis whatever for the remarks that the honourable member has made. If it is his wish, as it appears to be the wish of honourable members opposite, to destroy confidence by any means they can use in South Australia, I cannot think of a better way of going about it.

Mr. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The words come very strangely indeed from members opposite who were sitting on this side of the House and who were so resoundingly tossed to the other side such a short time ago.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Education investigate the possibility of forming an on-going planning committee, consisting of representatives of primary and secondary education, Welfare Department officers, both supervisory and floor workers, and of the Police Department, to consider the needs and effects of juvenile problems within the community, with the committee to report directly to the Minister of Education and the Minister of Community Welfare? The Minister is aware of considerable feeling within the community and also among those who are close to the problem of juvenile offenders, that an area most decidedly related to the problem, in particular, that of hard core offenders, is that the early lifestyle of those people and the effects of consistent truancy are paramount to the moulding of these young people. I refer the Minister to a report of the Community Welfare Advisory Committee on Vandalism, in which, at page 113, one of the recommendations is that a standing committee, comprising representatives from appropriate Government, semi-government, and private organisations, be established to keep security policies and practices under constant review. I believe, and I am sure the

Minister would agree, that this committee should not be like the Community Welfare Advisory Committee on Vandalism, which consisted of only one person from the Education Department, Mr. Fitzgerald, the Assistant Director of Educational Facilities. In having such committees to make recommendations to the department and the Minister, it is imperative that people who are close to the problem—

The SPEAKER: Order! I trust that the honourable member will not continue to comment.

Mr. MATHWIN: I apologise, Mr. Speaker: I did not intend to comment. Will the Minister set up this planning committee so that it can report to him and other Ministers?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I appreciate the honourable member's longstanding concern for a wide range of issues involving truancy, vandalism, and other youthful problems, although it is not necessarily isolated to young people. I have not had much time to study comprehensively the Community Welfare Department's report on vandalism, but I have been made aware over the past two or three days of the recommendation to which the honourable member has referred. It is in fact the very first recommendation that the committee made, recommendation 4.1, and, as it involves inter-departmental consultations, I shall undertake to negotiate with other Ministers to see whether such a committee is necessary. If it is, we will see about establishing a committee to make investigations, as recommended in the report.

BANK OF ADELAIDE

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Premier say whether his prime consideration in his statement to the House last Thursday was to advise shareholders of the likely profit they would make by voting to end the independent existence of the Bank of Adelaide? What priorities did this consideration have over the tangible benefit of job opportunities in South Australia and the intangible benefit of having a major financial institution centred in the State? I refer the Premier to his statement of Thursday 11 October in which he said that he believed that it was appropriate to point out to shareholders that the earnings per share of one Bank of Adelaide share in the A.N.Z. Bank in the first half of the current year was about 13.6 cents, whereas the Bank of Adelaide earned 8.8 cents a share in the current period.

As I suggest that the Premier might also have thought that the jobs of South Australians were appropriate, I ask him what priority he gave to keeping the bank in South Australia employing South Australians.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The answer yet again to the whole question the honourable member has now brought forward is that the decision depended on the shareholders: no-one else could take that decision, and no-one else took that decision, and neither should they have done so. The honourable member has highlighted that very fact. The matter of loss of employment has been clarified considerably by the statements by the A.N.Z. Bank that no jobs will be lost. This whole issue, as far as the Opposition is stirring it up, has become most boring, although it is a matter of grave concern to those people concerned with it. Everyone in the State has been concerned about the employment opportunities; that has been sorted out effectively by the statement of the A.N.Z. that no-one will be retrenched. I believe that we should accept, and I have no reason not to accept, that statement.

Regarding the obvious benefits to be obtained by retaining a locally based bank in this State, I have made that position clear. There is no-one in South Australia who would not like to see that bank remain in South Australia as a locally based bank, and I recognise everyone's

concern on that issue. The position I adopted in making the statements I made in the House was to ensure that the shareholders, in whose hands the decision lay, were in full possession of the facts as they were presented to me and as they had been investigated, and that is what I did.

HANCOCK ROAD

Mr. ASHENDEN: Can the Minister of Transport say whether it is planned that widening of the section of Hancock Road between North-East Road, St. Agnes, and Grand Junction Road, Hope Valley, will take place? If it is, when is this widening planned to occur, and could any existing plan be reconsidered before such widening is proceeded with? I was contacted recently by a constituent of mine who had heard that there was to be a rewidening of the section of Hancock Road to which I refer. This has been subsequently confirmed, in that when he placed his home on the market he was advised by his real estate agent that, under section 90 of the Real Estate Act, 1973, he would be required to show on forms 4 and 5 that widening was proposed. On investigation, my constituent found that it would appear that the planned widening will be such that it will leave absolutely no front yard whatsoever for houses on the eastern side of Hancock Road and very little front yard for houses on the western side of Hancock Road on the section nearest to North-East Road.

This northern end of Hancock Road is in an area that was subdivided much earlier than the more southern sections. As a result, houses were built on the basis of Hancock Road being only a dual carriageway. Should the plans as advised to the real estate agent proceed, it will have a very real effect on this earlier subdivision. It has already severely affected the resale value of these homes. I have visited the area and there is no doubt that a four-lane carriageway could be constructed, which would have a much lesser effect, purely by removing a median strip completely. This would enable the free flow of traffic which is so necessary on this major road but, at the same time, leave the existing front yards and, therefore, minimise any effect on residents in this area.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: There are no immediate plans for widening that section of Hancock Road but, as the other section of the road that adjoins it is already widened, it would seem logical that there are long-term plans for this work. However, the honourable member having made representations to me on the matter, I have asked the Commissioner of Highways to investigate the matter, in consultation with the local councils involved, because I think that that is extremely important. I will also forward to the Commissioner the very constructive suggestion the honourable member has put forward in explaining his question, because I believe that the whole matter needs to be looked at as a whole.

BANK OF ADELAIDE

Mr. MAX BROWN: Can the Premier say what were the sums of money involved in the modified scheme based on proposals by friends of the Bank of Adelaide that the Premier identified, in his statement to the House on Thursday 11 October, as the second option? In particular, can he give information about the amount of the required loan by the Government to the bank; the extent of the Government guarantee in relation to a share or notes issued by the bank; the amount of the loan from F.C.A. to the bank; and the extent of the Government guarantee in relation to any losses on land held by F.C.A.?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The detailed answers to that question would have been appropriate had the shareholders chosen to reject the merger offer between the

A.N.Z. and the Bank of Adelaide. However, they did not reject that offer and in fact voted overwhelmingly in support of the merger. I do not therefore propose to give the details requested.

SALVATION JANE

Mr. OLSEN: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether it is the policy of the Government to biologically control salvation jane in South Australia, and if it is, what consideration has been given to the economic effects on the honey industry? I have been approached by several apiarists who have expressed concern for the future of their industry if the plant is eradicated. They claim that salvation jane blossom provides a substantial proportion of the State's honey flora, and seem adamant in their view that biological control is unacceptable.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: It is the policy of this Government to support the all-State agreement to proceed in due course with biological control of salvation jane. I would like to emphasise that the decision to biologically control salvation jane is not restricted to South Australia alone. Indeed, as recently as September of this year at the Agricultural Council meeting in Perth all the States of Australia reaffirmed their support of this decision. As most honourable members would know, this plan will be applied Australia-wide and after very careful consideration of all the issues involved. The South Australian Government also reaffirms that the advantages of biological control of salvation jane do in fact outweigh the possible disadvantages. Therefore, it is the Government's policy to support the Australia-wide plan for the biological control of this weed.

This plan was initially agreed to by all the Ministers of Agriculture at their 106th annual meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council held in Christchurch in January 1979. The resolution at that meeting was that biological control of this weed would lead to net benefits for Australian agriculture, and for this reason it would be proceeded with. I repeat that this Government supports that policy. Biological control of salvation jane is supported by a number of other organisations which include the grower organisation, United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia, and the South Australian and the South-Eastern Dairymen's Associations, and also the State's seed industry.

Indeed, individual landholders have written to my office directly expressing the need for biological control, and there is no doubt that the views of a great many farmers who have also written have been conveyed adequately by the organisations I have mentioned. In addition, many district councils have written to my office directly expressing the need for biological control. I have received correspondence to this effect from individual councils, and on their behalf from the following bodies: South-East Local Government Association, Mid-North Pest Plants Control Board, and the Alexandrina Pest Plants Control Board. If further proof is required, I point out that it is a proclaimed agricultural pest plant in 27 Pest Plants Control Board areas representing 49 councils or corporations, and it is proclaimed in a further 17 council areas not yet operating under the provisions of the Pest Plants Act.

Mr. Wright: Insert it in *Hansard* without reading it.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Well, I regard the question raised by the member for Rocky River as an important one, as do many other people to whom I propose to address myself in relation to their respective interests. In geographical terms the areas of the State where salvation jane is a proclaimed agricultural pest plant

include the whole of the local government area of Eyre Peninsula plus counties Hopetoun and Kintore in the far west agricultural region; Yorke Peninsula as far north as the District Council of Bute; an area of the Mid North comprising the District Councils of Port Wakefield, Balaklava, Saddleworth-Auburn, Riverton and Kapunda, the Adelaide Hills, including the District Council of Barossa; the lower Murray Mallee, and, as I have said, the Upper and Lower South East.

In these circumstances, the law prescribes that effective control measures must be taken against the plant in a major proportion of the agricultural areas. In practice, however, traditional methods of control have proved less than effective and biological control now offers a solution to this problem, and a more effective method of upholding the law.

There is, of course, the overriding consideration that salvation jane tends to dominate other plant species, and, if we are to uphold the view that these species are more desirable as pasture, effective control of salvation jane must be implemented. There is speculation over the degree to which the plant dominates others, but it is obvious that it responds to soil fertility and appears to do equally well in both acid and alkaline soils. While the evidence on balance positively favours biological control, the Government does recognise that salvation jane is an important plant species for the honey industry in South Australia and that stockowners in the lower rainfall districts consider it an important source of fodder, particularly in the drier areas of the State.

Representatives of the apiary industry presented their views to me as recently as Monday 16 October and, whilst respecting those views, I can say that they had no new evidence to alter my belief that biological agents should be introduced in this country. However, they and northern graziers should appreciate that it is not known to what extent biological control will reduce the incidence or vigour of salvation jane plants. Certainly, salvation jane will not be eradicated. The C.S.I.R.O. has indicated that the effectiveness of biological control is expected to be greatest in the cooler, wetter areas of the State, roughly south of a line drawn between Adelaide and Murray Bridge. In these areas salvation jane is a major problem to landowners (and indeed it is a proclaimed noxious plant), and is not regarded as useful by the beekeepers there because of the poor nectar flow it produces in the cooler, wetter areas.

In summary, biological control of salvation jane is essential to improve pasture production in the higher rainfall areas of the State, and it is in the overall agricultural interests of South Australia. Bearing in mind that the proposal is to be implemented Australia-wide and that our higher rainfall zone is more representative of conditions in other States, South Australia cannot therefore stand alone in opposition to biological control of salvation jane.

BANK OF ADELAIDE

Mr. HAMILTON: Can the Premier say whether the Government will commission a report into the allegations that the Bank of Adelaide borrowed about \$40 000 000 from the A.B.A. consortium without following procedures that would have ensured that the bank received protection under section 51 of the Income Tax Assessment Act so that interest payments could be deducted from the bank's income tax assessment?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have made clear several times today that if there are any irregularities at all in

relation to the activities leading to the merger agreement between the Bank of Adelaide and the A.N.Z. they will be investigated by the Corporate Affairs Commission. As to the particular matter raised, I understand that that was arranged between the Reserve Bank, the A.B.A. and the consortium during the lifeboat operation to which the former Premier was a party.

DISABLED PERSONS

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Health give the Government's timetable for implementing Liberal Party policy on the disabled and, in particular, for forming a special committee to assist these people? The Liberal Party policy states that a Liberal Government will instruct the Health Commission to establish immediately a committee to assess, report on and co-ordinate all aspects from medical to vocational of the rehabilitation of disabled people. The committee will involve national and State organisations and handicapped persons themselves. I am sure that the Minister will know that we have been applauded for our policy on the disabled, the first political Party in South Australia to have one.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The honourable member will be interested to know that within a few days of being appointed to the Ministry I had a discussion with the Health Commission, went through the Government's health policy in some detail and indicated to the commissioners the areas in which priority should be placed. The Commission is aware of the value that the Government places on this aspect of its health policy, which of course embraces many Government departments and which will have an effect right across the field, so that the costs and responsibilities will not be borne entirely in the health area. I refer particularly to the provision for disabled persons to purchase motor vehicles through the State Supply Department. That matter will have to be negotiated with the Minister of Industrial Affairs. I will be addressing myself soon to the composition of the advisory committee, and will be having discussions with the Health Commission as to the appropriate people to be appointed to the committee. I have already had communication from representatives of associations that act on behalf of disabled people congratulating the Government and offering any assistance that the Government may need in implementing its policy. I hope by early next year to be able to announce what progress has been made and to state that the advisory committee has been established.

BANK OF ADELAIDE

Mr. BANNON: In his statement last Thursday concerning the Bank of Adelaide, why did the Premier not specify the financial support his Government would provide by way of guarantee, in order to allow shareholders to realistically consider the options proposed by certain South Australian businessmen? The Premier's statement purported, in his words, to explain to shareholders all the issues involved. He hoped, by his statement, to fully inform the shareholders of the options available to them. I think he dealt quite fairly with the two options that were alternatives to the merger, but in the case of the option under consideration from certain South Australian businessmen, there was absolutely no mention of the degree to which the Government would provide guarantees or loans that were fundamental to that option's being a realistic proposal to put before shareholders.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If the Leader of the

Opposition thinks the Government is so irresponsible that it would mention a fall-back proposition, or an alternative, as he chooses to call it, and not be prepared to provide the necessary measures to back up such a fall-back position, if the shareholders had chosen to take that course of action, then he is not very bright at all. That is my only answer; I will let the Leader find an answer to the rest of his question himself.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr. RANDALL: Has the Minister of Mines and Energy noted the statement, reported in the *Australian* of 10 October, of the National Secretary of the Australian Workers Union, Mr. Frank Mitchell, that members of his union will work on the Roxby Downs project? Will the Minister seek to influence the State branch of the union to adopt the same attitude?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I noted the comments of Mr. Mitchell, along with comments made by other responsible people within the trade union movement, particularly those regarding the mining of world class deposits of copper, uranium and gold at Roxby Downs. I want to say at the outset that the Government has no wish at all to seek a confrontation with the trade union movement in South Australia. The Government aims to give the public of South Australia the facts regarding any mining operations undertaken in this State. In fact, the Government seeks to put expert opinion before the public and, as I think I have indicated publicly on previous occasions, the Government would not allow any mining operations until it was satisfied they were safe.

I would also like to point out that Mr. Mitchell is fortified in his views in relation to mining at Roxby Downs by public statements made by the member for Baudin, the former Minister of Education in the previous Labor Government, who made a speech (while the then Premier was overseas on a fact finding tour in relation to uranium mining) extolling the virtues of Roxby Downs. It is known that, while the then Premier was overseas, a couple of his Ministers led by the then Attorney-General, since discredited, the member for Elizabeth (I think Duncan is the name), were busy sabotaging his efforts.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must refer to members by their electorate name.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I apologise, Mr. Speaker. I forgot the electorate name, but remembered the name of the member. While the then Premier was overseas, several Ministers white-anted his efforts. Mr. Mitchell is reinforced in his attitude by other influential members of the trade union movement. Even Sir Mark Oliphant (although I would not suggest he is a member of the trade union movement), an influential member of the Australian community, said a week or so ago that it would be absolutely stupid not to mine these deposits.

The most prominent trade union official to make statements recently in relation to mining, with a particular emphasis on uranium mining (I have pointed out that the Roxby Downs mine is a copper, uranium and gold mine), was the then President of the A.C.T.U., now a candidate for Federal Parliament, Mr. Bob Hawke. Mr. Hawke made similar statements two years ago at a seminar at Monash University, when he indicated that Australia had a moral obligation to supply overseas countries that were deprived of energy. A majority of A.C.T.U. members were then of the same view, before the lurch to the left. Mr. Hawke recently stated:

Reality demands that we come to terms with the fact that mining has occurred and will continue at Ranger, Mary

Kathleen and Nabarlek. Do you think we will do the union movement a service by creating a national monument to the futility of a moral decision which you can do bugger-all about?

That sounds characteristic. Mr. Hawke went on to describe the ban on mining as "monumental futility and moral luxuriating".

In answer to the question of the member for Henley Beach, I point out that the Government seeks to persuade the local branch of the A.W.U. to adopt the sensible and realistic attitude adopted by its colleagues in other States, in the Federal sphere and in Queensland. The Government seeks to reassure the public of South Australia on the basis of facts. I repeat, for the benefit of members opposite particularly, that this Government does not intend to develop any mining resources in this State until it is perfectly satisfied that is safe to do so.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: RADIUM HILL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I make this brief statement in view of a press statement that appeared in this morning's *Advertiser* regarding the depositing of waste material at Radium Hill. That press statement did not emanate from my office, nor, as appears from the inquiries I have made, did it emanate officially from the office of the Minister of Health. The statement has caused some concern in the Radium Hill area and some inquiries have been made.

The *Advertiser* statement was basically correct, but slightly misleading. I was quoted as saying that it was likely that material would be placed at Radium Hill. "Consideration is being given to the depositing of material at Radium Hill"—I think that was the phrase I used. Nevertheless, the matter is under consideration. I would like to make several points. The quantity of radioactive material to be eventually deposited will be very small. The material is presently contained at the Amdel laboratories. The material is a result—

Mr. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the ex-Minister cares to listen, I can tell him that this material was gathered during the life of the previous Administration. Uranium exploration was permitted under the rather nebulous terms operating under the previous Government, and Amdel was charged with the responsibility of analysing this material. The radioactive waste was collected mainly during the life of the previous Administration, and this very low-level waste must be deposited in a safe place. I am making the point that the waste is low-level; in fact, it will be deposited underground. The material will be of less radioactive intensity than the original ore mined at Radium Hill.

In fact, the material, which is small in quantity, will be buried underground and is less radioactive than was the original ore body mined at Radium Hill. The Department of Mines and Energy and the Health Commission are co-operating in an effort to find a suitable site for the final disposition of this material, which was gathered largely during the previous Government's exploration programmes.

Mr. Duncan: Where are they dumping this material at the moment?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know that that is part of the Ministerial statement, but it is held at the Amdel Laboratories.

**APPROPRIATION BILL (NO. 2)
AND
PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 11 October. Page 40.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): We have before us for consideration the first Budget of the new Government. The Premier and Treasurer, who has been for some years Leader of the Opposition, has, following his success in the recent election, an opportunity to present to this House his first financial measures. In accordance with the new procedure adopted last year, we will be considering the Appropriation Bill and the Public Purposes Loan Bill together. Let me begin, as did the Premier and Treasurer, with some general comments on the state of the economy and the financial situation inherited by the new Government. If we are to accept his analysis, South Australia has had a sorrowful decline during Labor's period in office. His statistics and remarks about the decline have concentrated solely on the State of South Australia, and have not related at any time to the general situation in the Australian economy, or indeed to the international economy.

Unfortunately, the stark facts are that there has been, in the Western capitalist world, a recession dating in large part from the energy crisis, the oil crisis, in the early 1970's, beginning in about 1974. From that time, unemployment in Australia has increased dramatically. There has been a recession in our manufacturing industry, and a persisting state of economic depression. That is something which all States have shared and in which they have had their part.

In the early years of that recession, South Australia held up remarkably well, particularly in relation to employment. Unfortunately, it had to come here eventually, and it did. It is true indeed that there has been a sorrowful decline in this country in terms of the general economic situation, but this decline has not been confined to South Australia, and that should be remembered in any discussion when we are talking about the state of the economy.

That decline has been hastened and exacerbated by the policies of the Federal Fraser Government, and the Premier in his speech makes quite clear that he does not intend to speak at all about the Budget and the economic policies of the Commonwealth Government; nor indeed should he. That Government is of the same complexion and, perhaps more important, of the same political philosophy as is his Government, and it is as well not to look at its policies, which have been in operation for some four years and which have plunged us deeper into the recession that was beginning when it came to office.

We have his analysis of South Australia, isolated, alone, in a situation of sorrowful economic decline. That is indeed a familiar theme. His statistics were chosen carefully to prove his point, to aid the process of talking down the economy of South Australia—something that he and his colleagues were far too ready to do during their years in Opposition. Regrettably, the first page or so in the Budget statement simply repeats the points which, in effect, talk down the economy of South Australia. They

are familiar. They formed the basis of the Liberal Party and the business group propaganda during the recent election campaign, but they are carefully chosen to paint the worst possible picture.

One should look, for instance, at the time periods used. Two years is chosen for population growth, eight years for private sector employment, 16 months for unemployment figures, five years for job vacancies, two years for retail sales, and three years for dwelling commencements. There is no consistency in or comparison possible amongst those statistics. The periods have been chosen to show them in the worst possible light. Other false statistics include our share of committed and likely capital investment, which it is claimed is well below the proportion it should be on a population basis (page 4 of the Financial Statement).

The figures quoted are suspect, because the Federal Government report on which they are based gives a clear warning that all the projects listed should not be totalled, as in some areas one project's approval means that another cannot go ahead. This was ignored in the Liberal Party's calculation of the figures. That fact was ignored by the Liberal Party during the course of the recent election campaign. It is a great pity to see it reappear, not as some polemic from the Leader of the Opposition in the course of campaigning but as a sober statement by the Premier and Treasurer in introducing his Appropriation Bill. Nevertheless, it is there. So, the warning about the danger of using those figures was ignored.

Most blatantly, the Redcliff project is omitted from the figures used to calculate South Australia's share. If that was included, it would bring us up to our proportionate share of such projects, which clearly shows a completely different situation from that appearing on page 4 of the Financial Statement. Certainly, the Premier, in Opposition, constantly threw doubt and cold water on the intensive Redcliff negotiations that were taking place. Perhaps he is arguing that Redcliff is not a project to which we are committed, but the figures he is using and those he quotes for other States refer not only to committed capital investment but also to likely capital investment.

In Opposition, the Premier saw this as a completely unlikely project. Only when he became Premier did he suddenly discover its viability, and he says in the Budget (which contains the false figures on page 4) at a later page, when dealing with the Redcliff project, that he is confident of a favourable result. That is an internal contradiction in his own document. It is a pity that the Premier is treating his role as Premier and Treasurer in the same way as he saw himself as a campaigning Leader of the Opposition on the hustings.

The main economic indicators in South Australia have been moving in the right direction for all of this year. The Premier has inherited an economy which has been showing a healthy rate of recovery for some time. Quoting those same tired old statistics selectively, as he has done, does the Premier no credit. As Leader of the Opposition, I do not see my role as talking down the economy, as he did when in Opposition. On the contrary, I say that the Premier is basing his first Budget on an extremely sound and improving economic position. We hope that, whatever is done by the new Government, it will not interrupt, halt or turn back that growth. The main economic indicators clearly demonstrate this. Private employment is up, overtime is up dramatically, job vacancies, both registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service and in newspaper advertisements, have shown strong growth and, most important, unemployment has been falling, even after allowing for the normal seasonal trends.

Let me examine these economic indicators. In the case of private employment, a reference to the latest Australian

Bureau of Statistics Civilian Employees Bulletin showing the latest figures from January to June indicates that private employment rose in South Australia by 3 300 or 1.17 per cent between January and June. By comparison, the national increase was 1.13 per cent. Admittedly, South Australia's difference from the national increase is a mere .04 per cent, but it is .04 per cent in the right direction. It is certainly above the national average, and it is an indicator that our private employment situation is improving.

Let us look at the overtime situation. The Commonwealth Employment Service monthly bulletin states that overtime rose in South Australian factories by an average 46 per cent in the first six months of this year compared to the figure for the same period a year earlier. Overtime for July 1979 (the latest available figures) maintains the recovery, being up 42.1 per cent over the July 1978—2.7 hours average for all workers, against 1.9 hours a year earlier. This is a most significant economic indicator because, as the economy improves and orders increase, the first response of employers in manufacturing industry is not to employ new labour but to increase the amount of hours worked by existing labour. When they are confident that the up-turn in orders will persist, it is then that they take on new employees. It is an important early indicator of improvement, and shows a great improvement from the beginning of this year.

Let us look at job vacancies, both registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service and appearing in newspaper advertisements. Measured from the Commonwealth Employment Service unfilled job vacancies seasonally adjusted, they rose by 18.5 per cent to an average level of 1 393 in the first six months of this year, compared to an average of 1 176 in the last six months of 1978. They have risen by another 13.5 per cent in July and August this year (August being the latest figure), making an overall increase in job vacancies of 34.5 per cent since the second half of 1978—an extremely significant improvement in jobs available through the C.E.S. registration.

Another indicator is the A.N.Z. Bank's tabulation of job advertisements in the *Advertiser*, seasonally adjusted. They rose 2 per cent, from an average 982 a week in the second half of 1978, to 1 001 in the first six months of this year, subsequently rising another 6.6 per cent to 1 035 in July and 1 066 in August, a total rise of 8.5 per cent, which is an important indicator of improvement. Unemployment itself has fallen by 8 000 since January; this figure includes a normal seasonal fall. So some kind of seasonal adjustment should be made in order to get a look at the underlying trend. If one analyses these figures they show that unemployment peaked earlier this year and has subsequently fallen by 2 000. The C.E.S. figures for September have not yet been released by the Commonwealth Government; they are expected shortly. However, the Bureau of Statistics figures, which unfortunately have not been going long enough to permit seasonal adjustment, show a further fall of 1 900 in the month to early September, compared to a national rise of 11 200, an extremely important and interesting indicator.

True, as the Premier says, our unemployment rate is the highest in the country at present, and has been so for some months. In terms of relative improvement, we are showing that the corner has been turned, the peak has been reached, and things can only improve. Most importantly, it is not an improvement as of next month, the month after, or some time in the future, but an improvement that has been consistent and strong in these indicators over the whole year. That is an extremely important fact, when we look at the Budget and when we try to judge the Premier's economic statement. All of it should add up to a

tremendous lift in business confidence, and I hope now the Premier will be intent on boosting business. Since it is not our role to talk down the economy, as he did when in Opposition, business will be even more encouraged here. It is disappointing that in the Budget he still seems to be locked into the negative rhetoric he displayed as the Leader of the Opposition. All he could say about the local economy was to reproduce those statistics I dealt with earlier.

I am afraid that, as with other parts of the document, there is a major internal inconsistency between the figures appearing on the first two pages of the statement and later references. I will quote some of them which indicate a much more optimistic note than the Treasurer would have us believe. At page 11 he states:

...there have been some signs recently that economic activity is beginning to pick up.

That is so. At page 27, he states:

The improvement in port activity in terms of gross tonnage of vessels and cargo through-put at Port Adelaide contributed to higher revenue in 1978-79.

That is an area in which economic activity has improved, and it is recognised in the second half of the Budget. At page 26, he states:

Property transactions showed signs of slight improvement towards the end of the financial year 1978-79.

At page 11, he states:

While the employment position is still far from satisfactory, there have been some signs recently that economic activity is beginning to pick up.

Again, I say indeed there have. None of these statements was included in the portion of the Premier's speech that he read to Parliament; they were simply incorporated in the record. The Premier said, in his opening rhetorical line, that private employment was down, unemployment was up, job vacancies were down, and retail sales were down, etc., all adding up to this sorrowful decline. I hope that the analysis I have made will indicate not only to the House but to the public at large that the economy is improving, and let us hope that it will continue to improve under the new Government.

I now turn to the Financial Statement itself. Not only is the economy improving but the Treasury that the new Government has inherited is one that is extremely sound and well managed. By sound financial management, the Labor Government left a surplus on the combined Revenue and Loan Accounts of \$600 000. When one looks at all the economic problems there have been, the most significant of which has been the way in which the Commonwealth Government has not met its responsibilities in a number of areas of State services, that result of a \$600 000 surplus (which, incidentally, is an improvement on a budgeted deficit of about \$7 000 000) is a tribute to the former Treasurer (Des Corcoran) and to the way in which the Treasury has been managed under his Premiership and, prior to that, under the previous Premier (Mr. Dunstan).

A major impact on the financial position will be felt as a result of tax cuts promised in the election campaign by the incoming Premier. These cuts will be imposed on the normal Government programme. One could anticipate that the revenue, which has been reduced, will be under considerable pressure to meet the expenditure side of the Budget in terms of provision of services. Despite this, on the combined Revenue and Loan Accounts, the new Premier now says that there will be a further surplus over the 1979-80 year. Given his gloomy statements about State finances and the South Australian economy, and his reckless promises of slashing revenue here, there and everywhere, the prospect of a surplus on this year's

operations appears remarkable. It needs, and will get, a much closer analysis.

The Premier says that the Government's financial planning recognises several major factors. The first is the present depressed state of the building and construction industry and the need to support the industry to the greatest extent practicable.

How does he do this? Not too well, if an examination of the figures is undertaken. The actual Loan Fund payments are to be reduced from \$232 200 000 in 1978-79 to \$218 500 000 this year. The State Government has cut Loan Fund expenditure as a direct result of reduced Loan Council allocations by the Fraser Government. This cut amounts to \$13 700 000 in the money value of payments. The effect on this State's economy will be severe. After allowing for inflation during the course of this financial year, the real effect on economic activity will be between \$35 000 000 and \$40 000 000. That sum, which one could have anticipated would be available, will not be available this year in a situation in which the building and construction industry is in a depressed state.

These Loan Fund cuts are a major determinant of the financial Budget result, yet there is barely a reference to them in the text of the Premier's Budget speech. He does not want to talk about what is happening at the Federal level in relation to Loan funds. It is a major gap in the Budget speech, which dwells on much less important factors in the overall outcome. It seems incredible that the building and construction sector can be made to bear the brunt of the Government's economic policies, when it is the one sector that has been identified as being in great difficulty in the South Australian economy.

The second factor the Premier referred to was the importance of the northern power station, Redcliff, and the Roxby Downs development. Indeed, they are all important. The first two projects, the northern power station and Redcliff, were well advanced under Labor. Details of those projects, and Loan approvals, had been announced by the previous Government. They were well in train. It seems, in the Premier's words, as though Redcliff is now most likely, and indeed it is, because of the hard spade work that has been done over the years to ensure the success of that project, coupled, of course, with several economic factors, including the price of oil, that have made that project far more attractive.

There has been considerable discussion of the Roxby Downs development over recent weeks. One thing should be made quite clear: all that is happening at Roxby Downs at the moment is a major feasibility study into what is there and what is involved in extracting, processing, and selling it. It is a \$50 000 000 feasibility scheme, which has been expedited by the previous Government. Certain approvals over financial arrangements were needed by those companies in order to embark on the study, and that approval was given by the previous Government. We are not standing in the way of assessment of the Roxby Downs project; indeed, we believe it should be fully explored.

What we are saying is that at this stage, when we are simply at the feasibility stage of the development, we should not be talking about it with the puffery and recklessness that we are now hearing from the Government, which has been talking loudly about Roxby Downs. It has created a mini-boom amongst speculative uranium ventures, and so on, on a project which has massive implications for the State financially but which requires a considerable amount of detailed assessment over some years before it can be seen as a goer. That is the way Roxby Downs should be treated—soberly, and not by announcements as though it is some kind of bonanza. There is nothing new there in the Premier's statement.

The Premier then refers to the need for the Government in co-operation with the private sector to accelerate the exploration programme in the Cooper Basin. There is nothing new on this point. In fact, when we were in office an exploration programme requiring support in terms of about \$30 000 000 over three years was devised and approved by the Government. It had not been announced at the time we went out of office, because the election intervened. It was interesting to note that it was one of the first announcements made by the new Minister of Mines and Energy, who hastened to say to the people, about the scheme he had inherited, that it was not really the announcement of a scheme of the former Government, that there were some new aspects to the scheme. I looked closely, but I could not quite see the new aspects. Perhaps there was \$1 000 or \$2 000 in the \$30 000 000 allocated. Perhaps it was going to be spread over three years in a different way, but it seemed very much indeed like the identical scheme that had been devised and approved by the previous Minister of Mines and Energy, who regrettably is no longer in this House. There is nothing new about the Cooper Basin exploration; we welcome the fact that the Government is proceeding with that exploration, and we support it.

A final point made by the Premier refers to the need to create long-term employment opportunities, particularly for those people seeking their first job. What employment opportunities are, in fact, being created in this Budget? The first employment opportunity that strikes one on reading the document is not one that is being created but one that is being abolished. I refer to the abolition of the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. In 1978-79, \$9 200 000 was appropriated for projects under that scheme but no funds have been appropriated in this Budget. In addition, over \$3 000 000 had already been appropriated and put into a special account, and that also was unspent. That has been recalled from the Deposit Account and put into Consolidated Revenue. Hence the total gain to the Budget from the abolition of the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, a job creation scheme, is a sum approaching \$12 500 000.

The Government is abolishing a major unemployment relief scheme, but can point to no definite jobs which will be created by business to stop unemployment rising as a result of the abolition of that programme. Mr. Fraser's experience that the private sector does not automatically expand and create jobs when the public sector is held back should be a lesson to the Premier. In abolishing this scheme the Government is attempting to shift the burden of unemployment relief in terms of acute need in particular areas to local government. The Premier makes a gratuitous statement that local government should use grants made by the State Grants Commission to finance unemployment relief. That will be not very welcome news to local government. Those funds were never intended to be used for that purpose. In any case, not all the Grants Commission money is made available on a needs basis; 30 per cent is made available simply on a per capita basis. That means that in terms of money available to councils, if indeed they were to go into the business of job creation in this way, the money provided would be based not on the needs of the area or on the pattern of unemployment but simply as a result of the per capita allocation. So, \$12 500 000 has gone, and what has replaced it?

The Budget statement refers to the extent and value of the various incentive schemes currently available to industry which will be examined, and a new scheme which is to be introduced related to pay-roll tax concessions, the so-called bold initiative that will create 7 000 to 10 000 jobs. How much is provided in the Budget for these

schemes? An amount of \$6 000 000 is to be spread among a number of schemes, including the motor vehicle industry scheme; the Riverland Development Fund; and the establishment payment scheme, and decentralisation incentives related to it. All of those are schemes of the previous Government, which were operating and which were funded by the previous Administration. One new scheme is mentioned—the pay-roll tax incentives for specified additional youth employment.

Let us look at the three schemes that were funded under the Labor Government. The motor vehicle industry scheme was allocated \$1 000 000; the Riverland Development Fund was approximately \$500 000; the payments to industry, establishment payments and other decentralisation incentives were \$1 500 000. That totals more than \$3 000 000, so the \$6 000 000 we began with is already more than half spent on keeping programmes going that were already initiated under the previous Government. There is nothing new in terms of job creation there. It appears that \$3 000 000 will be provided for pay-roll tax incentives for youth employment. This is the only new initiative that can be seen in any way in this Budget to aid long-term job creation. I will refer to the pay-roll tax concessions in more detail later.

It is significant in relation to that scheme that it still has not been fully spelt out. Despite the fact that the scheme was supposed to operate from 1 October, employers making contact with the appropriate Government department cannot be told specifically what benefits they can get if they are prepared to employ some young person. It is time that that scheme was detailed, that pamphlets were prepared and that employers were given the opportunity to take advantage of it. After all, precious little money is provided for it and it seems to be the only new initiative that the Government has introduced in terms of employment or job creation.

So much for the factors recognised by the Premier. I now turn to tax. The Government, the Premier says, is committed to a policy of lower taxation; indeed this was said often and loudly during the election campaign and all sorts of promises were made in terms of taxation cuts and concessions. Despite the campaign rhetoric and despite the statement in the Budget that the Government is committed to a policy of lower taxation, the first Tonkin Budget is a high-tax Budget. The following analysis I think will demonstrate quite clearly to members and I hope to the public at large precisely how this is a high-tax Budget.

The Budget document makes clear that total receipts will rise from \$1 265 000 000 in 1978-79 to \$1 378 000 000 this financial year. That means the receipts of Government will increase by \$113 000 000, a not insignificant sum. In this total increase in receipts state tax collections will rise by \$16 600 000. This is a Budget that is meant to cut taxes, yet this Budget says in terms of its figures that it expects an increase of \$16 600 000 for the period the Budget operates. What are the reasons for this rise in State taxes? Two are possible, or a combination of them. One is that the State economy has been recovering and is now in a much better state than the Liberal Party would have us believe, and I think I have amply demonstrated that that may well be the case. Certainly receipts from two State taxes which are responsive to changes in economic activity are forecast to rise this year. Pay-roll tax is expected to rise by \$11 800 000, and stamp duty by \$3 900 000.

The other possible explanation for the rise in State taxes is that despite Liberal propaganda taxes have not been cut at all or, alternatively, they have been cut to such a small extent that other factors such as improvement in the economy and expected tax collections mean that there will be a total increase in the amount of tax collected. The

actual \$16 600 000 rise in taxation in the Budget Papers is at odds with the public impression given by the Premier that this is a tax-cutting Budget. The \$16 600 000 rise in State tax collections this year amounts to a 5.5 per cent increase. In the 1978 Labor Budget actual tax collections rose by only \$13 600 000, or 4.7 per cent.

State taxes have never been as high as they will be this year, and this is despite the Premier's policy speech statements claiming high taxation under a Labor Government. Actual taxes will rise, despite the statement that the Government is committed to a policy of lower taxation. Pay-roll tax collections will rise by 7.8 per cent, and that is also to a record level, and this year's large increase is despite a much-heralded pay-roll tax remission and certainly despite the Premier's election statement. In the Budget, the Premier costs his "tax cuts" for 1979-80 as follows: stamp duty which will cost revenue \$1 100 000; succession duties, \$2 000 000; gift duty, \$500 000; and pay-roll tax, \$500 000; a total of \$4 100 000.

In addition to the above, as noted there is probably \$2 500 000 to \$3 000 000 which will be allocated for youth unemployment schemes. As that is being done through remission of pay-roll tax, one could add that to the total tax cuts to make a budgeted total of about \$7 000 000. However, if the total tax collections are still to rise by \$16 600 000, more than double this figure, the result is that the public will not receive any net benefit at all. The tax cuts of about \$7 000 000 set against the \$16 600 000 rise in total tax collection indicates the hollowness of the campaign rhetoric used by the Premier and the fact that he has been forced to come to grips with the reality of trying to run a State and its services to the public with the revenue resources that it has. It is not so easy when in Government to make promises to slash the revenue and put them into effect, as apparently it is in the course of an election campaign in which one does not expect to be successful.

The \$7 000 000 tax cut is well below that promised by the Liberal Party during the election campaign. This is the second aspect of the matter. Not only has the Government not cut taxes (and I have demonstrated how I am able to make that statement), but in showing cost to the revenue of \$7 000 000 the Premier now is breaking the promise of the revenue cuts he would be making in his first Budget on coming to office.

The official costing document for the Liberal Party election promises issued in Mr. Tonkin's name has tax cuts, totalling \$9 800 000 in 1979-80, excluding the hospital levy. That is an understatement of the full cost, as it was arrived at by deducting savings due to the abolition of the unemployment relief scheme. That scheme is a separate item in the Budget papers from taxation: it is not a tax measure. The Liberal Party costing needs to be put on a comparable basis to the Budget. When this is done the cost for 1979-80 of the Liberal Party election promises is \$13 300 000, so the actual tax cuts, excluding the hospital levy, fall short of promises made by over \$6 000 000; they are barely half of those promised. This performance needs to be compared with the Liberal policy speech, which said:

The Liberal Government will cut State taxes and we can afford to do it. Our tax cuts have been carefully costed. The promises in actual tax cuts for 1979-80 show a great discrepancy between the document of costing, careful costing, that was put out in the election campaign, and the reality of this current Budget. For instance, pay-roll tax cuts—promised \$8 300 000, actual \$3 000 000 to \$3 500 000; succession duties—promised \$1 000 000, actual \$2 000 000 (which is an increase); gift duty—promised \$1 500 000, actual \$500 000; land tax—promised

\$1 600 000, nothing in the Budget; and stamp duty—promised \$900 000, actual \$1 100 000. There is a difference between promises of \$13 300 000 and actual cuts of \$6 600 000 to \$7 100 000.

The major discrepancies between the two can be seen clearly from the figures I have given. The value of the provision for general pay-roll tax remissions is only one-third of that promised. Only about 40 per cent of the allocation promised for special pay-roll tax remissions will be made. In the case of land, no allocation has been made for this year at all, owing to the postponement of the abolition of land tax. Already there is a large gap between promise and performance, a gap that might have been forced on the Premier when he saw the implications for State services in the reckless promises he made in the election campaign.

The Liberals promised complete abolition of land tax this financial year on the principal family residence. That statement has been challenged by some reference to the Premier's policy speech, in which no particular time was put on that promise. However, a reference to his costing document makes clear that it was intended that that remission should be made in this financial year because it was shown in the column of tax cuts which accompanied the Premier's policy speech. It was not in the speech in terms of timing, but it was in the costing document. In his policy speech, Mr. Tonkin said:

High land tax has forced many people out of their homes and has denied many young people the opportunity of owning their own homes.

If that statement was correct, the prospect of many more people being forced from their homes in 1979-80 does not seem to bother the Premier. He obviously does not give it priority, or he knows his election claim is untrue. Certainly, it can be seen that the abolition of land tax is receiving very low priority, when it is considered that the Premier has budgeted for a \$2 100 000 surplus over the year. On his costings, \$2 100 000 could have financed the complete abolition of land tax on the principal residence this year. He has chosen not to do so.

Total actual pay-roll tax remissions are tiny in comparison with total pay-roll tax collections, which are over \$160 000 000. Cuts of such small magnitude will have an insignificant effect on firms' total cost structures, and they will therefore do little to aid private sector employment, which apparently is the purpose of those cuts as the Premier sees them. Just what measures is the Government going to bring in to get this rise in private sector employment? These pay-roll tax cuts, supposedly, were to do the job, were to create in fact 7 000 jobs, the bold initiative that was promised by the Government.

I now turn to expenditure. The Premier says that the Government has had to take a number of hard and unpopular decisions, and he lists them. He refers to holding the Public Service to no-growth constraints in 1979-80; a major thrust by the South Australian Health Commission to rationalise services and reduce hospital running costs; financial constraints on the Public Buildings Department; and the Education Department and the Department of Further Education being held to tight financial allocations.

Holding the Public Service to no-growth constraints in 1979-80 was, unfortunately, something that the former Government would have felt obliged to do. In fact, that policy has already operated for one year. It is certainly a pity, given the importance of public services to the community, that that no-growth policy had to be adopted in response to reduced Commonwealth allocations. In maintaining it for a further year, the Premier was doing nothing that had not been done by the previous

Government. So, how that constitutes a hard and unpopular decision, which he took on his own initiative, I am not sure.

The Premier referred to a second unpopular decision, namely, a major thrust by the South Australian Health Commission to rationalise services and reduce hospital running costs. Again, this was being done successfully by the previous Administration. The severity of such cuts, and the way in which they are applied, has become crucial. People cannot have much confidence in the new Government because of the way it will apply these decisions. There is nothing new in the Government's examining hospital services with a view to rationalising and assisting in economies. I do not need to talk about the other two matters in any detail.

I turn now to the Loan Account. The Premier, in reference to Loan Fund cuts, says that he expects the effects to be offset partly by non-budgetary measures, such as building and construction projects undertaken by the State Government Insurance Commission, the expansion programmes of the Electricity Trust and the State Transport Authority, and increased activity in the private sector generally.

Regarding non-budgetary measures, such as building and construction projects undertaken by S.G.I.C., that organisation and other institutions were already heavily committed to capital work projects in the last financial year. It is fairly unlikely that they can expand capital works projects so significantly as to offset the huge fall in Government works provided for in this year's Budget. Those comments apply equally to the Electricity Trust and the State Transport Authority programmes. Regarding the private sector, no real evidence is available regarding what will happen or how this Budget will assist.

In the course of his speech, the Treasurer commented on several important issues, including personal income tax sharing, which is a vital source of revenue for the State Government. The guarantee arrangements specify minimum funds to be paid to the States by the Commonwealth. The present guarantee expires at the end of this financial year. Future payments to the States are very uncertain, and the Premier assures us that he is determined to fight vigorously for the retention of the guarantee and for an adequate proportion of income tax collections. The Opposition fully supports him in that move. Former Premier Corcoran, in that situation, would also have hoped for the support of the Leader of the Opposition.

Regarding another aspect of personal income tax sharing, the Premier refers to the review of State relativities now being made by the Commonwealth Grants Commission. This review could cost South Australia tens of millions of dollars. As the Premier now admits in his Budget speech, the review may place in jeopardy the financial benefits obtained in transferring the non-metropolitan railways to the Commonwealth Government. It is pleasing to see at last the Premier placing on record that the Labor Party obtained large benefits for South Australia under the railways agreement. In the interests of the State, the Opposition certainly supports the Government in fighting to retain these benefits that it has latterly just discovered. Indeed, the Opposition believes that those relativities should not be structured in such a way as to take away the benefit of that agreement, and it will support the Premier in anything he can do to ensure that those benefits are not taken away.

Financing of major development projects is referred to in the document. This includes the Cooper Basin and particularly Redcliff. As I said earlier, there is nothing really new in these sections; most measures referred to

were set in train by the former Labor Government. Redcliff is to be a reality as a result of the efforts of Messrs. Dunstan, Hudson, Corcoran, previous Ministers, and persons in responsibility in this area. The new Premier will inherit the benefit of the work of these men and reap the reward of their efforts.

Regarding the 1980-81 finances, some time should be spent in making an assessment of what the future will bring South Australia. It is important that this should be done, because the Premier has been able, in this Budget, to maintain the services he has maintained and to make the cuts that he has made partly because he has deferred both the full impact of his taxation concessions and also because he has taken a number of risks in regarding predictions in certain areas. Therefore, 1980-81 will be an important financial year for this State. On analysis, the Premier's promised tax cuts were much wilder than realised and certainly this was exposed during the election campaign. The Premier is faced with that harsh reality in government. This makes even more stark his inability to deliver them. The Premier is building up real financial problems for next year. If one adds the financial problems that the Premier will face when putting his promises into effect to the problems surrounding the uncertainty that will come following the ending of the income tax guarantee and the problems posed by the relativities review, to which I referred earlier, one sees the great difficulties that are building up for South Australia in 1980-81.

Excluding the hospital levy, the full-year costs to tax revenue resulting from the Premier's policy speech will be evident. These can be fairly estimated at \$35 000 000 (\$24 000 000 as the corrected cost of the Liberal full-year programme, plus \$11 000 000 in errors in calculation). So the financial crunch will come in 1980-81. The \$35 000 000 true cost of the election promises is markedly different from the \$19 400 000 referred to in the Liberal Party costing document. The difference between the two sums is the magnitude of the extra revenue gap that has to be made up.

The Liberal Party election costing document says that the full year cost of abolishing succession duties is \$8 000 000. The Budget documents, however, indicate that actual full-year revenue from succession duties is now about \$16 000 000. The full-year loss will therefore be twice what the Premier estimated while in Opposition. A sum of \$8 000 000 more, over and above the costing, must be found next year, and every year, to compensate for that rash promise. According to the Treasurer's speech, the tax cuts in the Budget will cost \$20 000 000 in a full year, without considering the loss of revenue that will occur after land tax is abolished. The Liberal Party document, incidentally, costs land tax cuts, on a full year basis, as \$1 600 000.

However, the Budget refers, on page 4, to land tax concessions having an annual cost of \$5 000 000. That is yet another major discrepancy in terms of costing. How is the \$3 400 000 difference to be made up in relation to the land tax promise? Will \$650 000 of this money come from reduced pensioner concessions in respect of land tax paid through the Department of Community Welfare? Presumably, the Government will not replace this concession which gives some small benefit to pensioners relative to the rest of the community. Will the land tax cuts be indefinitely deferred? So, on just two items documented in the Budget speech, there is a discrepancy of \$11 400 000 between the election promises and costing, and financial responsibility and reality in government. These two items illustrate sharply the incompetence of the Liberals in financial matters. During the election

campaign the Premier denied these errors emphatically and attacked the former Premier for pointing them out. In a *Sunday Mail* column the member for Fisher, the former Opposition Whip, denied that there were errors in the Liberal Party's costings.

However, the official Budget figures introduced by the Treasurer confirm those errors. Do the Liberals really understand what is meant by the full year costings and the implications of them? What sort of financial mess will they get the State into if they make an 80 per cent error on their tax cut costings alone—a \$16 000 000 discrepancy on an initial \$19 000 000? Just how is the large vote-buying sum of \$35 000 000 to be financed? How is the State to stave off bankruptcy? These are major questions stemming from this Budget.

Will there be further major cuts in payments from Loan Funds to levels even below the disastrous levels for 1979-80, in real terms about \$34 000 000? How is the building and construction industry, so dependent on Government work projects, to survive if further Loan cuts are made? Will the Government cut community and other services in order to fulfil these promises? Will it increase other taxes? One likely source of finance for the revenue short-fall next financial year is increased land tax on properties other than principal family residences. The Liberal Party costing document states that increased land tax will be collected on commercial properties. Therefore, despite all the talk about incentives for business and lower State taxes being a stimulus for private sector development, land tax paid by business will, in all probability, rise. There is absolutely no consistency in Liberal Party policy towards private sector employment. One policy talks about the need for incentives, while another takes them away. There is even speculation, again from the member for Fisher in his *Sunday Mail* column, that land tax would rise not only on commercial and industrial properties, but also on 105 000 rented homes in South Australia.

With the abolition of some of these taxes, with the way in which they are being applied, the tax rebate promised to the people of South Australia is in reality a tax shift, a shift which means that those who can afford to buy a home will not pay land tax at all, whereas the less well off who are forced to rent homes will face increased rents as landlords pass on the increased land tax on rented properties. There are sure to be other shifts in the taxation burden from those with ability to pay to the less well off. The tax shift is a dishonest way of approaching public revenues and expenditure. If there are indeed to be tax cuts, the implications of that are cuts in services. However, that nettle apparently will not be grasped. The tax burden will remain high, but it will be passed on to those less able to afford it.

The only other source of rescue that one can see for the Treasurer in his next Budget is to depend heavily on election year hand-outs from Mr. Fraser. He may have had some advance notice of assistance in that direction. If he has, it is just as well. In summary, one could say about this Budget, Premier Tonkin's first Budget, that he has inherited an expanding economy. Let us hope that he keeps it on the rails. He has inherited a Treasury in extremely good shape, such good shape that he is able to budget for a surplus. We are not opposing or suggesting that the economy should be talked down in that respect. He has made promises which appear to be so far-reaching and so wild in terms of their effect on revenue that he will be faced with the stark reality of either bankruptcy or a substantial cut in services next year.

When he reaches that point—and already it has been flagged in these Budget documents presented to us last week—we can only hope that the Premier will come clean

and say honestly to the people of South Australia what option he has chosen, that he will admit that the revenue cuts that he announced, the promises that he made, were wild and reckless and should not have been made, that in effect he got into Government under a false pretence, or, alternatively, that he will say that he will honour every one of those promises but cut services, and specify the areas in which services will be cut, allowing people to judge the value of the services involved. He must do that honestly and openly. However, I am afraid that that decision does not have to be made in this financial year. That is the crunch that is coming. Let us keep our fingers crossed that the up-turn in the economy which has been taking place from early this year will continue, because only in that way will the State's finances be at all viable under the present Government.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): At the outset, let me say that the Leader of the Opposition has proved the truth of what Lionel Bowen said about him: he is a fine boy. As a fine boy, he shows his immaturity in not grasping the financial state of South Australia. He has failed to appreciate the message, as stated by the Treasurer. I shall take up two issues immediately. The first relates to land tax. I wish the Leader had read out what was stated in the document; then, he would have found what the true position was. The Treasurer stated:

Because of administrative difficulties, it will not be possible to abolish land tax on the principal place of residence until the beginning of next financial year. There is a considerable amount of preparatory work which must be done within the department and the identification of properties which properly qualify for the exemption is a major task.

Mr. Bannon: It is administratively impossible.

Mr. BECKER: It is a major task. When the Leader's Party was in Government, his then Leader could do nothing about it, and obviously made no preparation. The Treasurer continued:

However, the concession will be introduced with effect from 1 July 1980. It will have an annual cost of about \$5 000 000.

Mr. KENEALLY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. BECKER: The Treasurer continued:

I can assure people living in their own homes that the land tax they pay in this financial year, on those homes, will be the last such payment. Further, we are taking steps to see that increases in valuation levels will not be reflected in increased land tax bills on the principal home in this last year.

As the Leader pointed out, land tax will not be abolished in the current financial year (in which we have only about six or seven months to go), and that was partly the fault of his Party when in Government. I would have thought that they would learn. Last time an election was called in September, the financial arrangements for the various Government departments were thrown into chaos, because Parliament did not pass the Budget until about November, it was about December before they knew where they stood, and spending could not start until January.

Land tax was the greatest ever imposition on property owners, and I am pleased that our Party will be able to honour its promise of abolishing it during the life of this Government.

Mr. Keneally: No, they won't, only on the principal place.

Mr. BECKER: It will be abolished on the principal residence. The member for Stuart should have listened to

what was said earlier. It is the greatest imposition in the person owning the original home. It is regrettable that we will have to pay land tax in this financial year. People living in the Glenelg or Henley Beach council area will realise how we are being ripped off. This is the fault not of the present Government but of the previous Government and the stupid system that it introduced five years ago, namely, to introduce an equalisation system. In the Glenelg area, the equalisation factor was to be 90, so property values should have increased by about 90 per cent over the five-year period. However, they increased by only 40 per cent to 50 per cent. In parts of the Henley and Grange council area, the increase was considerably more, whereas in some parts the increase was not equal to the equalisation factor.

Mr. Keneally: Has the increase—

Mr. BECKER: If the member for Stuart would listen, I could tell him what it does to my place of residence. It could affect the honourable member in the same way, and he would be annoyed if it happened to him. For the past three years, we have been over-taxed on my residential property because of the previous Government's inane equalisation factor system, because written into the increase in rates and taxes was a provision that the property would increase by a certain sum each year. Three years ago, it reached the point where that property had reached the maximum valuation increase. Although my property went up only 40 per cent, the equalisation factor in Glenelg was 90 per cent. I objected having to pay to the previous Government, which wasted millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, even \$1 more than I had to. I do not see why I had to pay anything. I object to it.

Mr. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: I would not worry about the member for Napier. When the council of which he was Mayor was calculating council rates on property valuations, what happened to the Town Clerk? He was sacked. That is how we know how the member for Napier looks after the workers of the State, saying "We couldn't care less. Sack him." If his council and he as Mayor were so incompetent as to check the works of the Town Clerk, they were the ones who should have been sacked, not the Town Clerk. He should not talk to me about property valuations. It is a pity that the Leader did not tell the truth about land tax. As a property owner, I object to having to pay more in land tax than I should have to pay, and thousands of people in the metropolitan area will be in the same situation.

We got a small reminder from the Leader about the receipts from succession duties but, again, he failed to understand the Liberal Party's policy on this matter. True, in the Budget document, receipts from succession duties will be about \$15 000 000. The Leader did not say anything about his Government's ripping off \$16 000 000 the previous financial year or about hardships caused to many people in the country. Succession duties will be abolished as from 1 January 1980.

Mr. Keneally: Shame!

Mr. BECKER: I hope that the honourable member tells that to all the rural people in his district. There are many fine property owners in Stuart who have large properties and who would be delighted to know that the member for Stuart believes that they should pay succession duties. The workers will also be pleased to know that he believes that they, too, should pay succession duties. In other words, if they work hard, save money, acquire assets, and if they are fortunate and inherit or have other assets given to them, good luck to them. Why begrudge these people? However, the honourable member wants to take everything off them. He believes that these people should

be taxed and have their assets taken from them. He has received benefits as a result of being a member of Parliament, as has the member for Gilles, who is not slow to criticise people who have worked on his committee. The honourable member did not even know how to read a balance sheet when he was first appointed to the Industries Development Committee. He had to be helped with that and to do half his work on the committee. The only question he could ask the witnesses was, "What union do your employees belong to?" It would be said to my colleague (Hon. R. A. Geddes), who was also a member of the committee, "I bet they will be back for more money. There will be industrial trouble." In a number of cases, that occurred.

Mr. Slater: You weren't always there.

Mr. BECKER: I was always there. Because of the stupid hours at which you called meetings—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! We cannot have private conversations across the Chamber.

Mr. BECKER: I have a busy district office, and it was sometimes difficult to get away. If I did not have something to eat, I would have starved to death. Anyway, we helped the poor member for Gilles.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing about the honourable member for Gilles in the Budget.

Mr. BECKER: Yes there is, as payments to politicians, together with the cost of running the Parliament, appear in the Budget. If that was spelt out, the South Australian public would be amazed. Anyway, succession duties will be abolished from 1 January, and for the last six months of the financial year the State Government will not receive succession duties. It will be interesting to keep a record of deaths occurring up to 31 December 1979 and to see whether they correspond with the pattern of previous years.

Mr. Keneally: More people will probably die under a Liberal Government.

Mr. BECKER: It is not that. The death certificates might be signed after midnight on 31 December 1979. However, we will certainly watch that situation. What it means (and, no doubt, I will have to spell it out to the Opposition) is that we will, in theory, lose six months income from the normal collection of succession duties. There are all the estates in the course of preparation now, and some will take longer than others, because they are larger and more involved. There is also the matter of life-term estates. Even though we have abolished succession duties in South Australia as from 1 January 1980, it has been conservatively estimated that the State Government will continue to receive \$2 000 000 or \$3 000 000 a year for many years as a result of the previous Government's actions in relation to succession duties.

Mr. Keneally: Why don't you legislate to stop that?

Mr. BECKER: I am not in the field to do that, and that is not what we said: we said that we would abolish succession duties from 1 January 1980. So, life-term estates will continue to pay until they are wound up, and any estates operating until 31 December 1979 will contribute.

Mr. Wright: You are a hypocrite.

Mr. BECKER: What does the honourable member mean?

Mr. Wright: You're a hypocrite to take it.

Mr. BECKER: I am explaining how we worked out the financial arrangements.

Mr. Wright: Why didn't you introduce a private member's Bill to prevent it?

Mr. BECKER: We have made an offer to the people that they could not refuse, namely, to abolish succession duties from 1 January 1980, and that was accepted by the

people. They gave us the majority in this House; that is necessary to enable us to pass the legislation. So what the Leader said was not true when he analysed those two aspects of the Budget document. I am disappointed that he, his speech writers, or research officers did not go into detail. That is how the funding situation works out, and that is how it is anticipated that the income will occur.

The Budget document is a pleasure to read, for a change. There is nothing in it criticising or condemning the Federal Government, as has happened in political Budgets in the past. The Budget explains clearly and precisely to South Australians what the Government's programme will be, and that there will be a small surplus. I am a great believer in balanced Budgets. However, the Government, for reasons stated in the document, is hoping for a small surplus with which to prepare the infrastructure for the Redcliff proposal.

As the Leader and Deputy Leader know, the previous Minister of Mines and Energy said that the State would have to contribute a considerable sum to the Redcliff project, and we are taking a responsible step in that regard. The Leader referred to this aspect with almost a childish smirk on his face, hoping that the present Government would run into financial difficulties.

If the Opposition is going to carry on like that, all I can say is that they are nothing but a bunch of traitors. Nobody would want any Government, whether the previous Government, this Government or any other Government in the future, to run into financial difficulties.

Mr. Keneally: You should have been here when he spoke.

Mr. BECKER: I was here for most of the time, and I heard him also on the speaker in my office. He proved to me what Lionel Bowen said: that he is a fine boy and that he has a long way to go in relation to assessing such complex Parliamentary documents as the Financial Statement and receipts. Of course, he did not even touch on the great red book, the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: Here we go in relation to the real proof regarding the activities of the previous Government. I said some time ago in a private conversation with the Auditor-General that I would be watching his activities and reports very closely. However, I am very disappointed in the presentation of the present Auditor-General's Report. It is the poorest document I have read in the nine and half years that I have been in this House. As far as I am concerned, it is lacking in initiative and punch, and in the details that we have come to expect from Auditor-General's Reports in the past. I want to know why: I remember very clearly the member for Hartley, when he was Deputy Premier, saying in this House, when I raised a certain issue that had been raised by the Auditor-General, that it would not occur again. The then member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) said, "Are you going to instruct the Auditor-General?" There is no doubt in my mind that either there has been an instruction or the message has been passed around. I believe that the Auditor-General or his Deputy could have been intimidated, because, I said right from the beginning, I think this is the poorest document that has ever been presented to this House. I expect more of the Auditor-General.

Mr. Wright: Would you really be in a position to judge the Auditor-General?

Mr. BECKER: Yes I am.

Mr. Wright: Well, I don't think you are.

Mr. BECKER: I would be, far more than the honourable member would be. Having heard the Leader's speech, I am quite convinced that no-one else in the Opposition would know, either.

Mr. Wright: I don't set myself up to that standard, but you do.

Mr. BECKER: The honourable member would not want to. It is not a great standard: it is just a matter of common sense. When one looks at the 1977-78 report (bearing in mind that the current Auditor-General was in office for only part of the period covered by the 1978 report), one still finds therein the fine work of the previous Auditor-General, Mr. Byrne, for whom the Deputy Leader has a fine regard because he wisely appointed that gentleman to a committee.

Mr. Wright: It's a pity the Auditor-General can't come here to defend himself, isn't it.

Mr. BECKER: He will have the chance at any time he likes.

Mr. Wright: In here, I mean.

Mr. BECKER: He will have the chance, because it has always been the prerogative of the Public Accounts Committee to question the Auditor-General and seek information from him. It is certainly my intention to ascertain why the format of the Auditor-General's Report was changed. I believe that there is a reason. I refer, for example, to the South Australian Health Commission. For the past 15 years we have had quite critical reports of the Health Department, now the Health Commission, and this year for the first time we are unable to use comparative tables. Indeed, we find very little indeed in the report. So, I am very disappointed in that respect, and I must put forward my protest regarding the efforts of the Auditor-General. Furthermore, the size of some of the printing in it (the tables, balance sheets and so on), having been reduced, makes it extremely difficult to read.

Mr. Keneally: All those three-syllable words.

Mr. BECKER: In the nine and a half years the member for Stuart has been in this place he has never matured. He has been an eternal embarrassment to his Party. When it was in Government and he is now a bigger embarrassment as a member of the Opposition. He is so frustrated.

Mr. Wright: He has never been dropped from the Ministry, though.

Mr. BECKER: He has never been in the damn thing, either, and, after all the years that he has been here, one would have thought that he would be on the Executive, as he is an instant expert on everything, although he knows nothing. So, he is ideal material for the Opposition front bench.

I am pleased that the Deputy Leader is present, because he was for a time the Minister in charge of the Public Buildings Department. We find that the Government's poor supervision of the various departments continues.

It is a shame that we still see references to the lack of supervision of various projects. Mention was made of the great contribution to the community of the Parks Community Centre, and I have no doubt that that is certainly beneficial to the community. Of course, the cost there was about \$14 000 000. Regarding the Parks Community Centre, we find (and I should be interested to know which auditor wrote this) in the Auditor-General's Report:

A structural fault in the ceiling of an indoor swimming pool resulted in additional expenditure of \$55 000 to June.

This is the type of reference that we have been accustomed to reading in the report and the type of reference that Parliament should know about. We have these projects and then find that mistake after mistake has been made after the construction period. How this could have occurred is, of course, something that one would want to know. It is not an isolated case involving poor design and poor architectural supervision. There has always been a dispute as to the actual size of this indoor swimming pool,

which was supposed to be of Olympic standard but which, I believe, falls short by a few inches.

Mr. Keneally: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. BECKER: Two other matters that have concerned me considerably relate to the amount in the previous year's accounts for advertising of Government departments. I have noticed from the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1979 that the South Australian Land Commission spent \$376 775 on marketing. No doubt, a large proportion of that would have been for advertising. The amount spent by the Department of Tourism on advertising promotion for the same period was \$474 000. It is interesting to note that the advertising agent for the Government Tourist Bureau and the Land Commission is none other than Leo Burnett Advertising Agency, which is an American-owned company which is also the same advertising agency used by the Australian Labor Party. I now refer to a statement headed "Boycott this dealer—McRae" that appeared in this morning's *Advertiser*:

South Australian members of the A.L.P. were yesterday urged to boycott a car dealer Adrian Brien Ford Pty. Ltd.

Mr. McRae, A.L.P. member for Playford—

Mr. Keneally: What has this got to do with advertising?

Mr. BECKER: The honourable member must be deaf. I have been talking about the cost of advertising for Government departments, and I have just referred to the A.L.P. advertising agent. Now I am about to link up these remarks in relation to a statement that was made in this House yesterday.

At that time the member for Playford under Parliamentary privilege made derogatory remarks about Adrian Brien Ford Pty. Ltd. Mr. Adrian Brien is not able to defend himself, and what happened yesterday is typical of the remarks that have been made in this House year after year by members of the Opposition.

Mr. Keneally: You were the Opposition Party for nine years.

Mr. BECKER: Even when you were in Government you raved on and criticised people like this; it was shocking. It is just a disgraceful breach of Parliamentary privilege. The member for Playford used Parliamentary privilege to claim that Mr. Adrian Brien was responsible for and paid for an advertisement which appeared during the election campaign. I know that the Opposition has an obsession about some of the advertising authorised by Mr. Nigel Buick and the witch-hunt is on as to who paid for them and who was responsible for them. Mr. Adrian Brien has been singled out for a boycott by the A.L.P. because someone said to the member for Playford that Adrian Brien picked up the bill for the advertisement. Let the member for Playford table some evidence if he can, and let him prove that that is correct. Let me remind the House that we know of the activities of Mr. Graham Bignell and Stillwell Ford. Who do they advertise with, Leo Burnett. Mr. Bignell is a great contributor to the Australian Labor Party, and a friend of the Deputy Leader.

Mr. Keneally: You wouldn't use this place—

Mr. BECKER: Of course not, but let us have a look at what the member for Playford was suggesting. He was suggesting the boycott of Adrian Brien Ford. What will that achieve? Would that create employment?

Mr. Slater: Is this where your new cars are coming from?

Mr. BECKER: The member for Gilles must be so disappointed. As Chairman of the Industries Development Committee he had to rely on the Liberals to help him get by. Boycotting creates unemployment, and that is why

the people voted for the Liberals during the last State election, because they were sick and tired of what was going on. People did not vote for the A.L.P. at the last State election. It is typical of the A.L.P. to attack, under Parliamentary privilege, defenceless businessmen. I said earlier that this had been done many times. I remind the members of this House of the last time the member for Playford was critical of a business person, one Goretzki. The result of that criticism, whether it was valid or not (and I believe it was valid to some degree), was that the "roundhouse" at Glenelg was left sitting there as the most expensive pigeon coop in the State. That criticism destroyed that man's credit; it ruined him and caused his bankruptcy. The member for Playford criticised the man instead of trying to resolve the situation and find out how the business could be helped out of a particular problem. That is why I take umbrage at the tactics that have been used during the past two days.

It is generally known that Mr. Bignell of Stillwell Ford contributed to A.L.P. funds. Does the honourable member think we should ask Liberal supporters to boycott Stillwell Ford? That is not the way we do things on this side of the House. I understand from the business and commercial industry that the whole town is laughing at the member for Playford, and that Mr. Adrian Brien thanks him for the free publicity, which could have the opposite effect, causing more people to get one of his famous "out-of-town deals". I hope Adrian Brien Ford does increase its business. We know the Labor Party has many supporters in industry—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. Before calling the member for Salisbury, I ask honourable members to show the normal courtesy to a member making his maiden speech.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I want to talk today about cutbacks in the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, which are outlined in the Budget, which I feel is an atrocious act by the Government at this time. Before doing so, I want to make some comments about the succession duties debate. In general I will endeavour to keep my remarks more closely allied with the Budget and its proposals than perhaps has been the case at other times today.

We are told that the Government proposes to collect succession duties for at least six months of this financial year, that and the remissions will not operate until 1 January 1980. I feel this is an unprincipled and hypocritical attitude. The Government has said that succession duties are unfair and immoral. If it feels this way about it, in all honesty and conscience it should have back-dated the exemptions to 1 July this year, and also made provisions for the estates that are currently in probate and dated before 1 July. Our stand on this side has been that there is a role for succession and gift duties. We believe they are not unprincipled or immoral taxes. We would argue that all people in life should be able as far as possible to obtain equal opportunities for their children in the life ahead of them. We believe some people should not get an unfair advantage through no actual work of their own.

We would argue that there are already taxes; we know this from the Budget Papers of the State and Commonwealth Governments to which all people are subjected, and perhaps the one that has the greatest effect on the individual is income tax. Income tax, by its very name, implies that it is a tax on income earned through work; people have to work to pay it. Why has it not been said that that is an unprincipled or immoral tax? Why is it not being said that money is being ripped off the people who have earned it by the sweat of their own brow? But

that is not unprincipled or immoral from the Government's point of view. What is unprincipled and immoral is where the money falls into a person's lap without any effort on his part, just by virtue of his place in history, by being the recipient of a gift from someone who knew them or who received money by being the relative of a family who had an estate that could be passed on.

If we look at the proposals put by our Leader before the last election to the people of this State and see what was proposed in regard to succession and gift duties, we will see that the majority of people in this State would not have been liable to pay gift duty or succession duties. If they had to pay such duties, it would have been at a marginal rate of taxation. In regard to income tax, we are allowed only a basic limit of \$3 893 before we pay tax on income earned, and from that point on we pay at a rate of at least 33.5 cents in the dollar. There is only that concession up to \$3 893. The Labor Party was proposing that gift duty would be free of tax up to \$10 000. In other words, a person could have falling into his lap a gift of \$10 000 and he would not pay one cent of tax. He would only have to pay tax on gifts in excess of \$10 000. Likewise, we were proposing that succession duties would not incur any impost until \$20 001 for an adult child or \$50 001 for a child under 18 years. The tax on an estate to an adult child of \$20 001 would have been infinitesimal, but if someone earns an income of \$10 000 or \$12 000 he pays over \$2 000 in income tax.

Where is the protest about that as being an unfair tax? In fact, we on this side believe that tax is the means by which wealth in this country is redistributed for the benefit of all and for the provision of decent services for everyone in society. What particularly concerns me about this Budget is the cutback in the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. That scheme was initiated by the previous Government in 1975, and has done much good for the unemployed people of this State and for the South Australian community. We should all know that the way in which the scheme operated was that any application could be put forward by local government or community groups for assistance with projects that involved at least 60 per cent labour component in the total cost. In many instances, the applications were also supported with funds from the organisations making the application, so that in fact, SURS grants could generate substantial capital flow in local communities. The idea, by the scheme's very name, was for the relief of unemployment, and in a few minutes I will look at the other means that this Budget provides—or fails to provide—for the relief of unemployment.

The scheme provided young people with the opportunity to obtain work experience. It was said on many occasions, printed in the press and reported by employers, that employers were reluctant to hire young people, because they did not have work experience. In the situation that exists in Australia (and I point out that the problem exists throughout Australia, not only in this State), where a vast proportion of young people cannot get work experience, they are being threatened with the possibility of having no work at all for many years to come. They are being threatened with the return of the events that took place during the depression, when some people, on leaving school, found themselves without work for periods of up to 10 years. The SURS scheme was an effort to provide as many people as possible with some work experience, so that when they went to an employer seeking work (as they are doing in their thousands, regardless of the accusations about "dole bludgers" that often come from the other side), they could say, "Yes, I have work experience."

In my capacity as the member for Salisbury, and in my previous capacity as personal assistant to my predecessor, I know of the many examples of young people who have had contact with the office and who have appreciated the valuable opportunity they have had to get work experience, which helped them later on to obtain employment. In fact, a great many of these young people were able, by virtue of participation in the scheme, to obtain employment, in some cases because the employer took them on and in other cases because an employer, impressed with their participation in the scheme, their worthiness having been proven, agreed to take them on.

Another category of people that the scheme aimed to help was people with families who had the misfortune to lose their jobs primarily by virtue of the policies followed by the Federal Government but also because of the international economic situation that has resulted in job loss in this country. Again, I refer to many of the constituents with whom I had contact in my district. Some of those people were family people with children, who had high house mortgages and suddenly found, without warning and through no fault of their own, that their jobs had disappeared and they were unemployed. They faced, first, a serious economic problem: they just did not have the money to meet the demands that I think all of us would regard as legitimate, demands to maintain their own homes and to maintain a family in a lifestyle that is at least adequate. Of course, they faced other problems more serious than that: the social effects of being without work, social effects that for many people are disastrous and have grave effects on the entire family life structure.

I know that in parts of my district, and in other districts, the unemployment effect has been seriously felt. I know that the effect in economic terms has been that many people have literally had to walk out of their houses. They had no option but to do that. Any effort by a State Government to try to alleviate some of those economic problems and the social problems that must result can only be regarded as laudable and praiseworthy. In that light, the SURS scheme deserved praise and accolation. Likewise, the decisions of the present Government to phase out the scheme and not adopt any new project can only be condemned.

There is even more value in regard to the SURS scheme. The scheme not only provided jobs (and that was the primary aim), but it also provided a tremendous contribution to community life as a whole. If one looks at the types of project involved in the SURS scheme, if one goes through all the projects that were approved over the past few years and actually sees what they were involved in, one will see how communities have benefited, how those with jobs have benefited, and how the entire population of this State has benefited in a way that might not have been the case had these projects not existed. I do not intend to go through all the applications that were submitted within my district, but I will mention three of them.

The first application received support not only in my district of Salisbury but also in other areas—the handyman scheme. This scheme was funded by SURS in the Salisbury area for some years, and it provided an invaluable facility for house-bound people, aged people, people who were unable to do their own handyman work and who were unable to pay someone else to do the work for them and who desperately needed these minor jobs done. Many pensioners in the area just did not have someone to fix guttering which might have fallen away and which was distressing them because the house was deteriorating as a result. Other people did not have someone to fix a broken window lock and feared that the house was insecure. The

handyman scheme removed much needless worry by providing people to do minor jobs.

As an unexpected side benefit to the handyman scheme, it also provided a means of referral. It was reported by those handyman schemes that existed in Salisbury and in other areas that, when handymen went to houses to do repair work, they often became aware of social problems that needed professional attention. On their return to respective authorising agencies, the people involved would make it known that someone was in need of a social worker or some other assistance. The matter would then be attended to. These social problems might not have been highlighted had the handyman scheme not existed. I know now that when a handyman scheme makes application for funds, this fact is used as one of the main aims, and is stated as an important function.

Another project in the Salisbury area was the Salisbury North Community Centre. Members will be aware that I represent what is sometimes referred to as an outer urban district. Very often, as other members of outer urban districts know, the development of community facilities tends to lag behind residential development. The residents in many of these areas have to wait many years before they can call on the same extent of community facilities that are available, quite naturally by past development, to people in the inner city areas.

The Salisbury North Community Centre is placed in perhaps the most isolated part of the residential development of the Salisbury district, an area under-served by public transport and all types of community services. Various social problems have resulted from the isolation and financial difficulties I have spoken about, and there is a desperate need for improved community facilities. Because of that need and because of local initiative, the people of the area got together and, through approaches to the local council and then through approaches to the State Government, applied for assistance. Assistance was granted and the community centre was built. I have followed with interest the way in which the centre has developed, and I note with pleasure the extent to which those resources and facilities in the area are being used by the residents of Salisbury North.

They have shown by their use of the facility how desperately needed it had become. Another one, in a similar category, not affecting the same proportion of people, would be the St. Kilda progress hall. Some would say, perhaps, that the small township of St. Kilda, in population terms, does not warrant facilities being given to it, but it is surrounded by a market-gardening area and, because of their isolation, the people have not up until now had community facilities available to them that possibly they have needed. The project perhaps was not viable in strictly economic terms. If they had been required to raise their own funds, they could not have done that but a community need was present, and the commissioners who determined the allocation of funds under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme and referred their decision to Cabinet found the case justified.

They are three of the many facilities—reserves, buildings and otherwise—developed within the Salisbury area. I know that the Salisbury council had made application for other reserves to be developed and buildings to be erected. The need, again, tended to be for the provision of proper facilities for the area. One that has bitten the dust by virtue of the attitude of the present State Government is the case where a reserve needed to be developed in one of the wards of the Corporation of the City of Salisbury. The area housed 3 000 people, and only one hectare of developed reserve had been provided for all those residents. One might say that the automatic

responsibility devolves on the council to do that. It is easy for people with some association with city councils which have had a chance over the years to develop the resources they have needed, but that cannot apply to a corporation that has found its population growing eight-fold in 15 years—far too fast for any reasonable allocation of funds within that council to provide the necessary resources. Hence the application to SURS to provide those 1 200 houses with more than one hectare of reserve. It is a small area, and if all 1 200 chose to use the reserve at the same time, one can imagine how crowded it would be.

That has all gone. We are told that local government should use the Grants Commission. If those who have any knowledge of local councils would study their budgets, they would find the funds allocated under the Grants Commission are already used in other desperately needed programmes and other needs faced by local government. Now, they are suggesting that the buck should be passed, the funds should be squeezed out, and the services cut so that they can provide for this. Schemes such as SURS played a valuable role there.

The Premier made the point that this Government prefers job creation programmes to unemployment relief schemes. Much of the thrust of SURS has been in providing work for those primarily, but not entirely, involved in building projects. The benefit to the Salisbury electorate has been quite obvious. The state of the building industry in South Australia has been woeful for the past few years. The factors causing that are not necessarily local, but also national and international, although certain factors peculiar to the State are involved, such as the heavy reliance on a secondary industry revolving around consumption goods.

Whatever the facts, the housing industry in this State has declined over the past two years. Building figures within the Salisbury area declined from 1 400 houses in 1976 to 900 in 1978. We can anticipate that, if national factors and attitudes improve, and if the international economic situation improves, likewise with this regrowth and consumption expenditure in this State there will be a regrowth in the building industry. It is not a case of creating jobs in a sense, because the jobs are there. The people are there to fill the jobs, but until we can improve the international situation and the national philosophy of our present Federal Government it will not be possible for those houses to be built. The SURS projects took some of the people involved in the building industry who were out of work, suffering the economic and social distress of being without work, and provided them with interim employment. That has been a particularly valuable area that concerns me, as representative of the Salisbury District.

I have touched on the question of job creation and the problems facing this country. Serious problems face the people in this country over the coming decades, but I have found nothing in the Budget papers to indicate that the challenge is being taken seriously. The Leader of the Opposition has gone through the figures to see what has been proposed. Like him, I can find nothing. We are cutting out SURS and replacing it with pay-roll tax concessions as a cost factor. What is that doing to meet the real challenges that this economy faces? We have the prospect of the export of jobs. In my question to the Premier yesterday, I touched on this, particularly in relation to the clothing industry. We are surrounded by countries with cheap labour and poor working conditions, and they are on the verge of flooding this country with cheap imports. Many business men find it a temptation to export their factories and jobs to those countries. I believe this country has an obligation to take part in the economic

development of all the nations of Asia that surround us, but I do not believe that the philosophy of the I.A.C. and of the present Federal Government is the correct philosophy to assist in that economic development.

Jobs are being lost to this country without any means of recouping them. The other serious threat is job loss through technology, again a challenge not faced in the Budget papers. I shall quote some figures prepared by American authorities, indicating that at present in industrialised countries (Australia being one), for every job in primary industry capital involved is of the order of \$50 000 on average. In the secondary sector, for every job required the capital involved is \$30 000. In the tertiary sector, the figure is only \$2 000. Those figures may be of no more than passing interest unless one looks at the flow of employment history.

In the Agricultural Revolution 200 years ago, the mechanisation of agriculture started, and the long historic advance from then until now has resulted in that heavy involvement of capital per job. The effect was for people to leave the land, a fact lamented by many, and take themselves to the cities and, in the birth of the Industrial Revolution, find employment in the factories in the cities.

With mechanisation and advancing technology in the secondary sector, likewise we found, particularly after the Second World War, a flow of people from the factories, a declining share of employment in the secondary sector, a factor noted throughout the industrialised world, and that until now has been taken up in the tertiary sector, in the clerical field and in the commercial and retailing fields, and in all aspects of work involved in the tertiary sector.

Now, the threat appears to us from those figures that, if capital can be invested in the vast amounts in which it has been invested in agricultural and secondary industry, it will be in the natural course of time invested also in the tertiary sector. We have seen in the past two years prospects of the imminent introduction of millions of dollars worth of technology into the tertiary sector. That \$2 000 per person employed in the tertiary sector will increase and will approach much greater figures in the 1980's. If the people go from the primary to the secondary sector, and from the secondary to the tertiary sector, where is it anticipated that they should go from the tertiary sector after they are replaced by technology? I am not going to argue against the introduction of technology into that sector. It will provide very many efficiencies and increases in services to the whole community.

But it is essential that all Governments at least face this challenge and say what they are going to do with the people involved—those who have been displaced by that increase in capitalisation in that sector. There is nothing in the Budget to suggest that the Government has any opinion on that matter, at a time when the Federal Government anticipates the introduction of 10 000 word processors over a three-year period. This means that about 30 000 clerical assistants will be out of work. This is happening right now. Therefore, it demands a response by this Government here and now, not later. I remind members that the member for Hartley (Des Corcoran), when introducing his policy speech, proposed to the people of South Australia that he would face this challenge and have all efforts made to investigate the seriousness of this problem for the State. The aspect of job loss should be faced urgently.

I now examine the Budget in more detail, the Leader having already touched on some of these details. For instance, the State Unemployment Relief Scheme allocation has been cut from \$9 200 000 to nil, and pay-roll tax deductions increase to about \$3 000 000. The \$3 000 000 offer in pay-roll tax concessions, before the

election was advertised, was worth about \$500 for each small business. I shall be interested to see in one year's time how many of those small businesses that obtained the \$500 relief have employed an extra person. They will not be able to employ an extra employee for \$500, but will have to justify out of their own expenditure the extra money needed to pay the salary, perhaps \$10 000. Where will that money come from?

They will only get that money by increasing consumption and those means of stimulation. We will not increase consumption if the level of unemployment in South Australia remains as high as it is or if we do not make serious efforts to alleviate the economic position of the unemployed. The \$500 being given back to these small businesses may be useful for a Christmas box for that firm or may pay the higher land tax that we have been told they will have to pay, but it will not substantially be used for the creation of jobs.

Looking through other lines, we find, under the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, that the amount allocated for the Apprenticeship Commission has increased by about \$70 000. It has not been created afresh; this involves not a new programme, but a minuscule increase.

We find that the Premier made much in his speech of the fact that \$1 400 000 was being allocated to the Department of Trade and Industry for economic development. Last year's figure was \$1 310 000, whereas this year's figure is not \$1 400 000, as stated in the Budget but only \$1 370 000 (or an increase of \$60 000). The Budget papers tend to imply that the magnificent sum of \$1 400 000 is brand new and did not exist previously. The only sum that did not exist previously is \$60 000, which less than compensates for inflation.

I was intrigued to see that an allocation has been made for the building of an industries complex. My eyes lit up when I saw that term. I thought that perhaps this would benefit the people of the State. But, alas, the benefit will be somewhat restricted and isolated, because the industrial complex, costing \$1 300 000, is to be built at the Yatala Labour Prison. Should I direct the unemployed who come to me to that place in order to partake of work? More serious attempts should have been made by this Government in this respect.

I have already said that one of the problems we face is the export of jobs, and jobs lost through technological change. We have the problem of cheap wages and poor working conditions in South-East Asia. We cannot undermine the real standards that have been achieved in this country for our working men and women. We cannot allow those standards to be jeopardised. However, we can say that we have access to cheap land, because the Government is able to make available land and facilities cheaper for developers. The Housing Trust has been doing this for years. We could also have access to cheap fuel. If the Prime Minister and Federal Government had not imposed the impost on fuel in this country, we would have had cheap fuel for industry.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the honourable member for Ascot Park, I indicate that this is his maiden speech, and I ask that he be accorded the usual courtesies.

Mr. TRAINER (Ascot Park): I will deal again with the topic on which I touched yesterday during the grievance debate, a topic that was mentioned two or three times in the speech by the member for Salisbury. I will refer again to the lack of attention given to this subject in the Budget, and I am likely to return to it several times during the course of this Parliament, namely, the lack of attention

given to the problem of uncontrolled technological change. I add my comments to those made by the member for Salisbury. The attitude of this Government both in its campaigning for the 15 September election and in what we have heard from it so far shows that the Government has no awareness whatsoever of the problem of untrammelled technological change.

In his policy speech, the member for Hartley, when Premier, pointed out that, had he been successful in the election, the Labor Party would have set up a technology section in the Department of Labour and Industry, which would have been renamed the Department of Labour and Technology. Earlier in the year the former Premier referred to the establishment of a data processing co-ordinating board to ensure that the introduction of computer technology in the public sector occurred in an orderly manner. He was also to establish a standing committee on technological change in order to minimise any social impact on the public sector, and any information gained by that committee would be shared readily with the private sector.

So far, we have heard nothing from this Government that indicates that it has any awareness of the problem of technological change or of its economic and social implications.

Technological change is not a new phenomenon: it has been with us for centuries. When the landscape of Europe was altered by the industrial revolution, that was technological change. When the blacksmiths became redundant as the car replaced the horse, that, too, was technological change. When containerisation affected this country's ports, that was technological change. But the wharries had the foresight to see what was coming, and held out until some sort of redundancy arrangements were worked out for them.

Redundancy and loss of jobs through technological change are something of which we will be seeing more and more in the next few years. Technological change is not a new phenomenon but has accompanied our civilisation as it has changed through the centuries. However quite a few things are different now about the phenomenon of technological change. One is that technological change used to affect only blue-collar, or manual, jobs, and we used to call it mechanisation or automation. No-one, other than those who lost their jobs, cared much about it. The rest of the community was not interested. Nowadays, white-collar jobs are just as likely to be affected, because the change now involves computers and the phenomenal tasks that they can handle in what I am told are referred as nano seconds. The jobs of bank tellers, officer clerks, typists and draftsmen are now also at risk. Middle-class workers, once they overcome their initial shock of joining the unemployed, are likely to be much more vocal about it than were some of the manual workers of the past.

Apart from the different sections of people now affected by technological change, the most significant thing about it is the speed with which it is happening. The industrial revolution took nearly a century and a half to change the face of the European and British countryside. In the case of the blacksmiths to which I referred earlier, it took three or four decades for the car to displace the horse. But, as Alvin Toffler pointed out in his book *Future Shock*, major changes today take place at an ever-accelerating rate in a period much less than one person's lifetime, and nowhere is this more evident than in the field of computers.

In the 25 years from 1952 to 1977 the cost of 100 000 multiplications by a computer has dropped from \$1.26 to .008 cents. That tremendous change in capacity, the dropping in costs required to carry out tasks that would have involved many people, has taken place in less than a

quarter of a century. The changes are coming faster. A change equivalent to that will take place in the next five years, and in the next period after that the equivalent change will be even quicker. At a meeting of the Australian Institute of Management, Mr. Allan Lloyd of I.B.M. said that it was not only the pace of technological change that was distinguishing today's society but also the breadth of the scale on which that change is occurring. Public and private enterprise, primary, secondary and service industries, travel and entertainment, learning and leisure, are all being cut by advances in information technology.

There seems to be no awareness at all by members opposite of this problem. Judging from what we heard in their policy statements and from what we heard in relation to the Budget, nothing seems likely to be done.

I now refer to the progress that this State is supposed to experience as a result of the election of the Liberal Government. The main thrust of this development seems to involve a bonanza because of mineral development—an eldorado of thousands of new jobs.

Several advertisements in the course of the campaign referred to 7 000 jobs that are going to appear, apparently almost by magic. However, to those 7 000 jobs we will have to add the 700 that will have to be found to make up for the 700 jobs that will disappear because of the Government's inaction in relation to the Bank of Adelaide. Another 60 will have to be added to the list to make up for those who were sacked today at Oldfield's bakery at Albert Park. As far as I can see, the only job that the Liberal Government has found so far is one for the twice defeated Liberal candidate for Mitcham, who has been found a cosy job with the Minister of Community Welfare.

The main thrust of the development seems to be in the mining area. The Premier seems to be suffering from a Midas complex believing that every bit of uranium he touches will turn to gold. Very little was said in the campaign about the development of uranium mining specifically. It was all very low key. The word "uranium" hardly appeared during the campaign. Instead, the magic phrase was "Roxby Downs"; it was "Roxby Downs this" and "Roxby Downs that", and the whole State would be transmogrified overnight by the development of Roxby Downs.

The words "Roxby Downs" became synonymous with the horn of cornucopia itself or with the goose that laid the golden egg. The long lead time needed to develop such a mining bonanza, even if full-scale work started tomorrow, was conveniently ignored.

More importantly, though, the uranium mining aspect was carefully played down before the election.

Since the election, however, we have been informed that it is full speed ahead for uranium development, and the Premier seems to be claiming some sort of mandate for uranium mining. This claim is immoral. In fact there is a double dose of immorality here: the immorality in trying to con the electorate into agreeing that it had voted in favour of such a programme, and the immorality of the uranium mining programme itself.

Aside from that, there is the additional problem that it may all be economic lunacy in any case. Even if the uranium was pouring out of the ground today, it is doubtful whether it could profitably be sold to the shrinking market for uranium overseas. By the time full-scale development of the mines take place (if it does), the trend against nuclear energy will have accelerated even further. On Saturday, we were reminded in the *Advertiser* that contracts that were expounded on at length by the Federal Government concerning the sale of uranium to the

Philippines may not now be going ahead. President Marcos, with some of his corrupt cronies, had organised the construction of a \$1 000 000 000 nuclear plant 100 kilometres west of Manila, which they did not want.

Mr. Max Brown: They don't want it.

Mr. TRAINER: No, they do not.

Members interjecting:

Mr. TRAINER: Some funny things happen in the Philippines. Some of the inner circle of President Marcos's dictatorial regime stood to make enormous profits from deals connected with the Bataan reactor and the scandals associated with this have been well publicised outside that country. Of course, they were not well publicised within the country. However, we are told the following in a report in the *Advertiser* of 13 October:

Construction of the \$1 000 000 000 plant has stopped. It is unable to get a licence to ship equipment from the United States. The United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the agency controlling all reactor exports, is not satisfied with the safety aspects of the project.

Why are they not satisfied with the aspects of this project? They are not satisfied because the nuclear plant is located on the slopes of a volcano and it is near a geological fault. It is not so much that the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission is worried about the lives of Philipinos. Their objection is that it would imperil two of the largest U.S. military bases—Subic Naval Base and Clark Air Base, which are located 20 kms and 100 kms respectively from the site. Note the distances from the nuclear plant of the two air bases whose American personnel were of so much concern to the United States Government. They object to a hazardous nuclear plant 100 kilometres away from one of their bases.

One could be very critical of the intelligence of a planning group putting a nuclear plant on a fault line. One could well say that the Filipinos are not as aware of technology as are people in advanced countries like the United States, Canada and Germany, and that they cannot be expected to know much better. Perhaps one could take some sort of racist line if one was that way inclined, unless one knew that the Americans had also done the same with a Californian nuclear reactor, which was being built on the infamous San Andreas fault line in that State.

The Philippines is one of the two or three major contracts for uranium that Australia was expected to get. What will happen to that market now that the work on the 20 per cent completed Bataan reactor has been suspended? With the Philippines contract fading away and the continuous reduction in the number of reactors planned to be built in the future, the market for uranium is shrinking daily. The bonanza that is hoped for will probably never take place, and the near disaster at Three Mile Island has made it even less likely, as people become more aware of what is really involved in nuclear energy.

I recently saw the film *The China Syndrome*, which other members of the House may have done, and I commend it to every member. It is based around the theme of the ruthlessness of the management of a nuclear plant where there is big money at stake. This money is very much at risk after a near disaster in the reactor. In this film, the management of the plant does everything it can to throw up a smokescreen to hide its mismanagement and the danger that the plant presents to people in the community.

Mr. Payne: Private enterprise in action!

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out that this is the honourable member's maiden speech.

Mr. TRAINER: Some proponents of nuclear energy have been sceptical of the film and have downgraded it as being far fetched and melodramatic. They obviously have

forgotten the suspicious circumstances surrounding the death in 1974 of Karen Silkwood. The critics of this film say that the death of one of the people in the film who takes some documents in order to have them receive media coverage, and so on, but is forced off the road and killed, is melodramatic. Yet, an "accident" very much like that occurred with Karen Silkwood. Some honourable members may have seen the episode on *Four Corners* that dealt at some length with the mysterious circumstances of her death. Karen was an employee of the Kerr-McGee Corporation in Oklahoma, and had discovered evidence of a cover-up with the unsafe handling of radioactive material. It seems clear that she was murdered while on her way to meet a reporter.

Shortly after the film's release, and in spite of all the criticism associated with its release, came what is now the well known incident at Metropolitan Edison's nuclear plant at Three Mile Island near Harrisburg in Pennsylvania. An article in *Time* magazine states:

Reassuring statements spewed from the plant's press spokesmen, sounding as if they were taken right out of the script for the film *China Syndrome*, a thriller that depicts nuclear plant officials as placing greed for profits above their concern for public safety . . . its basic premise will no longer seem so far fetched to those movie-goers until now unattuned to the nation's debate over nuclear power.

The basic premise is that a nuclear power plant is not nearly as accident-proof as its builders proclaim and that the "China Syndrome" is not out of the question. That phrase is used to describe a melt-down dropping the core into the earth, hypothetically continuing through the centre of the earth towards China. Of course, a melt down does nothing of the sort, but continues into the ground until it strikes groundwater, which it turns to steam and then with an explosion almost like the power of a nuclear explosion, it blasts radioactive material into the atmosphere covering a radius of about 50 kilometres from the plant. The article continues:

Ironically, although the film's fictional plant is in California, one of the actors expresses a fear that the disaster would contaminate an area the size of Pennsylvania.

The irony of that line in the film is that all of this will contaminate an area the size of Pennsylvania, and a few weeks later Pennsylvania was the State in which the Three Mile Island incident occurred. *Time* magazine continues:

Even more ironically, what actually happened at Three Mile Island is far more serious than the "event" portrayed at the fictional plant.

But, as *Time* pointed out, the management and its public relations staff were very similar in their activities to those in the film, continually trying to protect the company's financial position by protesting that all was well.

In passing, I must mention the role of the "flak catcher" in today's society, an occupation mercilessly set up by Tom Wolf in his book *Mau-Mau-ing the Flak Catcher*. Flak catchers are those who are hired by companies or institutions to catch all the flak directed against the companies. Perhaps the most famous was Richard Nixon's press secretary, Ron Ziegler, immortalised by the Washington Press Corporation as Ron Zieg-liar. These smooth-tongued, quick-witted individuals are paid well to serve their masters by throwing up a smokescreen of evasions, distortions and soothing platitudes to divert attention away from corporate evil and institutional wrongdoing.

The flak catchers worked pretty hard in trying to divert attention from what was going on at the Three Mile Island plant. At first, everything in the plant was according to routine, said the Metropolitan Edison's top public relations man. A little later he conceded that a "small amount" of

radioactive water had leaked on to the floor of the containment building. Then more smooth, soothing statements about no loss of radiation were made. A Pennsylvania environment department's helicopter flew over the area with a Geiger counter and detected a lot of radiation in the area. The company began to back-pedal. Eventually, it conceded that the "small amount" of water was actually 50 000 gallons, which had overflowed from the primary cooling loop's drainage tank and covered the floor of the reactor building to a depth of several feet. Later, an official of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission claimed the leak was over 250 000 gallons of radioactive water. Some "small amount"!

The sorry story of lies and evasions connected with the company operating the plant at Three Mile Island goes on and on. The company, for example, claimed less than 1 per cent of the nuclear rods had been damaged. N.R.C. investigators claimed 60 per cent. Company officials continued to pretend everything was as normal; nothing untoward or unexpected had taken place. The usual line from some of those who are in favour of nuclear energy (and I do not doubt that some of them sincerely believe the arguments put forward) is that every possible accident has been planned for in the design of nuclear plants. But the problem of a hydrogen gas bubble forming inside the chamber in the heart of the reactor, preventing cooling water from surrounding the rods, had not been anticipated in engineering studies.

We saw all that dramatic coverage of the engineers scratching their heads and suggesting one possible solution after another to the problem, which, had it not been finally treated, would have resulted in the nuclear reactor blowing its top, not as a nuclear explosion but as a release of heat blasting the chamber open and spewing radioactive material into the atmosphere.

How much faith can one have in those who tell us how safe nuclear reactors are and how carefully planned they are? How much faith can we have in profit-oriented companies which indulge in so many lies and evasions, such as the company connected with Three Mile Island? As a local resident said: "I just believed the company when it said it was safe. Now I don't believe it!" American Senator Robert Byrd said: "We've been assured time and time again by the industry and federal regulatory agencies that this was something that was impossible, that could not happen, but it did happen."

More and more incidents will occur like the Three Mile Island incident. Some will not be as serious and some will be worse, and they will cause the uranium market that Australia expects to find, to shrink. The uranium bonanza is a myth. This will happen not only in the Western world, where gradual back-peddalling on the future of the nuclear industry is taking place. Get-rich-quick merchants, who are in favour of ripping uranium out of the ground, and flogging it off quickly, people like Lang Hancock from Western Australia, who is very much in favour of rapid development, get very critical of their opponents. They refer to them as parlour pinkoes, greenies, and so on. They are often identified, by people like Lang Hancock, as being associated with the so-called left.

The comment is sometimes made that people who are critics of the nuclear industry do not say much about the Soviet Union's development of nuclear industry and technology. This argument has little logic. For a start, if one has a sincere opinion about a matter such as this, one could be far more effective in trying to achieve a change in his own country than a change in another country, particularly when that country is normally categorised as being in the enemy camp, so to speak, and also a country such as the Soviet Union which is not very sensitive to

public opinion. One should try to get one's own home in order first. It was with a great deal of satisfaction that I read the report in Monday's *Advertiser* headed "Soviet doubts on A-power". The report stated:

After years of praising nuclear power, the Soviet Union is openly admitting serious doubts over the scope, safety and environmental consequences of her ambitious atomic power programme. Two top Soviet energy specialists say unless the programme is radically altered, more densely populated areas of European Russia may soon reach the limits of their ecological capacity to cope with new nuclear power stations. Academic Nikolai Dollezhal and economist Yuri Koryakin sound the warning in *Kommunist*, the Soviet Communist Party's leading theoretical journal.

I point out that that article was not in a publication printed by dissidents within the Soviet Union. If it was printed in *Kommunist*, a leading journal of the party in the Soviet Union, it must have had the imprimatur of some important people in the Soviet Union. The article continued:

They also caution it would be wrong to assume safe, economical and time-tested technologies have been developed for all aspects of the complex uranium-plutonium fuel cycle. Western scientific sources in Moscow say they are astonished at the critical frankness of the *Kommunist* article.

Soviet officials and the media have tended to ascribe the anti-nuclear movement in the West to misinformed hysteria or machinations by oil monopolies worried about a potential threat to profits.

Just as some very strange things have been said about the anti-nuclear movement in this country, so some strange things are said about it in the Soviet Union.

In this country, opponents of nuclear energy are criticised as being too left wing. In the Soviet Union they are criticised as being tools of the oil monopolies. The explanation given, as stated in the article, is that the oil monopolies fear that nuclear energy is a competitor, and that is a rather strange argument because, as anyone who has looked at the subject is aware, we do not really have oil companies any more: we have energy companies, the giant multi-nationals which have a finger in every energy pie, whether oil, nuclear energy, coal, or anything else. Members of the hierarchy of the Soviet Union, who have been so enthusiastic about developing nuclear energy, just like the get-rich-quick merchants we have on our side of the Iron Curtain, have turned a blind eye to some of the hazards of nuclear energy, and they have been very critical of the anti-nuclear movement.

As I have said, this statement appeared in the leading journal of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, *Kommunist*, which indicates their imprimatur. It is not attributed to the radical dissidents in the Soviet Union, it comes from the top.

The profit motive may not have been there, but until this moment the apparatchiks of the U.S.S.R. have been just about as dedicated towards the development of nuclear energy as a lot of Western industrialists. Their programme of development of reactors in recent years, as has been said on occasion, may have been a lot less haphazard than the sort of construction that has taken place in the United States, where the profit motive is king.

The reason why the Soviet Union may have been a little more careful about the development of their nuclear reactors may be because of a horrendous accident that took place in the 1950's. That was during the earlier, even more naive, days of nuclear energy development. Some members may have seen the recent review of the book *Nuclear Disaster in the Urals* by the exiled Soviet scientist, Zhorez Medvedev. In the book review in Saturday's *Advertiser*, the article said, in respect of a no longer

existent town called Kyshtym:

Twenty-five years ago, this area in the Soviet Urals, one of the most densely populated parts of Russia, was a thriving industrial community centred on the town of Kyshtym. Close to 150 000 people lived in the immediate vicinity of Kyshtym back in the mid-1950s; today, its doubtful whether 50 000 of them are still alive. Some of the people died almost instantly when, late in 1957, their homes were blasted off the face of the earth by a shattering explosion.

Others died within months from the terrible effects of radiation poisoning. And still more people died years later from leukaemia and other cancers. Some people are still dying today as a result of that explosion more than 20 years ago. And the effects of the deadly radiation released by the disaster are still felt today and will continue to be felt far into the 21st century.

It seems that highly radioactive nuclear waste had been buried at insufficient depth with inadequate cooling and it exploded. As stated in the article, thousands died immediately, thousands more died within weeks and thousands more later on from leukaemia and other radiation effects. Medvedev's story is backed up by a Soviet Jewish scientist who emigrated a few years ago to Israel. He said:

In 1960, I had occasion to make a trip by car through an area in the Urals. We travelled mostly by night but after sunrise, we could see the countryside and huge signs on the road. The signs warned drivers not to stop for the next 30 kilometres and to drive through at maximum speed and with all windows shut. On both sides of the road as far as one could see, the land was "dead" and no villages or towns existed, only the chimneys of destroyed houses.

There were no cultivated fields, no herds, no people. Nothing. The whole area was exceedingly "hot". An enormous area had been laid to waste, rendered useless and unproductive for a very long time, for hundreds of years. Later, no-one was openly prepared to discuss with me what I had seen. I know that 100 000 people were evacuated from the area and that many of them later died.

And this secret was not secret to the top circles of people in the United States, because as the book review states:

Ironically, the American C.I.A. had known for years what happened in and around Kyshtym but for its own reasons, the C.I.A. had, over the years, always claimed that the accident was a myth.

Why would the C.I.A. pass up an opportunity for a major propaganda coup for so long? A nuclear incident affected 150 000 people inside the Soviet Union, and yet the C.I.A. never said boo about it. What sort of motivation could lie behind that sort of suppression? When Medvedev eventually went into exile in the United Kingdom he was surprised that no-one in the West knew about this disaster, which was common knowledge among many Russian scientists. When he mentioned it a couple of years ago in a British magazine, he was even more astounded at the reaction, which is explained in the book review, as follows:

Immediately and unexpectedly, the reference became front page news and newspapers were flooded with denials. These denials came not from the Soviet Union—which said nothing—but from nuclear experts in France, Britain and the United States.

Sir John Hill, the Chairman of Britain's Atomic Energy Authority, dismissed Medvedev's remarks as "science fiction". Medvedev was hurt and more than a little shocked. After all, had not the Soviet Union revoked his citizenship because he had refused to toe the line and "bend the truth" in his scientific work?

After ploughing through dozens of Soviet scientific publications and through C.I.A. files released under the American Freedom of Information Act, Medvedev has

released his book as a gentle warning to be careful, and he has said:

I hope my book at least makes people think. One wonders if it will make this Government think.

Mr. KENEALLY: Mr. Speaker, for the third time this afternoon I draw your attention to the numbers in the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Dr. HOPGOOD (Baudin): One of the continuing themes in Australian political history is federalism. It is difficult to find one of the larger matters that have come before both the Commonwealth Parliament and the State Legislatures that have not been coloured in some way by this underlying structure of federalism. It is something which newcomers to this country find difficult to understand. However, the more one looks into the great political battles of the past, the more one sees the realities of federalism as having very much shaped the course of these political battles.

One can go back to the Braddon clause, or one can come forward to the present theme of new federalism. In between that time, one can look at one of the very few referenda that have ever been passed: the fateful referendum about the Loan Council in 1927. Or, one can talk about the arrangement that was made with the States early in the Second World War in relation to uniform taxation. All of these things spring from the fact that the Commonwealth Constitution does not interfere fundamentally with the sovereignty of the States and the legislation that originally set them up. Therefore, the framework against which this Budget is presented to us is one of new federalism, which is the newest of themes in this continuing process.

It must be said that in a sense new federalism has been somewhat of a dead letter. The reason for that is that although the Commonwealth has passed the legislation that enables the States to levy taxation measures in line with undertakings that were given by the Fraser Government, none of the States has been prepared to take it up. However, and more importantly, the old Whitlam formula has continued. Therefore, there is a sense in what was happening before the introduction of new federalism has continued to be the bedrock of Commonwealth-State financial relationships. That process is about to come to an end; the formula is about to run out. This will give the Federal Government and those State Governments that are prepared to play ball with it the opportunity to introduce a full measure of new federalism.

The relevant pages of the Financial Statement by the Premier on this matter make fascinating reading indeed because they seem to be running a fine line between what, on the one hand, is an objective account of what is going on and, on the other hand, a political gloss which has been put on it. We have to appreciate that that is the very nature of the document with which we are dealing. It has basically been drafted by public servants who have been concerned with objectivity and some continuity of what has been seen as the Treasury line from former days. However, on top of that, the Premier's political censors have written their own gloss. They seem to be having a bob each way as far as new federalism is concerned. The biggest test for the Premier will come when he has to front up to the meeting of the Premiers with the Prime Minister and the Treasurer to determine what the new arrangements will be. So far his track record has not been all that great. We know what sort of response he got from the Prime Minister in regard to the Bank of Adelaide.

Mr. Slater: One fight, one loss.

Dr. HOPGOOD: Yes. One would hope for the benefit

and future of South Australia that the next fight will be a win for the present Premier. Paradoxically, his own election results do not altogether help him in this regard because, with the Prime Minister, we are dealing with not a pragmatist but with an ideologue. He has a strong belief in what he has been trying to do and can only be frightened out of this course of action. The electors of South Australia did very little to put any fear into the mind and heart of the Prime Minister that short time ago. So, paradoxically, the Premier's very success at the polls will not help him when he has to front up in Canberra to discuss the future of Commonwealth-State relations.

I make no bones of the fact that I believe that, in the present state of the Constitution, it is desirable that the bulk of revenue should be collected centrally by the Commonwealth. I do that for two reasons: first, I believe that having the large say in the collection of revenue does give the Commonwealth some considerable control, if it is prepared to use it, over the state of the economy. There is no doubt, if one compares the sort of interest that is shown generally by the people and the media in this document before us with the interest shown in the Federal document, as to where people see the stress lying. It is not simply that in one case we are dealing with a Budget smaller than that of, say, the London council and, on the other hand, we are dealing with a document for the whole of a nation. It is also due to the fact that the Commonwealth Budget is seen as being a prime document and a weapon in the way in which the economy is tackled. The State Budget in the past has usually been seen as largely irrelevant to the state of the economy and that, by and large, with one or two minor caveats, seems to be a fairly reasonable and realistic perception on the part of people and the media generally. Therefore, first, it is realistic and desirable that the bulk of revenue raising should occur at the Commonwealth level because that enables them to have some control over the economy.

Secondly, we have the fact that the taxes which are available to the States are a rag-bag of fairly undesirable sorts of taxes being largely regressive in effect. Progressive income tax has always seemed to be the most desirable means of raising public revenue, and that has been, since the war years, in the province of the Commonwealth. New federalism opens up the possibility that the States should come back into this area. Anybody would understand that that is not a political reality. None of the States wants to get back into that area.

Mr. Evans: Tell us why.

Dr. HOPGOOD: Because the people will not stand for it. Certain political limits are placed on the activity of any Government, and I believe that any Government that is branded with the label "double taxation" will be in great difficulty indeed. Why is that necessary? Why is it that the Liberal Party, at the Commonwealth level, has seen fit to turn around in such a dramatic way from the 1960's, when Sir Henry Bolte wanted new federalism and the then Prime Minister, John Gorton, said, "We are not going to collect it for you"? Bolte dropped it like a hot cake because doing it at purely the State level would have cost him more to raise the revenue than he would have got in revenue. I do not want to explore the reason for that drastic change that has occurred in the Liberal Party's thinking at the Commonwealth level. Let it be noted that, where a State finally does give in and take advantage of the Commonwealth legislation, then it is Commonwealth legislation and has been introduced. The Liberal Party cannot avoid the accusation that it is its Government in Canberra which has opened the way for this to happen.

I reiterate what my Leader said in relation to industrial development in this State, and many figures can be quoted

in support of the fact that there has been some considerable improvement in that situation in recent months. It is interesting that the Premier, in his statement, takes account of this, because he states:

While the employment situation is still far from satisfactory, there have been some signs recently that economic activity is beginning to pick up.

None of that was said from the Liberal side during the election campaign. I wonder whether the Premier really intended that to go into the document or whether it was one of the objective factors in the document which escaped the political gloss put on it by the Premier's censors.

I mentioned in the House the other day the matter of the Noarlunga regional centre and the fact that that is an objective indication of the fact that the business community generally did have confidence in the future of this State. I briefly reiterate that matter, because it was obvious from the speaker who followed me on the Government side that he completely misheard what I said. Despite the fact that in that area there has been a drastic flattening off in population growth (with which I do not want to quarrel—it was necessary for there to be some breathing space for what was the most rapidly developing area in the metropolitan area), and despite the fact that a 75 000 population predicted in the 1960's and even later when this investment was first being considered now turns out to be 58 000, nonetheless the Labor Government was able to get that investment. When the Premier opened that shopping centre, he proclaimed open a monument to the confidence that those investors had in the State of South Australia. We are not talking about an ideal situation. We are talking about a situation in which many projected customers were simply not there on the ground. Nonetheless, investment took place.

While I am talking about the matter of local issues, other of my colleagues have talked about the SURS scheme. I regret that it is being wound up, not only because of the benefits it had in the employment sphere and the way in which it was able to get people back into jobs again as a transitional scheme but also because of the enormous benefit it had for local areas. This was not a matter of picking up sand dunes, carting them 10 yards and dumping them down again, which seemed to be the old depression era caricature of job creation schemes. Two projects in the southern areas, which, over the years, have provided a great deal of benefit to people in the south may illustrate how useful this scheme has been. If during the time that I was member for the expanding area, which was the old seat of Mawson, I had not been able to secure the agreement of the then Government for the development of the Southern United Netball Association complex at Morphett Vale east, now in the electorate of the present member for Morphett, I might not be standing in this place with a broken arm.

However, it is certainly true that this complex has been of enormous benefit to the people in the south. It would not be there today, had it not been for the SURS scheme. The O'Sullivan Beach community house was a smaller and a more modest project that has been of enormous benefit to an area that is rather limited in recreation facilities, partly because of the nature of the topography of the local area. They are just two projects that have been of enormous benefit to the people in the south, and I could go on expanding on this theme. I do not want to do that; instead, I will turn to those aspects of the Budget concerned with education expenditure, because already we can see in that area a gap developing between promise and performance.

If there is one person who should be somewhat

embarrassed here and now from reading this document, surely it would be the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers (Mr. John Gregory) who, in effect, recommended, during the campaign, to teachers and parents associated with schools, that they should vote for the Liberal Party on the score of that Party's education policy. I wonder what that gentleman now thinks of this document which, no doubt, he has had time to digest at some length.

It is interesting to note that, when we look at a recent edition of the *Teachers Journal*, we can see that Mr. Gregory has met with the Minister of Education, who has said that he would strive to honour his Party's promises in the forthcoming Budget—not over the three-year period of the life of this Parliament, but in the forthcoming Budget. Without subjecting the House to a detailed lecture on the sort of thrust coming through the present Minister of Education's policy when he was the education spokesman, I will make a *precis* in which I list the following: there would be provision for 3½-year-olds in kindergartens and pre-schools generally; extra staff would be provided for primary schools; and there would be reduced teacher rents. I await with much interest the debate on the lines, when the Bill goes into Committee, to see whether I can get more detailed information from the Minister of Education as to how "in the forthcoming Budget" those commitments are being honoured.

Let us take, for example, the matter of reduced teacher rents. One is well aware of the problem that the Teacher Housing Authority faces. I can recall the late Mr. Ramsay, when I was Minister of Housing, once telling me that, whereas most of us die with the name "mother" engraved on our hearts, public housing commissionaires die with the rate of interest engraved on their hearts. Undoubtedly the fact that the Teacher Housing Authority has not had access to reduced interest money has been one of the prime problems. Even so, it has not done too badly, if one looks at the rents teachers pay, compared with the rents of Housing Trust tenants, all of whom these days get only rental accommodation from the trust on a means test basis and some of whom, because of reasons of hardship, are on reduced rents below that. That is basically the problem.

The only way out of it is for the Government to provide some sort of subsidy to the Teacher Housing Authority so that this can happen. I will be fair to the Minister and say that I may have missed this in the Budget papers; I am not suggesting omniscience in this matter. All I can find in the Budget papers is that the authority is to be provided with \$1 000 000 as part of the Loan Works Programme. I imagine that that is less than the authority expected it would get. What will be the rate of interest on that? It will be exactly what the State has to pay on any Loan works money. There is no prospect from that \$1 000 000 that there will be a reduction in teacher-housing rents. All that will happen as a result of that \$1 000 000, if that is all the Minister is going to do, is that the authority will get into, I would imagine, deeper water, because the alternative is to increase rental charges. That is quite contrary to what he and his Government have said they will do.

Nowhere in any of the revenue expenditure can I find any allocation of moneys to the authority that would enable some subsidy to be built into the interest rate which, as far as I can see, is the only way in which rents on teacher-housing premises can be reduced. The Government may well have some defence in this matter by saying, "We will do it next year or the year after," that it is all part of the life of this Parliament. The Minister has said to the institute that the Government will endeavour to honour its promises in the forthcoming Budget. Who is being fooled?

Mr. Evans: Did he say that?

Dr. HOPGOOD: The journal states:

The Minister for Education, Mr. Harold Allison, stated that his Party's education policy was expansionary when he met with a SAIT deputation soon after his election. SAIT President John Gregory reported, "The Minister later added that he would strive to honour his Party's promises in the forthcoming Budget."

SAIT expects that the new Liberal Government in South Australia will honour its promises in education in the same way that it has honoured its promises in pay-roll tax cuts, etc.

Mr. Evans: It didn't say "immediately".

Dr. HOPGOOD: What does the "forthcoming Budget" mean, but the document in front of us? Perhaps the Minister of Education was using a form of words he believed would fool Mr. Gregory. It may have fooled him. Judging by his performance during the election campaign and his inability to be able to look into the real meaning of Liberal Party policy, that may not be a difficult task.

Another promise was in relation to 3½-year-olds in pre-schools. This is a sad story because, as I think I have told the House before, the Commonwealth at one time used to fund 75 per cent of the total cost of youngsters in pre-schools. It will in this financial year, I understand, fund about 25 per cent, a complete mirror image of the situation that occurred some years ago under the Whitlam Government. This financial year is the first financial year for three years in which the Commonwealth has not reduced its allocation for pre-school services in money terms. We are getting the same as we got last year, and this is a reduction in real terms. The strain coming on to the provision of pre-school services has been as a result of the enormous reduction of effort from the Commonwealth in this area, and the State has had to pick up the tab. The point I make for the Minister is that, in relation to extending its policy to the 3½-year-olds, he will get not one brass razoo from the Commonwealth unless it changes its policy, because the funding operating from the Commonwealth, small though it be, relates only to those who are four years of age and older. So, far from having to find three-quarters of the total cost, as the Government does at present, it will have to find 100 per cent of the total cost of this initiative. Where do we find in the document any indication that the State will make that effort and be able to find the total of the expenditure to be able to do the job? Nowhere in the document is there any indication that the amount of the increase which has been made available to the Childhood Services Council will be able to do that job.

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

Dr. HOPGOOD: The other problem that I believe the Minister of Education has about delivering up his promise in the pre-school area is in relation to capital money. What I have said so far relates to recurrent expenses. It is a lamentable fact that no capital finance has been available from the Commonwealth for this purpose for about three years. The only capital finance that has been available to the State has been Loan borrowings, which are outside the Loan Council arrangements and under the Kindergarten Act.

I will be interested, during the debates on the lines, to find out from the Minister what assumptions he is making about how active the Kindergarten Union will be allowed to be in raising this sort of loan finance. I will also be interested in what provision has been set aside in the lines to service this money. Largely, the commitment must be picked up in areas that depend on capital facilities. There are many parts of the metropolitan area where there are under-used capital facilities.

They are largely the areas where the 3½-year-old children are enrolled and where kindergartens have scoured the countryside for any three-year-old children they can find to try to keep up their rolls and avoid the possibility of being rationalised out of some fraction of their staffs. It is in the new areas where often only 4½-year-old children can get enrolment. The solution to that is not only recurrent money: it is also capital facilities having to be built where no facilities are available. Therefore, I predict that the Minister's problems will be more difficult on the capital side than on the recurrent side.

The other matter was the sort of promise that was not spelt out in much detail. That was about additional staffing resources going into primary schools. The last two years of office of the Labor Government saw almost all additional staffing resources going into primary schools. There is also a promise of additional facilities being provided. I cannot see that this is being provided for in this Budget, because the other problem that the Minister has is that new schools must be opened and staffed next year. They cannot be staffed completely by the deployment of staff from other schools, so what additional money he has will have to go into that area and into financing increments. That is another gap between a promise and the delivering of it. However, I can try conclusions with the Minister on that matter later.

One area in which the Minister has started to move towards fulfilment of a commitment is in regard to non-Government schools. That is fairly obvious, because I know what is required to fund those schools at 20 per cent of State standard cost. The figure was given by the former Premier before the recent election, and I think it was \$9 997 000. On the line for per capita grants for independent schools, it is listed at \$10 270 000, so a little extra is being made available to non-Government schools, and I will be interested to know how close that amount gets the Minister to the magic 25 per cent of State standard cost.

Perhaps what is more important than that is the basis on which this money will be disbursed, because it is interesting to note that the Treasury officials continue to list this under per capita grants for non-Government schools, whereas I should have thought everyone knew that the vast bulk of that \$10 000 000 is not distributed as a per capita grant, but is distributed by the so-called Medlin committee under a needs funding formula.

The per capita grant has not increased in the past nine years. It is still where it was under the Hall Government and it is only a small proportion of total expenditure. I and many other people are interested in whether the funds will be disbursed largely in accordance with the needs formula that was operated before the Medlin committee and the Cook committee or on another basis, or whether we are going to get back to the old per capita funding, which takes no account of the real needs that occur in these non-Government schools. The Opposition is extremely interested in this matter and is keen to see that there is a retention of needs-based funding. Let Government members remember that their colleagues in Canberra fund on a needs basis that is more steeply graduated than occurs under the Medlin committee here. Liberals elsewhere do not see needs funding as necessarily damaging their own political Party.

In any event, I am keen to see that needs funding remains as it is, and I think that most people in the non-Government schools area are keen to see the same thing. With that small caveat, I think I have shown that in this Budget there is a gap with this Government between promise and performance. If the Minister has been

misquoted by Mr. Gregory in the report on the front page of the journal, I assume that he will take action to correct that. The Minister may be assuming that he will be bailed out by Supplementary Estimates next year. All I need say on that, as has been said by my Leader, is that the Government has been extremely optimistic about its revenue returns. When the Labor Party has been in Government, we have been able to bring in Supplementary Estimates because a windfall has occurred later in the year and more revenue has come in than was expected. I think it most unlikely that the optimism in the Budget will be rewarded. If that is so, the Minister and the Government will have to find other ways to deliver on the rash promises on revenue made during the election campaign.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill. I congratulate you on your elevation to your high position in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and likewise I congratulate the other members who have been elevated to positions.

Mr. Keneally: I thought you fellows were serious about the Budget.

Mr. MATHWIN: We are. It is all very well for the member for Stuart, who is an authority on collective farming, to interject so early in my speech. I also congratulate my constituents on having wisely re-elected me as the member for Glenelg, with an increased majority. It has increased from the old days of a majority of 1.3 per cent to the position where I received about 64.5 per cent of the votes. That proves that we have worked very hard in our area.

There are new members on both sides of the House, and I wish them well and hope that they will serve their constituents honestly and well in this place. The position in the coastal electoral districts has been marvellous. We have my colleagues in Alexandra (there is a slight deviation in Baudin) and Mawson, which is held by one of our new members. We hold the districts of Brighton, Glenelg, Hanson, Morphett, and Henley Beach. We have a consolidation along the coast and, if we stand firm (as we will), we will not be moved.

Members on the other side of the House can look forward to a long spell in Opposition; they may as well get comfortable in their seats. It was interesting to see the influx of new members in the Legislative Council. I congratulate them on their election. In fact, an opponent of mine in a previous election, Miss Barbara Wiese, is now a member in the other place. Obviously, the experience she gained when she stood against me has enabled her to gain a seat in the Upper House. Thereby hangs a tale; if you want success, stand against the member for Glenelg!

I congratulate the Government and the Premier on the good Budget that has been presented. In his speech, the Premier mentioned that the rate of unemployment in South Australia has been higher than the national average for 16 consecutive months and is now the highest of all the States—so much for the unemployment relief schemes of the previous Government, although we heard so much about them in the grievance debates yesterday and today. Whether those schemes have achieved permanent employment for anyone is arguable, because it seems that few of the people who worked on them have been able to obtain permanent employment. The important thing about any employment scheme is that it should create permanent employment, but the previous Government, in some cases, spent money to keep the unemployment figures down and to keep the position from looking worse than it did.

The Premier, in the Budget speech, said that this Budget provides for:

The abolition of succession duty on the property of a

person who dies on or after 1 January 1980.

The abolition of gift duty on all gifts made on or after 1 January 1980.

The abolition of stamp duty on the purchase of the first home, or housing allotment, up to the value of \$30 000 with effect from 1 November 1979—

the very good reasons for that date being set were given by the Premier—

The basic exemption level under the Pay-roll Tax Act to be increased from \$66 000 to \$72 000, tapering back to \$32 400 at a pay-roll level of \$131 400—with effect from 1 January 1980.

The statements prove that we, as a Party, believe in low taxation, which is quite a different view from that taken by the Labor Party. The Premier continued:

Those concessions are estimated to cost about \$4 100 000 in 1979-80 and about \$20 000 000 in a full year.

The Premier said that the Government is committed to a policy of lower taxation, which, of course, is quite a different attitude from the socialist or Labor Party approach to high taxation. Socialism means that wealth is redistributed, and therefore high taxation must be introduced. People must be taxed to the hilt to provide all the things that are to be provided to so many people on the so-called free list. That is known as welfare from the cradle to the grave. Indeed, some of the socialist Parties have got there before the cradle, and have a tax on death, after the grave, so the socialists really get into the principles of taxation.

I draw to the attention of this Parliament that this Government intends to spend more money on promoting tourism, which I believe was a lost cause so far as the previous Government was concerned. Over the years we saw it pushed from one Minister to another. When I came into this place, the Premier had tourism under his wing. Later, he off-loaded it on to one of his Ministers. After that it was transferred from one Minister to another. I thought it was a poor effort on the part of the previous Government. Tourism is a money spinner and the sooner people realise that the better. It brings advantages to everyone in the community. The Government is going to lift the amount spent on tourism from \$2 600 000 to \$2 800 000 this year, so we should see some improvement in tourism. I hope that the Government sees fit to provide more money for advertising to stimulate the tourist industry. In some countries in Europe, tourism is one of the first five industries. I refer particularly to Italy, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

Like many others in the community, I shared the Premier's concern about where the State was going under a socialist Government. Those people spoke at the last election in no mean manner, when they showed that they were concerned about where this State was heading. They were concerned about the many factors of socialism that were being pushed by the previous Government. South Australia was lagging in every area. Capital investment on major mining projects was only 1.5 per cent of the national total. The building industry, which has had a proud record in the years since I have been in this place, has had a shocking record under the Labor Government. New dwelling commencements were down 50 per cent in the past three years under the Labor Government. Once there is a depression in the building industry there are problems generally; that is the beginning of them.

I believe that waste was rampant under the previous Government. One has only to think of the Frozen Food Factory. The latest Auditor-General's Report, prepared this year, did not give a good account of the Frozen Food Factory. There was no consolidated balance sheet for members to peruse and it was difficult to find out what was

the situation of the factory. My colleague, the member for Hanson, pointed out to me that, in the five months to 24 November 1978, the loss was \$563 103. There is no mention of that in the Auditor-General's Report. In 1978, there was a further loss of \$122 286, making a total of \$685 389.

Interest in 1978 was \$600 000, computer costs were \$35 000, and preliminary expenses were another \$209 000, making an approximate cost to the taxpayer of \$1 500 000 for the Frozen Food Factory.

In the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1978, honourable members can see the effect of this white elephant that was imposed on South Australia by the former Government. At page 242 of his 1978 Report, the Auditor-General stated:

Cost of Frozen Food Factory and Equipment:

The estimated cost of the project in January 1974 when submitted to the Public Works Standing Committee was \$4 275 000; revised to \$7 000 000 at the time the project was approved in April 1975; and to \$8 949 000 at 30 June 1978.

Payments from loan funds (Government Buildings, Land and Services—Hospital Buildings) were \$8 690 000 (\$2 041 000 in 1977-78).

The cost of land has not been brought into the accounts. Land was purchased in 1974 for \$501 000; however, portion only was utilised for the Frozen Food Factory.

Honourable members can see the high cost of this white elephant to the State, and that cost will remain. That project points to the bad administration of the previous Government.

In his 1979 report, the Auditor-General indicates that the accumulated deficit for the South Australian Film Corporation was \$2 152 000, and that the State Transport Authority cost taxpayers a contribution of \$44 200 000. At page 271 of his report, dealing with the Monarto Development Commission, the Auditor-General states:

Significant features for 1978-79:

The excess of expenditure over income and funds for the year was \$1 701 000.

Interest on borrowed funds amounted to \$2 235 000 (\$2 073 000 in 1977-78), of which payment of \$1 452 000 was deferred.

Staff establishment decreased from 17 at June 1978, to nine at June 1979. There were 65 full-time staff employed at June 1975.

So much for that undertaking of the former Labor Government and the high cost of the project to the taxpayer.

I now turn to a further blunder by the former South Australian Government, the South Australian Land Commission. The previous Government was warned by me and by other honourable members of my Party. We pointed out the folly of this sort of operation and the problems that it had caused in the United Kingdom, where the British Labour Government had dispensed with its land commission and the nationalisation of land. This made no difference whatever to the former Government, which continued on in its search for a land commission. At page 338 of his report, the Auditor-General states:

The commission was established under the provisions of the Land Commission Act, the administration of which is committed to the Minister for Planning.

The functions of the commission under that Act are to acquire, manage and develop land for the present and future urban expansion with the primary objective of providing land to persons who are without large financial resources.

Honourable members would think that the land held by the commission would be much cheaper than land being sold by private enterprise, which, of course, is not true; that does not apply at all. The Auditor-General's Report

continues:

Significant Features:

There was a deficiency of \$1 748 000.

Provisions have been established for decreases in land and other asset values of \$1 837 000.

Sales increased by \$2 252 000, 39 per cent . . .

Again, honourable members can see the folly of the previous Government in respect of another of its little schemes. A similar situation relates to the Government Clothing Corporation. The story unfolds like the chapters of a bad book, which, if read thoroughly, could give one nightmares. At page 368, the Auditor-General indicates a deficit for the year of \$65 838. Obviously, the former Labor Government could not run a clothing factory, either. From information that I have gleaned, I understand articles obtained from the factory are much more expensive than are similar articles obtained from private enterprise areas; private companies can supply uniforms and garments much more cheaply than can the Government-owned factory, which was established by the former Labor Government.

At page 369 of his report, the Auditor-General deals with the State Government Insurance Commission. A similar situation applies, and the report states:

Features of the annual operations:

The net profit for the year on account of general insurance was \$1 859 000, which reduced the accumulated loss to \$618 000. Compulsory third party bodily injury insurance incurred an underwriting loss of \$17 598 000.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will please resume his seat.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member for Napier has had his fun. When things are different they are not the same! When the honourable member's Party was in Government there was often less than a quorum in this place, but it was very rare for the Opposition to call for a quorum to be present. That is the honourable member's right, and I suppose that he has to get some fun out of life. He has had a hell of a pasting from his electorate, and no doubt he is a bit sore around the ribs. There are only four Opposition members in the Chamber.

Mr. Slater interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: Opposition members are permanent sleepers, anyway. They have not made any contribution to this place in the 10 years I have been here. I refer now to the nationalisation schemes introduced by the socialist Government that has since been removed from office. We have seen socialist Governments in other parts of the world, too, removed from office. For example, the Swedish socialist Government was removed from office; the people of Norway, after 40 years, saw the light and removed the socialist Government there from office; further, in the United Kingdom, Mrs. Thatcher was successful in defeating the socialist Government there, with the result that sunny Jim is now in the midst of a power struggle within his Party. If he remains Leader of his Party, it will be by the grace of his staunch supporters.

The lurch to the left that occurred in the countries to which I have referred occurred in South Australia, too. The Labor Government here threatened to remove the law of tort for trade unionists; that would have made everybody else second-rate citizens. The member for Peake made some remarks last night about the member for Henley Beach and me. He said that he was the President of the Australian Workers Union, yet he does not know the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act in relation to balance sheets of unions in South Australia.

He reverted to the old adage: if anybody disagrees with a trade union he is a scab. If he has been brought up in that way, he should read the Act. As President of a union, he ought to know it. If he reads the Act, he will see that it is impossible for any member to see the balance-sheet unless he is a member of the union and unless he obtains permission from the Industrial Court. Then and only then is he able to peruse it; he is not able to have a copy of it. The member for Peake, as past President of a union, ought to know that. He should not come in here blabbing his bib off about Government members, some of whom are good trade unionists.

Opposition members should not think that they have the sole rights to trade unions, because they have not. Many thousands of trade unionists belong to the Liberal Party, and many more thousands of trade unionists vote for the Liberal Party. Unfortunately, at present unions take money from their members' wages and they give a sustentation fee to the Labor Party. We know that a ratio is worked out, not forgetting that the person who keeps the ratio reasonable then has the advantage when he puts up his hand at preselection ballots at the Trades Hall.

Let us consider the case of a candidate for preselection who works hard in his district and within the Labor Party branches in his district, only to find that, when the preselection ballot takes place, a union representative who has command of 9 000 or 10 000 votes puts his hand up; then, the candidate to whom I referred is gone, unless he can do a deal. The heir apparent to the Semaphore District was planning to come into this place through left-wing unions having command of a large block of votes; he thought he had it made, but he did not read correctly the attitude of the people in the Semaphore District. He thought he did not have to bother any more, but he got a shock. What a way of choosing a candidate for an election!

Mr. Slater interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: If the member for Gilles, who was previously a union secretary, really wants to do something for his Party he will have that rule altered. The socialists are always blabbing about one vote one value. Let us see how good they are at their next conference in connection with one vote one value. Will the Labor Party have one vote one value when preselecting candidates?

Mr. Plunkett interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: If the honourable member has already given his maiden speech, we will give him a bit of stick next time he speaks. I support this responsible Budget which I believe will rationalise and reduce running costs in hospitals. I know that the State will go well under the Liberal Party and that the members of the Opposition, as I said earlier, had better get comfortable, because they are going to be there for a long, long time.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): The Government has presented to this House a rather negative Budget, yet in introducing this Bill the Premier stated that the prime concern of the Government was the economy of South Australia. He made particular play in regard to the promotion of the private sector as against the Public Service. If this State Government or any State Government in Australia is going to stipulate what the economy should be to any marked degree, then of course the impetus must essentially come from the Federal Government, and a change of economic strategy by the Federal Government is imperative for this to occur.

The Premier stated that the Government was committed to a policy of lower taxation. The Premier is also committed to the development of the State's natural resources, although he said that in common with other State Governments his Government faces a difficult

financial situation, with major uncertainties in the area of Commonwealth funding. So he more or less admitted that the Commonwealth must change its economic strategy if the State is to prosper for the benefit of the whole of the population. It is proposed to hold the Public Service to a no-growth situation and to seek an actual reduction in the number of people employed in the Public Service. The Minister of Industrial Affairs only a week or so ago stated unequivocally that there would be no reduction in employment in the Public Service.

Whom are we to believe? On this occasion, I am inclined to believe the Premier, as opposed to the Minister of Industrial Affairs, in that there will be a reduction in the number of people employed in the Public Service, to the detriment of the general population in this State, because South Australia has probably had the best Public Service and the best public services in Australia.

There will certainly be a decline in essential services such as health, hospitals, schools, and public works, in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and in many other departments. Almost every facet of the Public Service will feel the effects, and the people of this State, which has, in the past, had a good record regarding the provision of public services, will also feel the effect. It will be found that, like the Fraser Government, the Tonkin Government cares little for the welfare of the average citizen in the community, and significant deterioration of the Public Service will occur.

As I said last night, the proposed taxation measures contained in the Budget basically assist the more affluent members of our society. Succession duties, which is a progressive tax and affects wealthier people in the community, will be abolished on the property of a person who dies in or after January 1980. This measure will assist the wealthier section of the community rather than the average person.

The abolition of gift duty on all gifts from that date will also assist the more affluent members of our society. All of the concessions, which are estimated to cost \$4 100 000 in the ensuing year and \$20 000 000 in a full year, will affect significantly those sections of the community, to the detriment of the average citizen, who, in one way or another, will shoulder the burden, either in regard to the decline of the Public Service or because of the shift in the taxation burden.

There is a parallel between the tax shift in this Budget and the Californian tax charge, which is called Proposition 13 and which came into law in California in July 1978. The Premier, before the elections, was a strong advocate of Proposition 13. At a meeting of the Australian Institute of Valuers, he stated:

A Liberal Government's highest priority would be to reduce South Australian taxes . . . The California approach would be followed by a Liberal government in South Australia and he was confident the results would be just as dramatic. "We must, and we will, bring Government spending to account," Mr. Tonkin said.

"We must, and we will dismantle the unnecessary bureaucracies . . . In one year, California slashed \$7 000 000 000 from its revenues, far more than we shall remove in the first few years of government."

The real truth about the Californian proposal has not been revealed. The Premier, in this House on 7 August 1979 (page 397 of *Hansard*), stated:

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. . .

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.

The real facts of Proposition 13 are not known to the public generally because a number of facets are involved. I now refer to a report entitled "How has Proposition 13 worked out?", as follows:

If you are planning a trip to California this year, remember to take some insect repellent: the mosquitoes are looking for vengeance. For years, Californians have boasted the good life: blue skies, an ideal climate and *no* mosquitoes. They were wrong. This year the spraying programme has been curtailed. There is the possibility of malaria again. And everyone is rushing to install window screens—everyone who owns a house and can afford it, that is.

Thus, painfully, Californians are learning the full implications of Proposition 13. And all too often they are finding that it means private spending to make up for public programmes that have been cut. . . . The immediate impact of Proposition 13 was a dramatic 60 per cent cut in property taxes. This meant a loss of over \$6 billion to State and local government. Nearly two-thirds of the benefit was enjoyed by corporate business and landlords, who had contributed substantially to the campaign. Moreover, the benefit to owner-occupiers was reduced by the fact that State and local taxes are deductible from the income assessed for Federal tax. . . . A number of factors have helped to soften the impact.

First, California had, and still has, a large budgetary surplus. This has been used to compensate lower levels of government in large measure for the direct and indirect loss of tax revenues. (In all, \$4 000 000 000 was set aside for this purpose this year.) Interestingly, this shift from direct revenues to State subvention should have allowed for a more thorough going redistribution of resources.

Those comments were made by, I believe, an independent British person, R. W. Kirwan, who believes that Proposition 13 has not worked out.

Mr. Evans: Did you give the reasons why it didn't work out?

Mr. SLATER: I have just given the reasons why it didn't work out.

Mr. Evans: No, you gave the results.

Mr. SLATER: I gave the results. He does not give the results in detail, and the reasons are too lengthy for me to explain in the time now available to me. If the member for Fisher desires to read the article, it is available from the Parliamentary Library. For the information of the Minister of Education and the member for Fisher, I refer further to Proposition 13.

As stated previously, we should recall that proposition 13 was passed by referendum by the Californian voting public and became effective from 1 July 1978. Proposition 13 provided for the imposition of a maximum ceiling on the rate of property tax that can be levied by local government, thereby reducing current taxation levels by half; changed assessment procedures that break with the principle of uniformity in assessment; and restrictive conditions inhibiting the ability of State and local government to raise revenues and a prohibition on introducing certain types of property taxes.

The vote in favour of the proposition was two to one (65 per cent in favour), but only 40 per cent of those eligible turned out to vote. Proposition 13, first and foremost, involves a shift in the tax burden from established home owners to new home owners and from business to home owners as a result of the new methods of assessment and from higher income (which is important to note) to lower income earners and welfare recipients as a result of the

loss of revenue from a progressive tax, and the consequent introduction of regressive taxes to replace part of the revenue lost.

Mass retrenchments have been avoided only by the State Government using its accumulated surplus to bail out local government. Even so, despite most of the shortfall in local government funding being met by the State, about 102 000 jobs were eliminated over the first 12 months, although most of these went by attrition and only 16 per cent were direct retrenchments. Had it not been for the "bail out" the effects on the Californian economy would have been, in one word, disastrous. We must hope that the Premier, who is an advocate of proposition 13 (which has been effective in California) through his Budget does not also cause disastrous effects on the State economy.

Turning back to proposition 13, hardest hit by the ensuing cuts were the education, health and welfare areas. Employment in education dropped by about 9 per cent in the first 12 months of proposition 13. Overall the number of public employees fell by 7 per cent over the same period. As predicted by the University of California at Los Angeles, the Californian economy has benefited from proposition 13 over the first 12 months of its operation. This has been primarily due to the "bail out" action taken by the State Government and by an inflow of property and finance capital from other States. Without "bail out" the situation would have been completely reversed and the original estimate of a loss of 450 000 jobs and a 10 per cent unemployment rate may have become a reality.

In summary, the Californian experience can hardly be taken as positive proof of the salutary effects of tax cuts by themselves, nor of the need for cuts as drastic as those embodied in proposition 13. Although there seems to be a widespread movement in the U.S. to control public expenditure by revenue capping legislation, only two other States have followed California's lead in imposing such drastic measures as proposition 13. The expenditure reforms introduced and contemplated in most other States have tended to take milder forms and in the main involve some concept of tying increases in existing levels of public expenditure to growth factors, such as the gross national product.

One factor which stands out is the importance of exposing such "tax revolts" for what they are, as tax shifts. They are shifting the burden from one section of the community to another. Although arguments on governmental waste were used in a supportive role, the main concern of the voting public was about their level of taxes at the time the referendum was taken and not about abstract spending questions. Californian property taxes were 42 per cent above the national average at that time.

Without "bail out", proposition 13 would have brought chaos to the Californian economy. Because of "bail out" the effects of proposition 13 have largely been masked. As a result, the current improvement in economic conditions in California does not provide support for a policy of drastically cutting taxes in isolation.

The parallel that I have drawn between the Government's Budget and proposition 13 is that it is also a tax shift, shifting the burden of taxation from the wealthier members of our community to be borne by the less affluent members of society. That aspect has been highlighted in proposition 13. In my research into this topic I found an advocate of proposition 13, supporting the argument of the Premier, contained in a journal called *The Electors' Voice*. That publication is put out by the Australian League of Rights Service for the Preservation of Free Society. Like the Premier, that organisation believes that proposition 13 is a good proposition, and a

small article on the back page of the publication states:

It is now 12 months since proposition 13 enabled Californian taxpayers to vote for a substantial reduction in taxation. Comparatively speaking, Californians are now much better off than other Americans.

It appears to me that that is not the case and that, in due course, the people of California will regret the situation, because there will be a shift in the tax burden from one section of the community to another.

I now return to a matter that I mentioned briefly last night concerning the inconsistency that I noted in a press statement by the Minister of Transport, when he said that his Government was doing an economy drive on Government vehicles by changing from LTD vehicles to Holden Commodores. I said that I believed the member for Hanson, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, was to be supplied with a Government vehicle. I was critical of the fact that he and other Government members, when in Opposition, were very critical of what they called "waste" by the then Government. Now that the situation is reversed, it has become a different kettle of fish.

In the press today, I notice that my rumour has been confirmed, and the Premier has said that this was in line with the expanded role envisaged for the committee. Mr. Tonkin said that there would be a lot more travel for the committee than it had done previously. I have never been a member of the Public Accounts Committee—

Dr. Hopgood: That's their loss.

Mr. SLATER: I think so. I can read a balance sheet, despite what the member for Hanson said this afternoon. Not only can I read a balance sheet, but I prepare them occasionally for a certain organisation that I have an interest in. They have been audited and I have been complimented on the balance sheets I have prepared.

Mr. Randall: Are they available to the public?

Mr. SLATER: No, it is an incorporated club. Members opposite were critical of the fact that we were going to introduce amendments to the existing legislation to ensure that the balance sheets of clubs would be available to the public. The Premier went on to say, in regard to providing a car for the member for Hanson as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee:

It is also in line with the Government's intention of putting the committee on the same standing as the Public Works Committee, the Chairman of which was given a car by the previous Government.

The Opposition at that time was critical of that situation also. I see that the tide has turned, and they now want to provide a Government vehicle for the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. I do not think that that is justified, and I suggest that those persons who are members of the Public Accounts Committee will also be critical of that, as the previous Chairman of that committee did not see the need for a Government vehicle. As I have said, we were criticised at the time for the fact that vehicles were provided for other committee chairmen. It would seem that the member for Hanson is assuming a double standard. The article continues:

Mr. Becker denied today that the provision of a car for his duty was a pay-off for not being included in the Ministry.

"My work load will now increase tremendously," he said.

Time will tell whether he is worthy of this perk. I do not think that it is necessary for the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee to be provided with a motor vehicle. It is a disgrace, when the then Opposition was critical of Government expenditure in this field. They have presumed to save money in regard to the changeover to smaller vehicles, and yet they are using more of them.

In conclusion, I return once more to the proposition I

mentioned previously which is in vogue in California, and compare it with this Budget. One commentator referred to proposition 13 as a can of worms. I believe that this Budget and the Government presenting it are also a can of worms.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support the Bill, and I do so because it is a measure which provides for lower taxation in South Australia and also, I think, for reduced Government spending. This is the ultimate aim of the Government, and it is a commendable attitude. I am sure that if the member for Stuart had taken that attitude some years ago he may still have been occupying the Government benches. When the Premier introduced the Budget he said:

The prime concern of this Government is the economy of South Australia. We will do everything we can responsibly to encourage and assist its growth. We propose to work in co-operation with all sections of the community to remove impediments to that growth. We see this as the best long-term approach to the problems of slack economic activity and high unemployment which currently afflict this State.

That is a responsible attitude, and it is one that all South Australians should be adopting in this new era of political history. One thing that concerns me is that neither in the Budget nor in the Governor's Speech is there much mention of those engaged in rural activities in South Australia and the importance that those sections of the community play in the economic development and stability of the State.

Mr. Keneally: It's a city-dominated Party.

Mr. BLACKER: I take up that point: it is a city-dominated Government. I have always said that, irrespective of which Party is in Government, it has to be metropolitan-dominated, and that fact cannot be ignored: it is a fact that every South Australian will have to face and appreciate, regardless of his political views. The factor underlining all of this and which is so important is the relevance of the private sector and the role that that will play in the future development of this State.

There has been much argument between Government and Opposition members during this debate involving the private sector as against the public sector. No doubt Opposition members are endeavouring to float the line of the public sector, but they are overlooking the basic fact that it is the private sector which is the producing sector and which is able to create and provide the jobs. It is on that basis that we must approach the need to bring South Australia back on to the correct course.

There has also been considerable flak across the Chamber regarding succession duties. The member for Gilles, who has raised this matter for the second time this week, is still of the opinion that it is the wealthy sector of the community that pays succession duties. He is so far from the mark, because it is the wealthy sector of the community that is able to set up trust funds, to divest all personal interest in companies and avoid paying succession duties. I am sure that, if the honourable member ascertained the income-earning capability of those people who pay succession duties, he would find that it was not the people on high incomes who pay succession duties but, rather, the middle-income group.

Mr. Slater: They cheat.

Mr. BLACKER: The honourable member has used the word "cheat". That is grossly unfair, because the method that the higher-income people have used to avoid paying succession duties has not been cheating. It has been a completely legitimate way of divesting themselves of their assets and thereby avoiding the payment of succession duties. They have probably paid it in company tax and in a

number of other ways but not in succession duties. The honourable member should keep that in mind when he is being critical of the abolition of succession duties. It is not the high-income group that we are referring to: it is the middle-income group.

I am concerned also about the abolition of the SURS scheme. This scheme has played an important role in most areas of the State, and its abolition will affect a major project in my area. On 13 September 1979, just two days before the election, Mr. John Burdett, the then Liberal Party shadow Minister of Community Welfare, was quoted in a report in the *Port Lincoln Times* as saying:

In Government, the Liberal Party would honour any undertakings made by the present Government in regard to finance for the proposed Matthew Flinders Nursing Home.

The report continued:

Mr. Burdett said he understood from Mr. Ian Bassham, Chairman of the nursing home committee, that the State Government was committed for bridging finance if required and assistance in the provision of furniture. These undertakings would be honoured by a Liberal Government.

Mr. Burdett said he also understood that the committee was negotiating for State Government finance for a proposed \$200 000 activity centre. While it was of course not possible to give this kind of undertaking until the Liberal Party achieves Government, a Liberal Government would certainly give sympathetic consideration to this project.

Two days after that report, the Liberal Party won Government, and we did not know what was going to happen to this SURS scheme grant that was expected for the Matthew Flinders Nursing Home.

Before discussing that project further, I will outline to the House its importance. Eyre Peninsula does not have a nursing home. We do not have one bed that could be classified as a nursing bed in a nursing home on the peninsula. That is a major concern, because South Australia has more nursing home beds per capita than has any other State. The concentration of nursing home beds is in the metropolitan area; regrettably, the country has missed out.

The proposal for the Matthew Flinders Nursing Home has been mooted, developed and debated for some considerable time. The first time it came to my notice was in 1951, when the South Australian policewomen's organisation conducted a survey on the peninsula's needs, and recommended at that time that there was an urgent need for a nursing home facility on the peninsula, bearing in mind, as all members know, that Port Lincoln is about 420 miles from Adelaide. When we are dealing with care for the aged, it is always desirable that we should keep them in their own local community, where they have their friends, rather than remove them to an area that is completely unknown to them.

Before continuing with this matter, it is appropriate that I should explain to the House the vast difference between nursing home facilities and geriatric facilities because, all too often, the average member of the public seems to think that they are alike, whereas they are vastly different. In normal aged care, we go from a hostel or a senior citizens' home complex, in which people can look after themselves totally, to nursing home facilities, in which there is a resident nurse or sister who can assist these people who are unable to look after themselves 24 hours a day. For the sake of that one hour's assistance, or even more, that nursing home accommodation becomes imperative. The next step on is geriatric accommodation, in which the patients are, to all intents and purposes, completely hospitalised, thus requiring specialist nursing and full-time attendance by trained personnel. We have

that series of steps in the provision of aged care for our senior citizens.

This nursing home facility in my district is a major project, estimated to cost \$1 250 000. Federal Government approval has been granted for a 40-bed home, which, on present-day statistics, is only half enough, but at least 40 beds are better than none. That is our present situation. The proposed project involving 40 beds is anticipated to have a day care and visiting centre, thus providing for the residents of the home some sort of rehabilitation. If we do not have those day care and visiting centre facilities, we would virtually require another hospital. The nursing home was looking to the SURS scheme for funding. We understand that \$230 000 was being earmarked for the proposal. However, because of the change of Government and policies, we have to look for other means of financing it. I feel sorry for the new Minister of Health, because this problem has been transferred from the Minister of Industrial Affairs to her.

Mr. Evans: Under a smokescreen.

Mr. BLACKER: I am not sure how it was shifted, but the Minister of Health seems to find this problem in her lap now.

Mr. Millhouse: If a promise was made during the election campaign, there is no problem about it; she will just have to honour it, won't she?

Mr. BLACKER: Someone will have to honour it. Within two or three days, it went from an optimistic proposal to one with a cloud over it.

Mr. Millhouse: There can be no question about it: it will have to be honoured if the promise was made.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Flinders does not need the assistance of the honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. Millhouse: I'm just giving him moral support.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BLACKER: The people of the Flinders District, the peninsula particularly, and some of your constituents, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are looking to this proposal optimistically and with the full expectations that building will commence in the new calendar year. The committee is ready to start tomorrow if we can get the nod of approval for the day care and visiting centre. We are up to that stage. If approval were given tomorrow, there would be 14 weeks delay for the working drawings and a month's requirement for the tenders, and then the submissions must be referred to the Social Security Department for final approval.

Initial approval for the draft plans has been granted, and it is expected that, if approval is granted within the next week or two, work can start physically on the project on 1 May. Costs are expected to rise, if the work is not started by 1 February 1980, by \$150 000. Every delay means additional cost. The community has got behind the project, which is one that cannot be sniggered at. The Port Lincoln committee of the nursing home organised a "Buy a brick" campaign and, by way of public advertisement, asked local residents whether they would buy a brick for the home. As a result of that campaign, \$64 844 has been raised—an immediate response by the public and a recognition by the local community of the need for such a worthy project. That happened in a few short months. Total assets currently held by the organisation as a result of its fund-raising efforts are about \$161 000. In addition, the Corporation of Port Lincoln has made available to the home a \$200 000 grant. We have total community backing for this project.

I should also mention the complementary nature that this proposal has in relation to the re-arrangement and upgrading of facilities at the Port Lincoln Hospital. Earlier

I pointed out the difference between nursing home facilities and geriatric facilities. Port Lincoln Hospital has recently had a re-arrangement of the maternity section, the childrens' section, and the so-called geriatric section. I say the "so-called" geriatric section because Port Lincoln Hospital has never officially had a geriatric section.

As a result of that re-arrangement, there is an improvement, particularly regarding the care of the geriatric patients. Of course, all of that is pending the new obstetrics wing for the hospital, work on which should have started in August 1978. The then Government, for reasons best known to itself, decided to re-arrange the building programme. Instead of being commenced on 1 August 1978, the proposal was put aside, and, as a result, no construction work was commenced. We have had the preliminary work of the movement of sections within the confines of the hospital, but no actual construction has commenced.

I repeat that the Matthew Flinders Nursing Home is of dire importance to the people of Eyre Peninsula. It has been proved that we need such facilities. We have no facilities now, so surely we have a right to some. As optimistic as I am about this proposal and although I hope that by 1981 there will be a 40-bed nursing home facility in Port Lincoln, that will still meet only 50 per cent of the needs of our community. When other sections of the community, particularly in the metropolitan area, have more than a fair share of facilities of this kind, we, in country areas, have a reasonable right to expect these facilities. I have already invited the new Minister of Health to visit my district and see at first hand the lack of facilities there. Hopefully, she will be able to take up the promise that the Hon. John Burdett gave on 13 September.

I wish to refer now to some other matters. One gives me concern, because I am always uptight when I find the metropolitan area getting some benefit that the country areas are not getting. I was rather distressed a few days ago when a constituent who is a hairdresser received the following letter from the Hairdressers Registration Board of South Australia:

I am in receipt of your recent letter applying for registration in men's hairdressing. I assume you are referring to the automatic registration but would advise that this particular category of registration is restricted to the Adelaide metropolitan area only. Your cheque for \$26 is enclosed herewith. If however you are interested in undertaking the examination in men's hairdressing I enclose forms for completion and return to this office with the required references and cheque for \$13.20.

This is complete discrimination as between metropolitan people and country people. The constituent brought this letter to my secretary, whose note states:

[The constituent] brought in this letter that one of her hairdressers received in reply to her application for registration in men's hairdressing. She was under the impression that all that a qualified hairdresser had to do to get registration was to apply before 1 October. The girls are quite hurt at the reply, as they feel they are discriminated against because they live in the country. They attended trade school in Adelaide to qualify and attend all schools and seminars that they can to find out new techniques and try new products.

[The constituent] even suggests that country girls probably work harder than the city girls. These girls have been cutting men's hair for years (ever since longer hair became fashionable for men).

I consider that the Hairdressers Registration Board should be asked to explain the full import of the letter and say why, because of a person's place of residence, that person should be refused the opportunity to be registered

automatically to do men's hairdressing, when a metropolitan counterpart, provided it was done by 1 October, could just walk in and have the suitable endorsements placed on a certificate. That is one avenue about which the people are justifiably upset.

I wish to raise another matter that I do not think has been raised here for some time. I hope that, with the change of Government, we will see the rebuilding of the Rural Youth Movement. I understand that I am the first rural youth member to be elected to this House, and I believe that at the recent election at least two more were returned. You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are waving your finger, so I assume that you have been a member of the movement.

I think it fair to say that that organisation did much, not only for country youth, but also for metropolitan youth. I think the new member for Mallee was for some time President of the Adelaide Rural Youth Club, and I believe that the member for Rocky River was State President at one time. I assume that he was also a member of the branch in his area. It was of concern to me when I entered this House that, every time I tried to make a plug for the Rural Youth Movement, I was told that it was nothing but a Young Country Party. Nothing could be further from the truth. I suggest that now the Opposition will say rural youth is a Young Liberal Party, and that, too, is wrong. The rural youth did much for people in areas where they have been able to battle on their own. The member for Stuart is listening intently. He was invited to step in on behalf of the then Minister of Agriculture and officiate at the zone rally at Port Lincoln one year, and the honourable member carried out the duty with distinction. I am sure he now appreciates the role that the Rural Youth Movement can and does play in the community. I hope that the new Government will again take up the reins and try to rebuild the movement. I think that when I left it there was a senior adviser and there were six zone advisers, each actively involved. There was a considerable network of zones and branches in the State, and there were interstate and inter-zone competitions.

I was fortunate enough to be a State representative on one occasion, and that sort of background gave me the opportunity to enter this House. If I owe my presence here to one organisation, that would have to be the Rural Youth Movement. On that basis, I believe that the young people of South Australia, particularly those in country areas, are entitled to the revival and rebuilding of the Rural Youth Movement as we knew it.

One other matter that I bring to the attention of the House is that recently several people have approached me regarding the additional fees charged by the Electricity Trust of South Australia for reading meters where the people have installed a solar hotwater service. At present, when energy should be of prime importance, surely people should be encouraged and given the incentive to install these hotwater services.

Anything we can do to conserve energy should be done, yet we find that, because of the charter (I suppose we could call it) of the Electricity Trust, there is a penalty for those persons who try to save energy. I have spoken to several people who, whilst they are not hurt by the amount involved, are concerned that when they install a hot water service, if it is not connected to a J tariff meter, they are obliged to pay an extra \$4 per reading for electricity. That is \$16 a year, and when that is added to the account some people then ask what is the point of installing a solar hot water service when they are going to be penalised for doing that. Every effort should be made to encourage people to install solar hot water services.

The Budget is to be commended. Whilst many measures

have not been brought forward and we do not know the full intent of the Government, it is at least heading in the right direction in trying to reduce taxation, particularly in those areas where the producing sector has been most heavily hit. It is because of those measures that I commend the Budget to the House.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): The member for Flinders was prompted some pleasant memories of my visit to Port Lincoln many years ago when I went there representing Tom Casey, then Minister of Agriculture, to open the zone rally for the Rural Youth Movement and to declare open its official headquarters. They made me tremendously welcome and I enjoyed myself. The young people enjoyed themselves and seemed to mix well. The meeting was a good community activity, with representation from all over the peninsula. What interested me about that rally was how close I was in my thinking about rural matters to the thinking of the rural youth people themselves.

Despite the propaganda put out about the Labor Party's attitude to the rural industry, we were able to meet on common ground in many areas. I understand that I won for myself much goodwill on that trip, and much goodwill for the Labor Party. Unfortunately, I dispelled that support as a result of a magnificent speech I made in this House about primary industry in general. One of the comments I made (I suspect in the heat of the moment) was that farmers in Australia like to capitalise their gains and socialise their losses. That lost for me the support of all those people in Port Lincoln with whom I had been on such good terms until then. I am not prepared to comment on whether the Government should provide money for rural youth schemes. I guess that is a matter the Government is better able to determine than I.

I have been surprised that members of the Government have not felt able to rise in this debate and defend the Budget brought forward by the Premier. There has been some sort of support, I suppose, from the members for Glenelg and Hanson, but nobody takes them seriously, anyway. They could both talk under wet cement; they can both speak for half an hour and take up the time of the House while saying absolutely nothing; they both did that effectively today.

I do not intend to be ultra-critical of the Budget document introduced by the Premier. There will be ample occasion to do that when we get to the lines. I feel that the general thrust of this Budget ought to be commented on. It follows the policy of the Federal Government of redistributing the wealth of this nation from the poor to the rich, albeit not to the same extent that the Government's Federal colleagues have been doing.

I am prepared to agree that all members of this Parliament are committed to the aim of providing the best possible living standards for the people of South Australia. However, accepting that as fact, there is considerable variance in the methods we would apply to achieve that ideal aim. The Liberal Party philosophy works on the principle that, to provide for the need of the total electorate, Governments must fatten the rich man's table so that sufficient crumbs fall off to succour the needs of the poor.

The Labor Party, on the other hand, believes that Governments have a responsibility to produce an egalitarian type of society in which all people have an equal opportunity to provide for themselves and their needs. I could be asked why I draw this distinction between the philosophies of the Party in Government and the Party of which I am proud to be a member. The general thrust of the economic philosophy of the Liberal Party is to ensure that increased profits accrue to private

industry so that these profits will be reflected in increased jobs. This policy has centred on providing for the making of profits, no matter what effect that might have on the people we represent.

In fact, the record over the past three years quite clearly shows the fallacy in the Liberal Party's thinking. Over that period workers in Australia have had a drop in their living standards as a result of the trade unions accepting partial indexation, and as a result of taxation, which has increased alarmingly, so that there has been a redistribution of the gross national product of more than 5 per cent away from wages and salaries into profits and dividends. During this period, there has been an increase in unemployment in Australia of 100 000 people. I wonder how members opposite, and their Federal colleagues, can square that off with the belief that a decrease in the living standards of the working people in this country will result in more jobs. The fact of life, of course, is that this does not happen.

At the same time that the wage and salary earners of Australia have been accepting a decrease in their living standards Australian companies, in the main, are recording record profits. These profits are not being turned into jobs, so that fattening the rich man's table does not help those who are not granted a place at that table.

I mentioned earlier that while there has been a reduction through partial indexation in the incomes of wage and salary earners in South Australia, the tax burden is increasing at an alarming rate. We are looking at an inflation rate this year of about 12 per cent, and an increase in taxation of about 15 per cent. How empty now the promises of the Fraser Federal Government sound when we recall the promises it made about reducing inflation and taxation. In real terms, we are now far past double figure inflation. We are right back to those critical times in 1974-75 when the world economy went mad and the Australian economy was caught up in it. Since those times, we should have learned some lessons. Unfortunately, the Federal Government, tied as it is to Friedman and his quaint economic philosophies, does not have any way at all of overcoming the economic mess in which we find ourselves.

The Budget document which was presented to this House and which has been described by political pundits in South Australia as responsible is mainly based on the Budget produced by the previous Government, and changed to fit in with the thrust of the Liberal Party's economic policies. The Government has not had time in this Budget to bring in all the Draconian legislation that it would like to introduce. We will judge it this time next year when it has felt the impact of some of these reductions in taxation that it seems to want to brag about. We will see then just how those reductions are reflected in the economy.

The result of this drop in the purchasing power of wage and salary earners has had a dramatic effect upon our economy. Yesterday, the heir apparent to the Premier (the member for Rocky River), was telling us that his Government was going to be responsible for a consumer-led recovery in the economy. If by "the consumer" the honourable member means wage and salary earners, then I can assure him that these people are spending all that they get now (precious little that it is) just to maintain or to try to maintain a living standard to which they are entitled.

I suggest to honourable members opposite, to members of the Government, that under the present economic strains, wage and salary earners are unable to do that. They are falling further behind and, as a result, they are unable to go out and buy. All these millions of dollars locked up in savings accounts in South Australia are not accumulated by wage and salary earners, or by people on

pensions, or by people who draw the dole. They are not accumulated by any of the low income and depressed groups in the community, because those people spend every cent that they get. If a Government, be it Federal or State, provides assistance to the low income groups, that money is reflected immediately within the economy.

It is only those people who already have too much who are able to put aside huge savings. If the member for Rocky River wants to untap huge savings within the banks and private institutions in South Australia, I suggest that he should speak to the people whom his Party so proudly claims it represents: the people who have the money. Certainly, it is not the wage and salary earners.

If we want confidence in Australia, if we want confidence in South Australia, if we want people to be able to manufacture to an expanding market, then the average wage and salary earner, making up the overwhelming majority of households in this country, has to be able to feel confident to go out and buy; they must have the wherewithal to go out and buy. Whilst the Government has a policy of restricting or reducing the purchasing power of our average citizen, we will not have any sort of consumer-led recovery in Australia.

The average worker in the average home is going to be buying the white goods, the electrical goods, clothing, and food. If one individual owns many millions of dollars in terms of refrigerators, wireesses, clothes, and food, it is not going to make a dramatic impact on the economy. The Government must wait for the working people to gain that confidence and the wherewithal to spend.

I am particularly critical of the conservative Party's insistence that low income earners should bear the brunt of curing all our economic ills. They prescribe lower wages for our economy, not lower profits. If it were lower profits, that might make a contribution towards lowering inflation. We are told that Australia cannot afford lower profits, because it would prevent industry from investing its capital. We have been told that unless we can guarantee high profits there will be a strike on capital.

For some reason, a strike on labour is a dastardly thing designed to wreck the economy, but a strike on capital, which has a much more dramatic effect on our economy, is something that our political opponents are never prepared to face. In fact, what private enterprise does to us in Australia, to all Governments, Federal and State, is to say that unless it is given the conditions in which it wishes to invest its money, it will not invest its money in our country at all; it will maintain a strike on capital, and so we succumb to this argument, because we are so desperately bound up within the private enterprise system that the big industry can screw Australia as hard as it wishes.

The whole system is tied up with the ability of industry or commerce to invest within our community and, unless we have that investment, we do not seem to have any way at all of getting out of the bind that we are in. This is the blackmail that we are succumbing to every time we accept that proposition. I put it to Government members and to the Premier (and this is not reflected in any way in his Budget documents) that there are other sources of money that can be tapped, that can be invested in our mineral wealth and our industry generally. That is something that the former Labor Government did in a mild way, although we were loudly criticised as being socialist. Similarly, the Whitlam Government was widely criticised as being socialist. Frankly, to describe the Whitlam Government as a socialist Government is ridiculous: it was never able to be a socialist Government. Unfortunately, State Governments find it difficult to act in a socialist way; more is the pity.

Mr. Evans: Why did the people reject the Corcoran Government?

Mr. KENEALLY: Probably for the same reason that they rejected the Hall, McMahon, and Gorton Governments. Are we here for an exercise in semantics? This whole situation is ridiculous.

Mr. Evans: I do not think that is the same reason.

Mr. KENEALLY: It might not be exactly the same, if they rejected the Corcoran Government and the Whitlam Government because we were socialist. I suggest to the honourable member that, if he examined some conservative Parties elsewhere in the world and compared them with the Labor Party in Australia, there might be more equality there than to compare the Labor Party in Australia with the Labour Party in England. We are a mildly socialist Party in South Australia, and a mildly socialist Party in Australia. It is the very nature of the conservatism in the society in which we live that if one does something mildly socialist, such as Medibank, everyone in Australia gets hysterical and people are told that they must get rid of the Labor Party because of its terrible policies.

There is brainwashing taking place in Australia, and there is an automatic reflex to the word "socialism", which is a most effective tool for the conservative Parties to use. They will use it, and we will suffer the consequences. I read a report in today's press that purports to say that the Frozen Food Factory suddenly has become a useful instrument, that the Premier now finds that those terrible things he was saying about the factory might not be true, now that he has the responsibility for it.

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

Mr. KENEALLY: I suggest that the honourable member for Glenelg gets someone to read out to him, if he is unable to read it himself, this report of the Premier's comments in today's press. The incentives offered to industry are always at the expense of the Australian work force. As I said earlier, we are being blackmailed, and it is about time that Governments in Australia were able to withstand such activity. I hope that big industry and big commerce are called upon to play their part in overcoming the economic ills that are confronting us.

If the average Australian is expected to reduce his or her standard of living, how can we justify at the same time that companies in Australia are making record profits, and companies outside Australia, with interests in Australia, are ripping off hundreds of millions of dollars and taking them out of this country, while the average worker, the people we represent, the people that the honourable member for Goyder represents, are called upon by the conservative Governments in this country to pay the price for that. The honourable member's colleagues would say that if one was prepared to accept a reduced standard of living it will be reflected in increased jobs.

I shall quote now from *Hansard* from another place some comments made by a Federal member of Parliament, Dr. Moss Cass, who said:

Let us also observe another incongruity. In many key areas profits are going up, not down. This is mainly in areas where large corporations or transnational corporations are involved. How? Why is this so? Because they are best able to cash in on increased productivity. They have the resources to bring in new methods of production which lead to increased productivity—microprocessors, automation and all that. But this is at the expense of employing people. Wage payments of these companies go down because they employ fewer people. They produce more goods. They do not reduce their prices. They are content to sell fewer goods at the same large mark-up. Because they have spent less on wages and materials to produce the goods their profits go up. To a certain extent

they do not care whether they sell fewer goods as long as they can maintain profitability. So large corporations have increased profits. But it means that the rest of the community is winding down, particularly in the small business area. The small businesses are the ones going to the wall, going broke. In this debate about the causes of our problems and what we ought to do I think that we are all kidding ourselves. We catch on to jargon phrases such as "we have to beat inflation" but the ill is far deeper than that. The problem is more than inflation; inflation is merely a symptom.

I recommend that members read the enlightening contribution that Moss Cass made to the Federal debate on the Appropriation Bill (No. 1). I turn now to the inheritance tax or succession duties or death duties, as our opponents would like to call them when they want to evoke an emotional response. An article in the *Advertiser* of 16 May states:

Wealth or capital gain taxes are likely to be a fact of Australian life in the 1980's.

Experts—business and academic—agreed on this yesterday at the Economic Society's autumn forum into taxation reform.

Myer group administration director, Mr. R. J. Rechner, told the forum there was a possibility that a wealth tax would be introduced, but not before the next Federal election.

He said if the next Federal election was in late 1980 it was unlikely the tax system would see any material changes until 1981.

Professor John Head, of Monash University said the creation of a rational and generally acceptable Federal system of wealth taxation would be the "great political challenge to responsible government in the 1980's".

Mr. Rechner said Australia was one of the very few countries in the world without either wealth or a capital gains tax.

The United States and the countries of Western Europe, except Ireland, have, in addition to income tax, estate duties plus either a net wealth tax or a capital gains tax. The Australian *Financial Review*, not a paper known for its support of the Labor Party, commented on 13 June on the abolition of Commonwealth estate duty that the move would put Australia into a situation of having one of the most inequitable tax systems in the world. The article continues:

Professor Head said there was still widespread agreement in Australia that large inheritances and accumulations of wealth should be subject to tax. He said this was despite the prospect that the death tax system in Australia threatened to disappear completely following the moves in the area started by the Queensland Government.

"Large stocks of wealth exist in this country on which little or no tax has ever been paid thanks to gaps in our traditional income and tax systems", he said.

"Sooner or later some form of tax will emerge to fill the impending vacuum."

The member for Flinders said that succession duties do not fall on the more wealthy but fall on the average income earner. I point out to him that 6 per cent of all estates which had a net value of over \$200 000 were responsible for 60 per cent of the succession duties that accrued to the Federal Government. That indicates that the wealthy do pay taxes sometimes, but of course not as much as they should.

I invite Government members to attempt to rebut the points that I shall now make. In Australia, the wealthiest 1 per cent of the population owns 22 per cent of the total wealth; the wealthiest 5 per cent of the population owns 46 per cent of the total wealth; the wealthiest 10 per cent of the population owns 60 per cent of the total wealth; 50 per cent of Australians own less than 8 per cent of the total

wealth; and the richest 2 000 people in Australia own as much as the poorest 2 250 000 Australians. Of all the income received from interest, rent and dividends paid on shares, 1 per cent of adult Australians receive 45 per cent; 5 per cent of adult Australians receive 83 per cent; and 10 per cent of adult Australians receive 92 per cent.

Regarding real estate, 10 per cent of Australians own 52 per cent of the value of Australian real estate; the wealthiest 300 000 people each have access to an average of 4½ rooms of living space, whereas the poorest 1 000 000 Australians have access to an average of two-thirds of a room each; 10 per cent of adult Australians receive 92 per cent of income from interest, dividends and rents; and 5 per cent of Australians own 55 per cent of all shares in Australian business.

In 1977-78, pay-as-you-earn tax on wages and salaries created 48 per cent of the tax payable; 30 per cent went to indirect tax, etc.; 15 per cent, company tax; and 7 per cent, tax on self employed. Here again it is quite clear who is lowly paid and who pays the tax. The pay-as-you-earn tax has increased in Australia by 425 per cent since 1970. Tax on professionals, the self-employed, and income from wealth has increased by 348 per cent since 1970. Tax on company profits has increased by 223 per cent since 1970. Having regard to those figures, I cannot understand why members opposite would be so totally opposed to what is one of the few wealth taxes left—succession duties.

I would suggest to the member for Flinders and other members that one of the arguments used by the proponents of the elimination of succession duties is that they fall very heavily on some individuals. They quote cases where an individual has been harshly affected by the incidence of succession duties, and they use such cases to develop an argument that succession duties should be abolished in connection with wealthy people. However, I point out that the kind of individual to whom I have referred can approach the Treasurer for an exemption, because of the peculiar circumstances of the individual case. If there are problems related to succession duties, concessions should be increased; that is what the Labor Party would have done if it had been returned to Government.

The member for Hanson referred to his circumstances in developing an argument about land tax, and I will refer to my circumstances in connection with succession duties. I am a reasonably well-paid member of the Stuart District. I would be in the top 1 per cent of income earners in my district, but I would not be the highest income earner in the district. If I died today, my family would not have to pay any succession duties at all, because my wife would survive me. Further, if my wife and I died today, my children would not have to pay any succession duties, because of the nature of my capital assets. I would say that I am in a better financial position than 95 per cent of the people in my district, yet the people are hoodwinked by the sort of propaganda put out by Government members; the people are misled into thinking that they have some vested interest in the abolition of succession duties. The only people who have an interest in the abolition of succession duties are those people currently not paying their fair share of taxation.

Those people who inherited their wealth, and did not earn it, have never paid tax on it and refuse to do so now. Tax avoidance is alive and well, as shown in full-page advertisements in any newspaper that one wishes to read. Are the advertisements printed for the benefit of wage and salary earners? These people would not have enough capital to be interested in tax avoidance; they are lucky to have enough money to survive in this society. The advertisements are printed to enable people to avoid

taxation during their working life; they want to avoid paying tax again when they have accumulated some wealth that they wish to pass on. I believe that it is important for members of the community to have their money to use when they are alive and working; that is the appropriate time for money to be used. The Catch 22 is that if succession duties are abolished, those taxes that are placed on the community will go back to the poorer people. This will be a clear example of redistributing wealth from the salary and wage earners into the pockets, and for the profit, of the capitalist society. That is exactly what this Budget does. The good system that the Government inherited has been changed. This will be the total thrust of the Government when it is more secure on the Government benches and when it gets the support of the tyrant that the Government calls its Leader in Canberra.

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): The first Tonkin Budget has been received by the media, employer groups, and retail traders associations as extremely responsible. That is the kind of comment one would expect from those particular groups, considering the amount of effort they put into the last election to return the Liberals to power in this State. Looking at the Premier's Financial Statement, a rather confusing picture emerges. On the first page, the Premier informs us, in his opening remarks, that his Government has inherited a run-down State, and he states:

In just two years, South Australia's annual rate of population growth has fallen from being higher than the national growth rate to a level which is only one-third of the national growth rate.

During the last eight years of office of the previous Government, private sector employment in the other five States grew four times faster than in South Australia. In the recent period, from September 1977 to June 1979, private employment actually fell by 4 900 in South Australia, while in the rest of Australia there was a growth of 28 600 persons employed by private enterprise.

The rate of unemployment in South Australia has been higher than the national average for 16 consecutive months, and is now the highest amongst all the States.

This State's share of the nation's advertised job vacancies has fallen by 32 per cent in the last five years.

The annual growth of retail sales in South Australia has fallen by 37 per cent in the last two years, and in this same period this State's share of national retail sales has declined by the equivalent of \$110 million.

This is a totally depressing picture. The Premier then informed the House that the new Government had inherited a \$600 000 surplus from the previous Labor Government. That is not a bad surplus to inherit from a Government that was supposedly taking this State hell-bent to disaster. The Premier has listed as those things important to the State's economy (and no-one will disagree with him) a strong and expanded private sector, complemented by an efficient public sector. No-one on this side of the House would deny that in any way.

Prior to the elections, the Liberal Party's slogan was "Let's make the State great again." Let us look at what is in the Budget to see what will make the State great again. Regarding the Northern power station, everyone in this House, and the public of South Australia, are well aware that that project was already well in hand during the life of the previous Government. No-one can deny that the Redcliff project was due to the efforts of the Labor Government only, despite early opposition from the present Government to stall and block the project when it was first mooted. Acceleration of the exploration programme in the Cooper Basin, again, was already well advanced during the life of the previous Administration.

That leaves Roxby Downs. Roxby Downs is the one project that is going to make this State great again, according to the Premier. I doubt that this will be the situation. We are praying that Roxby Downs will get the State 10 000 jobs.

The Government has made many election promises and we on this side of the House will be watching closely to see that the Government keeps those promises. It is common knowledge that the Government did not realise it had any chance to win the election when its policy programme was put forward; under those circumstances, the promises were rather rash. Again, it is fairly obvious that the Budget closely follows the previous Government's prepared Budget, except, of course, in significant instances. To pay for those election promises announced in the Budget, the State Unemployment Relief Scheme has been axed, to pay for the abolition of succession duties, death duties, stamp duties, and pay-roll tax. How many ordinary decent South Australians will benefit from the abolition of such duties? Very few, I presume. Only the wealthy will gain in a significant way. The average worker will be no better off.

The many unemployed have lost for ever their only chance to gain temporary employment through the SURS projects. I mentioned earlier in a previous session of Parliament that SURS not only provided work on local government projects but other community projects for those people who were unemployed. The guidelines were changed in the later stages and only 50 per cent labour involvement was needed. There was an injection into the private employment sector for goods, equipment and earth-moving plant. This happened in my district in the many projects that were approved under the SURS scheme. Those things have gone for ever. As the Leader said earlier, the present Government has yet to produce a plan that will provide the incentive for employers to provide employment initiatives for young people. The Government has nothing to offer, yet in one bland move, the SURS scheme was destroyed.

Everyone knows that from 1975, when the SURS project was set up, \$55 700 000 was used to finance SURS projects. Hundreds of projects, buildings, community halls and other facilities in this State are due to the SURS scheme instituted by the previous Government. Yet, the Premier has decided that the scheme will be axed.

Turning to the Budget, when the lines are discussed, I will ask many questions about the areas of local government and health. In the Estimates of Expenditure, the South Australian Health Commission is dealt with in one line. I give notice to the Minister of Health that, when this line is examined, I intend to ask how the different hospitals and community bodies will suffer under the reduced expenditure available for the South Australian Health Commission.

I refer to one Budget allocation dealing with the Lyell McEwin Hospital, which has received drastic cuts in its Budget allocation. I want the Minister of Health to know that, when we are dealing with the lines, I will be asking questions on how other hospitals and other community services will fare. The Lyell McEwin Hospital, which covers most of the northern region, and has only 184 beds, is used to its capacity. It has a very fine medical team and runs a very efficient training course for nurses. However, it has been subjected to drastic reductions through the Budget. The Lyell McEwin Hospital is the only hospital for which I have the Budget allocation. However, if this is any indication of how other hospitals will suffer, I am sure that the whole medical profession will be up in arms when it realises exactly what it received.

I also intend to ask quite a few questions about the

Women's Community Health Centre and the Rape Crisis Centre. The Hindmarsh Women's Community Health Centre is run down and the building is unsafe and dilapidated. However, until now, all efforts to relocate that centre have failed. I will now read the submission to the Minister of Health regarding the purchase of a property at 26 Grange Road, West Hindmarsh, as a replacement site for the present site at 6 Mary Street, Hindmarsh. That proposal reads as follows:

The Women's Community Health Centre has been operating in the present premises at 6 Mary Street, Hindmarsh, since early 1976. The centre provides primarily health care, health information and education for women in pleasant non-threatening surroundings.

The term "non-threatening surroundings" is incorrect because already the ceiling is falling down in that building. The proposal continues:

The area of Hindmarsh was chosen as a site for the centre for three main reasons:

1. Hindmarsh is an economically disadvantaged area, containing many women unable to afford existing medical services.

2. The area has a large population of different ethnic groups, in particular Greeks, Italians and Yugoslavians. It was recognised that women of ethnic origin were subject to the additional stress of coping with living in an alien culture, and the service was planned, encompassing these needs. The western districts have a substantial Aboriginal population and we hope in the future to cater more fully to their needs by employing an Aboriginal health worker as outlined in our current budget.

Presently, there is no room to employ an Aboriginal worker. The proposal continues:

3. Hindmarsh is accessible by public transport, especially to women from the western suburbs. It is also relatively close to the city centre and is reasonably accessible to women from other areas of metropolitan Adelaide.

The present building has served as an appropriate site for our operations for almost four years.

The proposal then goes on to quote the terms of the lease. It continues:

We realise that the Health Commission has experienced certain difficulties in the past with respect to this lease. The major one occurred when the front office ceiling collapsed in late 1977 and was repaired at Health Commission expense, costing \$658.

In view of its liability for repairs, we understand that the Health Commission is unwilling to renew the lease. In addition, we have been informed in the past that the commission would not be interested in purchasing the building because it is old and would require considerable upkeep. We acknowledge that this is the case. However, we would like to put forward several arguments for the advantages of purchasing this building.

That is the building in Grange Road, West Hindmarsh. The proposal then deals with the problems confronting the women in the Hindmarsh area, and I will quote the Hindmarsh figures and then the appropriate figures for the rest of metropolitan Adelaide. Unemployment benefit recipients totalled 23.8 per thousand, compared to 13.9 per thousand for the rest of metropolitan Adelaide. Sickness benefits for the 16 years to 64 years age group totalled 8.2 per thousand, compared with 3.5 per thousand. Supporting mothers benefits recipients totalled 65.1 per thousand compared with 31.3 per thousand in the rest of metropolitan Adelaide. The perinatal death rate was 59.7 per thousand compared with 20.3 per thousand.

Bearing in mind the building from which this group operates, the following figure is the shocking one. I refer to the infant mortality rate of 45.8 per thousand,

compared with 13.9 per thousand in the rest of metropolitan Adelaide. Migrants from non-English speaking countries totalled 317.5 per thousand compared with 19.8 per thousand. Mothers with children in the 0 to 5 years age group, out of the labour force and never married totalled 2.5 per thousand, compared with .6 per thousand in the rest of metropolitan Adelaide. Mothers with children in the 0 to 5 years age group who are widowed, divorced or separated totalled 18.3 per thousand compared to 8.5 per thousand. Unskilled workers amounted to 257.5 per thousand, compared to 122.9 per thousand. Payments by the Community Welfare Department to deserted wives in the 15 years to 29 years age group totalled 18.8 per thousand, compared to 11.28 per thousand. Payments by the Community Welfare Department to single mothers in the 15 to 29 years age group totalled 10.5 per thousand, compared to 4.7 per thousand in the rest of metropolitan Adelaide.

That group at Hindmarsh has been making every effort to be relocated. I believe that the previous Minister of Health was sympathetic and had arranged for the Women's Community Health Centre to be relocated. Representations were made to the new Minister of Health concerning the relocation, but there was no reply. The Public Service Association then wrote to the Minister on behalf of that centre, bearing in mind the work it was doing, seeking action to relocate this particular centre.

I should like to quote the Minister's reply. I make the point that, because the Minister was newly appointed, she could have been acting on the advice of administrative officers attached to her department. Therefore, I do not say that this reply is entirely the work of the new Minister. However, it does relate to the attitude that this Government will take on behalf of these valuable community groups which, if the Lyell McEwin Hospital Budget allocation is anything to go by, will be facing drastic cuts this financial year. The letter, addressed to Mr. I. H. Fraser, General Secretary of the Public Service Association of South Australia Inc., is as follows:

I refer to your letters of 28 September and 5 October (your reference: IBD 036) regarding the Women's Community Health Centre, Hindmarsh, and confirm in writing our recent telephone conversation. As you know, there were sound reasons for not approving the purchase of the alternative premises.

Having spoken to the staff at the Women's Community Health Centre, I have yet to find out what those sound reasons were. I hope that when we debate the lines the Minister will be able to say what those sound reasons are. The report states:

As you know, they were very sound reasons for not approving the purchase of alternative premises.

The building is falling down and the Public Buildings Department has said that it is unsafe for people to operate from there. All these people to whom I have referred are using that centre, yet we are told that there are sound reasons for not approving the purchase of alternative premises, the cost of which was \$85 000, the expenditure of which could have given the centre the capacity to service the people with whom they are now dealing. I understand that currently 122 people use that service each week. If the premises were enlarged, it could increase the number of people going there. Although we are told that there are very sound reasons, I am inclined to believe that it is because of the financial restrictions that have been placed on the South Australian Health Commission by the Liberal Government. It is the same thing that we will see all along the line in relation to facilities for the ordinary people of Australia. The workers must face the brunt of

Budget cuts to pay for the succession duties and the abolition of gift duties and pay-roll tax.

As the member for Gilles said, it is a rip-off from the poor to pay for the wealthy. We are told that in the South Australian Health Commission there will be a major thrust further to rationalise services and reduce hospital running costs. This move will be undertaken in a proper and responsible manner. I hope that any cuts will be made in a responsible and proper manner. However, I do not think that they will be. I think that the South Australian Health Commission, in the time that the Guerin committee had been set up, had started responsible pruning and was carrying out responsible cuts. Unless the Minister can justify, when we debate the lines, that they are responsible cuts, they are cheating the people of South Australia.

Notwithstanding the remarks made by the member for Hanson about my being the Mayor of the city of Elizabeth when it went through a rather traumatic experience, I have some experience in local government. The decision by the Government to abolish community development and pass on those duties or functions of community development to local government is a blueprint for disaster. In my experience, local government will not be able to service the kind of facilities and services that community development provided in the past under the Labor Government. It will not be able to provide employment for those people who, in the past, gained employment under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. I have said previously in this House that, although the people that are elected to local government are genuine and are committed to providing services to their communities, they will not be able to take on the extra administrative costs. It will not be able to provide the initiatives, as a separate Government department could provide and, with the best will in the world, the local government liaison officer will not be able to assist them, and it will result in a further deterioration of community services in local government as happened when you, Sir, were in local government. A gradual deterioration has occurred in the past, and the State Government has been forced to pick up the tab and do the organising. Unless the Government reconsiders its portfolios and restores a Department of Community Development, local government as well as the people of South Australia will suffer.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I have listened with some interest in the past few days to the contributions made by members on both sides of the House. I have been interested in the economic theories that have been advanced by members opposite. On the one hand, we have seen the interesting exercise of criticism of the Premier and Treasurer and the manner in which he went about producing his Budget. We had one other member rise and say that most of the work was done by the previous Government. Obviously, honourable members cannot have it both ways. They must be unhappy with the previous Labor Government if they claim that most of the work was done by it. They obviously do not know where they are going. They are in a quandary, going around in circles something like a rooster with its head cut off.

It would appear from the contributions members opposite have made on other subjects that they do not know on which direction to settle. It has been interesting

to listen to their comments about the future development of our energy resources in this State. I was interested in the comments of the honourable member for Salisbury, when he spoke about solar energy and wind energy. I do not know whether the honourable member has ever had his electricity produced by wind energy. I have, and I do not want to have to rely on it again.

Mr. Keneally: You could provide enough yourself.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member, who makes his usual sarcastic remarks, is being very unrealistic. The matter I was canvassing is a very serious one indeed. The member for Stuart and the member for Salisbury ought to get their feet back on the ground and face reality. I firmly believe that, unless the industrialised world continues to develop its nuclear capacity, in many parts of the world the lights will go out. There are no alternatives. It is all very well for members to make comments and be as self-righteous as they like. However, those people overseas who are responsible for providing not only electricity for today's needs but also that for the future must come to the firm conclusion that they have to use nuclear energy to supply a considerable portion of that power. I suggest to the member for Stuart and other members who do not believe me that they contact the equivalent of our Electricity Trust in Scotland and see what their views are on the matter.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: That will be good because I am sure the honourable member has a lot to learn. I do not know whether, when the member for Whyalla was overseas, he discussed these matters with the responsible officers. If he did not, it was a pity.

Mr. Keneally: He was too busy defending your good name.

Mr. GUNN: Defended my good name! I am honoured that the honourable member would defend me. I feel humble that he would defend me overseas. I do not need defending. All those countries in Western Europe that do not possess large coal deposits, and even those that do, have said that they have come to the firm conclusion that they must have a nuclear capacity. It was interesting that a prominent trade unionist from the United Kingdom (Mr. Frank Chapple) visited Australia. He is reported in the *Bulletin* of 12 December 1978, under the heading "Ignore eco-freaks, says leading British unionist", as follows:

The unionist is Frank Chapple, secretary of the 420 000-member Electrical, Electronic, Telecommunications and Plumbing Union. But he is also spokesman for the British Trade Union Congress (the British equivalent of the ACTU) on fuel and power. He said, therefore, that he was speaking on behalf not only of his own union but "of the entire British Labour movement".

Chapple told a meeting of union delegates in Sydney: "About uranium mining we in Britain simply don't understand your attitude in Australia. In fact I'll go so far as to say we don't even believe it's right."

"It has to be a fairy story. Here we have a world which is being almost held to ransom by the Arabs, by the oil producing nations. The only chance we've got of any independence from them is through nuclear technology and for that we need to fuel it with uranium. And the Australians are saying—even in a condition when their economy is run down—they're not going to mine it."

He clearly indicated the farcical situation into which the Labor Party has boxed itself. I ask the member for Stuart, the Federal member for Grey, and those other members in the iron triangle whether they are prepared to say to the people in the northern part of South Australia that they cannot have the benefits from the Roxby downs development. Are those members prepared to say, if they

become the Government again soon (heaven help the people of the State), "We'll prevent the mining of uranium at Roxby Downs"? Are they prepared to stand on a platform and clearly indicate that to the people? Are they prepared to say that, even if the project were on the way, and contracts had been signed, they would do everything in their power to stop that development? I challenge them to indicate clearly where they stand, because the people of this State are entitled to know where the Labor Party stands on this important issue.

The reality of the situation is clear: there is a demand for uranium; we have it, and we are living in a fool's paradise if we think that we can leave it in the ground. The Labor Party adopts that isolationist policy, that head in the sand policy. Australia has to export to survive and to continue to develop our economy (we benefit by the growth factor in our economy). Do they think that other overseas countries which want our resources are not going to look elsewhere? Do they believe that, if they come to Australia and say, "We want your uranium, your iron ore, and we'll buy your barley," they would suddenly be told, "You can't have any of it." If they go elsewhere for their uranium supplies, they will also go elsewhere for their iron ore, barley or grain. The Deputy Foreign Minister of one overseas country clearly indicated to me that that was their attitude; that country has traded with Australia for a long time. The member for Stuart would no doubt say that, if there is plenty of uranium around, what are we talking about? Let us make it clear that the only people who will miss out, in the short term at least, if we do not develop the Roxby Downs deposits and export the uranium will be the people of South Australia and the rest of Australia.

Of course, there are other deposits of uranium in the world, and it was interesting to hear the member for Salisbury speak about the Republic of Niger. In France, I was told that the Japanese are making huge investments there in developing the uranium deposits. I also think that the French maintain a large presence of armed forces in Niger, obviously to protect their uranium investment in that country. Niger is not laying down the conditions for the safe mining and export of uranium as Australia is.

Mr. Keneally: To whom would we sell our uranium?

Mr. GUNN: It was reported in the press recently that several countries were showing interest. The people of France showed much interest in buying uranium from Australia. In addition, I believe that they would want to invest. Clearly, the people of the U.S. are interested. In the United Kingdom, the Under-Secretary for Energy said that that country not only wanted the supply of uranium but expected it. That was made clear to Mr. Dunstan when he was Premier. I have spoken to many people who spoke to the then Premier, and what our Deputy Premier has said is clear. The former Premier deliberately misled the people of South Australia, because he was under instructions from the extreme left wing of the Labor Party, headed by former Attorney-General Duncan, whose behaviour was disgraceful when the then Premier was overseas. He set out to sabotage—

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

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): The Liberal Government of South Australia said, as one plank of its election policy, that it would eliminate waste and extravagance in Government. Therefore, members can imagine my surprise when I saw this report on page four of the *News* today, headed "Row on car for Becker."

A row has erupted over the use of a Government car by Mr. Heini Becker, the new Public Accounts Committee Chairman . . . The Premier, Mr. Tonkin, said it was in line

with the expanded role envisaged for the committee . . . Mr. Tonkin said there would be a lot more travel for the committee than it had done previously.

I, as a foundation member of the Public Accounts Committee and a member of the present committee, can only say that this is an exercise in incredible extravagance, and it is nothing more than hypocritical for the Premier to allow the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee to have a car. It is even more hypocritical for the member for Hanson, the watchdog on public finance in this State, to accept the Government car.

It has been said that the committee will travel much more. I challenge the Government to prove to me, after the new committee has been in existence for 12 months, that it has travelled as much as the committee has travelled previously. It has travelled to Victoria, New South Wales, and Mount Gambier, and through the Murray and Spencer Gulf areas, and not once did we require a Government car for our Chairman. Whenever we wanted to go anywhere, we could call on the car pool and, if a car was not available from there, we got one from the Police Department.

There is no excuse for this extravagance except that it must be a pay-off. We want to know what the member for Hanson has on the Government that it is prepared to do this for him. It is no more than just a pay-off because he did not get into the Ministry. I am appalled at the hypocrisy. The Premier went on to state that the Labor Party gave the previous Chairman of the Public Works Committee a car. He does not know the facts. That car was provided to Mr. Shannon about 15 years ago, and some members opposite know why. I do not want to expound on the extraordinary circumstances that forced the Premier of the day (Sir Thomas Playford) to give that car to Mr. Shannon.

The present Premier did not know that: he wants to use as an excuse for giving a car to the member for Hanson the fact that the Chairman of the Public Works Committee has a car. I heard some members on the front bench say that they thought I had been given a car because I was Chairman of Committees in the last Parliament. I inherited that car. Obviously, I would be surprised if members on the Government front bench were not curious about this present agreement.

We want to know why it is that the Government feels compelled to give this particular member of Parliament (the waste watchdog) the privilege of using a car. If he was a conscientious member of his own committee the first thing he would want to do is investigate this decision. It does not mean a great deal, I suspect, in terms of the overall size of the State Budget, but I suppose that a new car, whether a Commodore or Valiant, will probably cost \$12 000 by the time it is fitted out in the Government garage. A driver has to be employed and his salary for a year would probably be no less than \$15 000, having regard to the sorts of social function that the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee will no doubt be invited to in his official capacity. Maintenance of that vehicle and provision of fuel would be at least another \$5 000. That is just off the top of my head, and I am talking about \$32 000.

Mr. Becker: You haven't got any brains.

Mr. KENEALLY: How can the Government justify that sort of expenditure? The member for Hanson interjects—he is a bit shamefaced about the whole thing. Of course he is, he has a conscience, but he'll take the car, anyway.

I will not reflect on the persons who are currently supplied with cars and who are members of this Chamber, but there are quite a number of them. But during the past

six or seven years I have heard members who are now on the Government benches criticise the big white LTD cars that ran around the State. We recently saw the amazing circumstance where the Government took the credit for changing the fleet of 8-cylinder motor cars to 6-cylinder motor cars. That order was placed by the previous Minister of Transport (Geoff Virgo) long before this group of charlatans ever got on to the front benches of Parliament in South Australia, yet they are taking credit for this and saying that they are reducing expenditure on motor cars in the Government Garage in South Australia. Now we know why—because they want to hand cars out to their defeated Cabinet candidates.

The mind boggles. What is going to happen to the Hon. Ren DeGaris—will he get a car? What about the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee—will he get a car? Why hasn't the Whip on the Government side got a car? He was a shadow Minister in Opposition for a number of years. Why hasn't he got a car? Or doesn't he have the power, influence, or whatever it is that the member for Hanson has to demand a car from the Government?

I am pleased to see the Minister of Transport enter the Chamber. I know the Minister to be an honest, genuine man. He is probably one of the few we see facing us, particularly tonight. I know he is embarrassed by the facts I am bringing before this Parliament. If he is embarrassed (as I assume he is), I wonder why he has not told his Leader, the Premier, and why he has not pointed out to the people who have made this decision (and hopefully he ought to have been one of them, but I suspect he was not) that this is a prime example of Government extravagance, the very thing this Government says it is going to wipe out in this State.

I repeat what I said originally—hypocrisy reigns supreme! Look at all the members opposite—hardly any interjections since I started, and no defence at all of what is quite blatantly and patently an exercise in extravagance. The Public Accounts Committee does not warrant having a car for the Chairman of that committee. I would like to see anybody justify it on the basis of work done by the Chairman of that committee I know exactly how much work that committee can do. I was a member of it during its busiest year—make no mistake about that. That brings me to the point that I read in the paper that the member for Hanson and the member for Eyre were responsible for the inquiry into hospitals. I point out to the House that the motion to investigate the hospitals, an investigation which has not won me a great deal of praise in my Party, was moved by me and most of the work was done while I was still a member of the Public Accounts Committee.

The then Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee (The Hon. D. W. Simmons), subsequently the former Chief Secretary, was the hardest working and most competent Chairman that that committee will ever have.

Mr. Mathwin: That's why you sacked him.

Mr. KENEALLY: We promoted him to the front bench for his good work. It was never necessary during his term as Chairman of that committee to ask the former Labor Government for a car. He would have been laughed out, because it was an extravagance that the Government was unwilling to consider. I am appalled about this. I heard the rumours, but I just did not believe them. I laughed about it. When someone said to me that they were going to give Heini Becker a car, I said, "You've got to be joking; what reason could they have to justify that?" I am asking the Government to come clean on this.

I am also concerned that the *News* saw fit to put this report in a small column of page 4. The article, although reasonably honest in representing the views of the

Premier, was a complete misrepresentation of the facts as they are. The only good feature about the report is the blown-up photo of Heini Becker which was obviously taken when he was a prefect at school, and does not show the lines on his face. Certainly, it does not show a face that has any shame or is unwilling to accept such perks from his Government. Within two or three weeks of coming into office the biggest perk of all is given by the new Government to a back-bencher. It is the worst type of Government finance—

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

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The member for Stuart has done it again: he has opened his mouth and put his foot in it. I will not go on a witch-hunt and find out what he used his car for, and where he travelled all over the State. I will not remind the honourable member of the accommodation allowance that is paid to members and how it is supposed to be vouched for as the actual expenditure incurred by members of the House. If the honourable member really wants to get down to gutter politics, I will accommodate him at any time. Let me make clear to the Opposition that the Liberal Party had 14 members in the Shadow Cabinet, and we accepted the decision that, if we were elected to Government, we would have 13 Ministers and that one of us would have to miss out on a Ministerial portfolio.

I accept that, and there are no lurks and perks to go with it. There has been no pressure put on anyone. I accept the decision of the Premier; there is no malice held anywhere in that regard. What nonsense we have heard tonight from the member for Stuart. However, if he wants to go on a witch-hunt, I remind him that the Public Accounts Committee has the power to investigate the expenditure of Parliament House, and I will be only too willing to look into the accommodation allowances and see which members, especially members of the Opposition, have claimed accommodation allowances and whether in fact they have spent those accommodation allowances. We can do a fair sort of exercise, and the member for Stuart will come out of it pretty poorly indeed.

However, the matter that has really concerned me for some time does not concern members of the Opposition. I know that they are having a paranoid period during the commencement of this session, but for some time I have been worried that there are certain members who are abusing the privilege of Parliament. The fact is that members of Parliament are paid a considerable sum, \$23 200 a year as basic salary, and one or two members absent themselves from the House to earn other income. In the past two days (and this session is only three days old), one honourable member was not present yesterday. I believe he attended for only about five minutes today. Where has he been? I refer to the member for Mitcham (I am not referring to members of the Opposition). Something has to be done.

I do not believe that any member should accept nomination and election to this House if he is not prepared to attend Parliament. I can accept the situation where members, through ill health, are unable to attend. We also accept the situation where on Parliamentary business some members are required to be absent from the sittings of the House, but I do not believe that any member of Parliament should absent himself from the sittings of the House to earn additional income. Where is the member for Mitcham tonight? Where was he yesterday? We should look at the Standing Orders of this Parliament and change them to do one of two things.

Either a member who absents himself from the House should pay to the Parliament and to the State the amount

of income that he earned while he was absent from the House, or he should forfeit that part of his salary. I do not care which of these two courses the member adopts. As far as attendance in this House is required, I do not believe that a member who walks in for a few minutes, interjects to get his name recorded, and has his name ticked off on the attendance sheet, should be able to call that attendance for the day. There are many members who have spent many years in this House. The former member for Todd was very proud of her attendance record in this House; she worked very hard and she was a very conscientious member. There are many members on both sides who have never missed a sitting of the House. That is a responsibility that members of Parliament have to the taxpayers of this State. I believe it is high time that the member for Mitcham was made to toe the line in this respect.

We have encountered a new tactic from the Opposition today in endeavouring to sabotage the speeches of the members of the Government. We know that the Opposition is very worried because their ranks have been seriously depleted. The incompetence and juvenile performances that we have witnessed from Opposition members indicate that they are unable to cope with the situation; they have been unable to be critical of the Government's performance, so they pick on petty little issues. Let us get down to the nitty gritty of the facts that concern the taxpayers of this State. Let us get down to some of the areas where the previous Government interfered with the operations of free enterprise.

The total net asset deficiency of the South Australian Film Corporation at 30 June 1979 was \$906 000. In other words, after a number of years of operation the corporation is still insolvent, although it has received considerable sums from the Government for the production of films. We are aware of the success of some of the films that have been made by the corporation, but nowhere do we see the great benefits of the so-called box office successes; for example, *Storm Boy*.

The deficit of the State clothing factory for the year ending 30 June 1979 was \$65 838. In other words, another organisation is running bankrupt; it was set up by the Labor Government as a political gimmick. The South Australian Government Tourist Bureau earned \$613 000; it earned \$487 000 in commission, yet their payments for

the year ending 30 June 1979 were \$2 159 000; that meant that the net profit of departmental operations was just over \$2 000 000. If any Government is serious in looking at the operations that cut across free enterprise, then surely it must be concerned to try to make these operations successful and profitable.

I do not see why a burden should be placed on the taxpayer. Even though the Tourist Bureau lost about \$2 000 000, and it is accepted that about \$900 000 was spent on promoting the State, something is still wrong somewhere. If the bureau was promoting South Australia and spending the advertising allocation wisely, surely the commission would have increased more than \$500 000 in the past financial year.

In the case of the State Government Insurance Corporation, we find again the Government attempting to interfere with the operations of private enterprise. This is one of the areas in which I am critical of the Auditor-General. The State Government Insurance Commission has the monopoly on compulsory third party insurance. The accumulated losses on compulsory third party insurance are \$7 000 000 since the commission commenced operation. Of course, the previous Minister of Transport, even though he reduced the registration fees in South Australia, did not tell the people that compulsory third party insurance premiums could be increased again later this year. The committee will meet some time in November or early December. I am prepared to bet London to a brick that compulsory third party insurance premiums will increase and will wipe out the benefits received by the reduction of registration fees and the fuel tax in South Australia. If ever there was a dishonest exercise, that was it.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL (No.3)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

At 10.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 18 October at 2 p.m.