

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 23 October 1979

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

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 1, 2, 5 to 13, 16 to 22, 24 to 28, 35 to 38, 40, 43, 48, 51 to 53, 56, 59, 61 to 64, 67, 70, 72, 81, 89 to 91, 93 to 102, 104, 106 to 109, 111 to 115, 117, 118, 120 to 123, 126 to 130, 132, 139, 141, 144, 147, 149, 151, 154, 157, 195, and 207.

RENTAL CONCESSIONS

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

1. What criteria are used by the South Australian Housing Trust for determining eligibility for rental concession, when were the criteria formulated and what, if any, changes have occurred during the past five years?

2. What is the range of concession permitted and at what frequency is the concession reviewed?

3. What has been the cost to the trust in each of the past five years for these concessions and is it intended to continue as at present?

The **Hon. D. C. WOTTON**: The replies are as follows:

1. The South Australian Housing Trust determines rents in relation to the accommodation provided. Where a tenant's income is such that this normal rent would create a hardship, then tenants may make application for a rent reduction. The reduced rent is assessed in accordance with the basic rent scale which first came into operation in 1974. The rents under the scale range from 16 per cent to 22.5 per cent of the main breadwinner's income excluding child endowment (allowances) plus additions for other persons residing on the premises and who are in receipt of an income. The basic rent scale has been adjusted from time to time since 1974 according to the rate of inflation.

2. The categories of people applying to the trust for a rent reduction consist primarily of the unemployed, those receiving sickness and supporting parents' benefits and those in receipt of invalid and aged pensions. In some cases also, rent reductions are granted to low income earners. Reduced rents are generally reviewed each six months, except those receiving unemployment benefits where the reduced rents are reviewed each three months.

3. The annual amount involved in rent reductions calculated at the end of the last financial years is as follows:

	\$
1947-75	710 000
1975-76	1 386 000
1976-77	2 393 000
1977-78	3 804 000
1978-79	5 760 000

This does not include the amount of rent forgone through reduced rents payable for cottage flats and rental grant houses. The trust has no intention of discontinuing its present system for determining rent reductions.

ELECTORS ROLLS

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

1. What number of electors have been registered on the individual House of Assembly electors rolls at the end of each month (or alternatively departmental audit date) from December 1978 to July 1979 inclusive?

2. When is it intended to have prepared a consolidated Electors Roll for each State subdivision and when were the last such rolls produced?

The **Hon. H. ALLISON**: The replies are as follows: See table A. These figures include approximately 900 electors who are Commonwealth electors only and are spread over all House of Assembly Districts. Existing procedures preclude actual House of Assembly elector totals being given from month to month. These are available on request for all subdivisions whenever rolls are updated. Table B is the total enrolment as at close of roll 27 August 1979 for the State election. This total is for House of Assembly electors only.

2. All subdivisional rolls were updated and printed as at 27 August 1979.

TABLE A
ELECTORAL ENROLMENTS

	December 1978	January 1979	February 1979	March 1979	April 1979	May 1979	June 1979	July 1979
Adelaide	16 920	16 896	16 675	16 696	16 463	13 532	16 274	16 331
Albert Park	17 779	17 967	18 268	18 426	18 439	18 489	18 377	18 054
Alexandra	18 029	18 043	18 120	18 131	18 225	18 287	18 353	18 363
Ascot Park	17 007	16 393	16 456	16 430	16 408	16 458	16 390	16 411
Baudin	20 484	20 597	20 605	20 718	20 833	21 044	20 883	21 034
Bragg	16 592	16 686	16 803	16 858	16 694	16 772	16 680	16 710
Brighton	18 821	18 539	18 577	18 573	18 555	18 550	18 526	18 595
*Coles	18 589	18 672	18 166	18 217	18 258	18 297	18 282	18 307
Davenport	17 809	17 903	17 711	17 808	17 070	18 218	18 254	18 252
Elizabeth	18 627	18 821	18 787	18 794	18 452	18 440	18 450	18 493
Eyre	15 463	15 436	15 423	15 296	15 277	15 261	15 249	15 273
Fisher	19 497	19 563	19 659	19 768	19 987	20 500	20 893	20 411
Flinders	15 985	15 991	15 996	15 831	15 865	15 872	15 870	15 884
Florey	17 647	17 571	17 654	17 942	17 917	18 051	17 676	17 793
Gilles	17 225	17 143	17 119	17 282	17 501	17 466	17 138	17 328
Glenselg	17 464	17 186	17 173	17 408	17 473	17 509	17 458	16 995
Goyder	16 872	16 810	16 836	16 849	16 883	16 858	16 899	16 853

TABLE A
ELECTORAL ENROLMENTS—continued

	December 1978	January 1979	February 1979	March 1979	April 1979	May 1979	June 1979	July 1979
Hanson	17 757	17 655	17 421	17 417	17 341	17 422	17 385	17 425
Hartley	18 329	18 415	18 574	18 907	18 943	19 114	18 379	18 435
Henley Beach	18 279	18 245	18 314	18 534	18 777	18 899	18 793	18 410
Kavel	17 642	17 617	17 632	17 686	17 737	17 767	17 820	17 857
Light	16 197	16 012	16 067	16 133	16 182	16 168	16 181	16 194
Mallee	15 518	15 520	15 575	15 488	15 485	15 493	15 532	15 583
Mawson	20 860	20 940	20 782	20 923	21 177	21 452	21 596	21 342
Mitcham	16 947	16 919	17 033	17 419	17 407	17 469	16 686	16 750
Mitchell	17 045	17 052	17 069	17 394	17 389	17 554	17 470	16 911
Morphett	16 930	16 894	16 883	16 975	17 118	17 351	17 192	17 489
Mount Gambier	17 818	17 862	17 962	17 909	17 877	17 901	17 634	17 655
Murray	17 721	17 636	17 756	17 925	17 998	18 102	18 152	18 190
Napier	17 397	17 572	17 685	17 909	18 065	18 079	17 672	17 687
Newland	20 006	20 059	20 078	20 404	20 732	21 005	21 474	21 306
Norwood	17 159	17 044	16 839	16 998	17 048	17 242	17 288	17 105
Peake	17 114	17 121	17 064	16 998	16 425	16 495	16 477	16 516
Playford	17 928	18 110	18 337	18 521	18 583	18 653	18 622	18 406
Price	16 379	16 403	16 408	16 616	16 574	16 036	15 858	15 899
Rocky River	17 076	17 069	17 094	17 102	17 123	17 133	17 065	17 040
Ross Smith	16 513	16 562	16 615	16 539	16 100	16 096	16 065	16 055
Salisbury	20 708	20 706	20 125	20 371	20 443	20 509	20 412	20 538
Semaphore	17 871	17 853	17 842	17 958	18 166	18 339	18 499	18 636
Spence	16 329	15 888	15 871	15 823	15 675	15 669	15 618	15 612
Stuart	17 054	16 915	16 983	17 227	17 252	17 246	17 031	17 063
Todd	18 888	18 972	18 456	18 546	18 591	18 686	18 694	18 776
Torrens	17 558	16 925	16 993	16 898	16 884	16 845	16 821	16 846
Unley	16 743	16 291	15 929	15 966	15 963	16 060	15 917	15 918
Victoria	15 624	15 642	15 677	15 590	15 596	15 615	15 617	15 652
Whyalla	17 452	17 411	17 389	16 602	16 619	16 609	16 575	16 578
TOTAL	827 533	825 402	824 372	827 852	828 642	831 753	828 344	826 964
*Chaffey	17 881	17 875	17 891	18 047	18 072	18 110	18 167	18 003

TABLE B
STATE ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS—ENROLMENT AS AT
27 AUGUST 1979

Adelaide	16 288	Mawson	21 470
Albert Park	18 112	Mitcham	16 794
Alexandra	18 402	Mitchell	17 077
Ascot Park	16 432	Morphett	16 968
Baudin	21 097	Mount Gambier	
Bragg	16 716	bier	17 699
Brighton	18 656	Murray	18 017
Chaffey	18 074	Napier	17 748
Coles	18 416	Newland	21 401
Davenport	17 983	Norwood	16 670
Elizabeth	18 583	Peake	16 493
Eyre	15 317	Playford	18 340
Fisher	20 670	Price	15 885
Flinders	15 932	Rocky River	17 071
Florey	17 770	Ross Smith	16 031
Gilles	17 499	Salisbury	20 557
Glenelg	17 058	Semaphore	18 029
Goyder	16 893	Spence	15 578
Hanson	17 377	Stuart	17 038
Hartley	18 504	Todd	18 850
Henley Beach	18 417	Torrens	16 884
Kavel	17 923	Unley	15 892
Light	16 257	Victoria	15 564
Mallee	15 552	Whyalla	16 602

McNALLY COW

5. Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Has a cow been grazed on grass in the security section of McNally and, if so, when, and what are the details of the cow's presence on the establishment?

2. Has the cow ever been ridden by either inmates or staff members and, if so, when and what are the details?

3. Has the cow which was grazing in the security section during late August suffered any injury as a result of inmate or staff activities and, if so, what are the details?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, during June, July and August 1979 to keep the grass down when the Security Section was unoccupied.

2. Yes, by residents on two occasions during outdoor activity time. The owner of the cow was present and he also rode it.

3. No.

BOAT REPAIR

6. Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Has a boat ever been repaired in the workshops of McNally and, if so, what are the details?

2. What was the origin of the boat, who now owns it, and what arrangements exist for its future management and ownership?

3. What was the cost of repairs and/or maintenance of the boat, from which account or treasury line was the work reimbursed and was this cost budgeted for or not?

4. If no budgetary commitment was involved, from which line was payment made, what was the final cost and what budgetary line was depleted to allow for the new commitment?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. Two boats were repaired. One was an incompleated hull, the other was a small yacht owned by the supervisor.

2. The incompleated hull was donated by a private citizen and is now owned by the Department of Community Welfare. It will be sold when completed. The small yacht is owned by the supervisor who retains ownership.

3. The cost of repair and maintenance to the incompleated hull was approximately \$500. Payment will be made from the Estimates line—Child Welfare: Treatment Centres—Provisions and Expenses incurred in Normal Operations and Maintenance. Workshop costs are budgeted for in this line. The cost of repair of the small yacht was \$28 paid by the supervisor in accordance with the standard procedure.

4. See 3 above.

McNALLY TEACHERS

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

1. How many teachers are involved with education at McNally, and who are they?

2. What period of time does each teacher teach per week and what are the class sizes?

3. What supervision is provided for students during class time and what duty, if any, does the supervisor perform other than being physically present?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

1. 1 principal—Mr. T. Parr.

7 Assistant teachers—N. Prysleki, A. Halls, P. Homer, S. Snoad, P. Westwood, S. Coughlin, K. Hope.

2. Teaching time: 23 × 45 minute periods. Class sizes: 5-8 residents.

3. One residential care worker per class to provide additional security and control as well as teaching assistance occasionally.

McNALLY STAFF

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

1. How many staff are there at McNally, what are their names, their period of service, their current position and their individual qualifications for the position they hold?

2. What, if any, time off for lectures or other formal training is provided for staff at McNally and are any staff denied the opportunity to train and, if so, what are the circumstances?

3. What has been the number of individuals employed at McNally since 1 January 1978 and for what period has each such person been employed, and as a result what has been the percentage of staff turnover?

4. If the percentage of staff turnover is above 15 per cent per annum, is this figure considered higher than normal for Government service and, if so, what are the reasons?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

1. 136½. Details are shown on Appendix 1 attached.

2. Details of time off for lecturers are shown on Appendix 1 attached. No staff are denied the opportunity to attend approved courses subject to the conditions prescribed by the Public Service Board Administrative Instruction No. 219.

3. 189 (including those employed on 1/1/78). The period each person has been employed is shown on Appendices 1 and 2 attached. Staff turnover for 1978 was 25 per cent and for 1979 to date 14 per cent.

4. The staff turnover in 1978 was high. Principal reasons were pressure of the work, alternative employment, full time study, pregnancy and travel.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN YOUTH TRAINING CENTRE

APPENDIX I

(136½ positions occupied by 135 full-time and three part-time staff)

Occupant	Period of Service	Classification	Qualifications	Lecture Time	Travel Time
R. Maslen	4 months	Supervisor, SW-7	1970—Diploma in Social Studies		
B. Kennedy	2 years	Deputy Supervisor, SW-5	1979—Bachelor of Arts Degree		
F. McClellan	6 years	Principal Residential Care Worker, SW-4	Residential Care Certificate		
J. Taylor	1 year	Psychologist Grade I	1975—Bachelor of Arts Degree, Psychology (Honours)		
S. Boase	1½ years	Community Welfare Worker (Assessments), SW-3D	Associate Diploma in Social Work		
R. Fulton	2 years	—	1966—Certificate of Qualification in Social Work (U.K.)		
T. Van Der Wal	3½ years	Matron, NU-5	Registered Psychiatric Nurse Residential Care Certificate		
M. C. Denison	13½ years	Senior Residential Care Worker, SW-2	—		
S. Jackson	5 years	Senior Residential Care Worker	—		
A. J. Jones	18 years	Senior Residential Care Worker	Residential Care Worker Certificate		
W. Rutter	19 years	Senior Residential Care Worker	—		

APPENDIX I—continued

Occupant	Period of Service	Classification	Qualifications	Lecture Time	Travel Time
J. Holland	3 years	Senior Residential Care Worker	Mechanical Technician's Certificate Undertaking Associate Diploma in Social Work		
G. D. Bateman	2 years	Senior Residential Care Worker	Electricians Certificate (London)		
P. F. Woods	5 years	Senior Residential Care Worker	—		
A. Bridges	3½ years	Senior Residential Care Worker	Undertaking Associate Diploma in Social Work	5 hours	1 hour 20 minutes
D. Snow	14 years	Senior Residential Care Worker	—		
J. Rosser	14 years	Senior Residential Care Worker	—		
R. Wood	2½ years	Senior Residential Care Worker	Undertaking Associate Diploma in Social Work		
D. Goldfinch	3½ years	Senior Residential Care Worker	—		
K. Fulton	3½ years	Senior Residential Care Worker	—		
A. J. Wingrove	1½ years	Senior Residential Care Worker	1953—Carpentry and Joinery (U.K.) Child Care Certificate		
A. Summers	2 years	Senior Residential Care Worker	1975—Business Communications I—odd subject		
E. Rose	10½ years	Senior Residential Care Worker	—		
L. Lynas	7½ years	Senior Residential Care Worker	Child Care and Development Certificate		
N. Jackson	14 years	Senior Residential Care Worker	Child Care Certificate		
F. Smith	5 months	Night Officer, MNG-1	Certificate in Applied Psychology (Wellington)		
A. Ferguson	2 years	Night Officer	Residential Child Care Certificate		
T. Jones	2 years	Night Officer	Bachelor of Arts—Social Studies (Honours)		
H. Kearney	17 years	Night Officer	—		
E. Saint	10 months	Night Officer	—		
C. Warrenner	7½ years	Night Officer	—		
R. Sayers	1½ years	Night Officer	—		
J. Hutchings	4 years	Night Officer	—		
G. Markwell	5½ years	Night Officer	N.Z. Prison Service Examinations—Pass in—Criminology; Penology; Psychology		
V. O'Connor	21 years	Night Officer	—		
N. Reilly	8 months	Night Officer	—		
J. Richardson	9 years	Escort Officer, SW-1	Child Care and Development Certificate		
N. Millington	3½ years	Escort Officer	Association Diploma in Social Work		
A. Pitt	6½ years	Escort Officer	—		
T. Melvin	2 years	Escort Officer	Child Care and Development Certificate		
K. Armstrong	8 months	Residential Care Worker, SW-1	Bachelor of Arts (Honours) Undertaking Graduate Diploma in Group Work		
R. Hunt	4 months	Residential Care Worker	—		
P. Barker	7 months	Residential Care Worker	Certificate in Residential Child Care Undertaking Associate Diploma in Social Work		
M. C. Beasley	11 years	Residential Care Worker	Residential Care and Development Certificate Residential Care Training Scheme Undertaking Associate Diploma in Social Work		
L. Blanshard	9½ years	Residential Care Worker	—		
M. Bradley	3 years	Residential Care Worker	Architectural Draftsman Certificate (incomplete)	4 hours	1½ hours
K. Brommage	3 months	Residential Care Worker	—		
M. Butcher	10½ years	Residential Care Worker	Child Care and Development Certificate		
M. Cameron	6 months	Residential Care Worker	Undertaking Associate Diploma in Social Work		
C. Chipperfield	6 months	Residential Care Worker	—		
J. Clay	7½ years	Residential Care Worker	Child Care and Development Certificate		
C. Colbourne	1 year	Residential Care Worker	—		

APPENDIX I—continued

Occupant	Period of Service	Classification	Qualifications	Lecture Time	Travel Time
D. Cooper	2 years	Residential Care Worker	Community Development Certificate		
M. Crampton	2 months	Residential Care Worker	—		
N. P. Davids	4 months	Residential Care Worker	Registered mental deficiency nurse (Strathmont Centre)		
S. Dodd	1 year	Residential Care Worker			
H. Duisberg	2 years	Residential Care Worker	Certificate of Social Welfare Practices and Techniques (Darwin Community College)		
D. Evers	4½ years	Residential Care Worker	Child Care and Development Certificate		
N. Franzway	1½ years	Residential Care Worker	Bachelor of Arts		
R. Freeman	4½ years	Residential Care Worker	—		
H. Fielding	15½ years	Residential Care Worker	—		
D. Gray	1 year	Residential Care Worker	Associate Diploma in Social Work (Part-time study)	3 hours	1¼ hours
D. Griffiths	10½ years	Residential Care Worker	—		
R. Hann	4 months	Residential Care Worker	—		
D. Hallahan	10½ years	Residential Care Worker	—		
P. Hammill	5 months	Residential Care Worker	1973—Qualified Motor Mechanic		
J. Harrison	17½ years	Residential Care Worker	—		
J. Holland	3 years	Residential Care Worker	—		
N. House	5½ years	Residential Care Worker	—		
D. Hudson	1½ years	Residential Care Worker	—		
P. Isaacs	2½ years	Residential Care Worker	Undertaking Associate Diploma in Social Work	5 hours	1¼ hours
J. James	10 years	Residential Care Worker	—		
I. Story	4 months	Residential Care Worker	National Certificate in Mechanical Engineering		
J. Jeansch	6½ years	Residential Care Worker	—		
R. Kauschke	1½ years	Residential Care Worker	Undertaking Associate Diploma in Social Work		
A. Kemsley	7½ years	Residential Care Worker	Child Care and Development Certificate		
R. Kennewell	5 months	Residential Care Worker	—		
E. Kustner	1 year	Residential Care Worker	Undertaking Residential and Child Care Certificate	3 hours	½ hour
M. Lane	7 years	Residential Care Worker	Residential Care Workers In-Service Training Course		
J. Lee	2½ years	Residential Care Worker	Diploma in Social Work		
B. Lewis	2 years	Residential Care Worker	Diploma of Teaching in Economics and Commerce	5 hours	1 hour 15 minutes
T. Lloyd	5 months	Residential Care Worker	Child Care Certificate		
P. Manoharan	2 years	Residential Care Worker	Group Work Certificate, One year of Social Work Degree		
A. Maudsley	1 year	Residential Care Worker	Undertaking Associate Diploma in Social Work	3 hours	40 minutes
D. McEwin	1 year	Residential Care Worker	Undertaking Associate Diploma in Social Work		
P. Neal	4 years	Residential Care Worker	Child Care and Development Certificate		
R. Paddick	11 years	Residential Care Worker	Child Care and Development Certificate		
J. Perkins	5 months	Residential Care Worker	—		
G. Pike	9 months	Residential Care Worker	—		
L. Rodenrhy	5½ years	Residential Care Worker	Undertaking Child Care Certificate		
G. Smith	1½ years	Residential Care Worker	—		
P. Smith	2 years	Residential Care Worker	—		
J. Symon	2 years	Residential Care Worker	Bachelor of Arts and Diploma in Teaching	3 hours	2 hours
P. Taylor	2 years	Residential Care Worker	Undertaking Bachelor of Arts in Social Work	4 hours	35 minutes
A. Vamson	5 months	Residential Care Worker	—		
M. Walsh	9 months	Residential Care Worker	Bachelor of Arts (Psychology)		
			Undertaking Masters Degree in Psychology		
W. Warner	1½ years	Residential Care Worker	—		
W. Wear	10 months	Residential Care Worker	—		
J. Wharton	1½ years	Residential Care Worker	—		
R. Swift	3 years	Residential Care Worker	Undertaking Bachelor of Arts (Honours)		
A. Kempster	1 year	Residential Care Worker	—		

APPENDIX I—continued

Occupant	Period of Service	Classification	Qualifications	Lecture Time	Travel Time
P. J. Steele	9 months	Residential Care Worker	—		
D. Woodley	6 months	Residential Care Worker	—		
P. Hewish	3 months	Residential Care Worker	Undertaking Certificate in Residential Child Care	3 hours	30 minutes
J. Riordan	2 months	Residential Care Worker	—		
M. G. Evans	10 months	Residential Care Worker	Associate Diploma in Social Work		
C. J. Elliot	5 years	Residential Care Worker	—		
D. Mashford	9½ years	Residential Care Worker	Residential Care Training Scheme		
M. Hartley	4 years	Residential Care Worker	—		
G. Baker	7 years	Residential Care Worker	Child Care and Development Certificate		
E. Tetlow	5 years	Residential Care Worker	—		
A. Ward	1 year	Residential Care Worker	Residential Child Care Certificate		
G. L. Pauley	9 years	Child Welfare Officers, IN7/IN9	—		
G. G. Penny	3½ years	Child Welfare Officer	1969—Apprentice Boiler Maker Undertaking Associate Diploma in Social Work	5 hours	1 hour 20 minutes
B. C. Marshall	14½ years	Child Welfare Officer	—		
G. A. Jardine	1½ years	Child Welfare Officer	1961—Certificate in Motor Fitting and Turning (S.A. Education Department) Undertaking Residential Child Care Certificate	3 hours	
B. Horridge	7 years	Child Welfare Officer	—		
W. J. Hailstone	11 years	Child Welfare Officer	Methodology in Further Education		
W. L. Bastian	13½ years	Child Welfare Officer	Methodology in Further Education		
C. Brown	3½ years	Office Assistant, OA-1	—		
J. Wood	5 years	Office Assistant	—		
M. E. McMillan	5 years	Office Assistant	—		
C. La Rose (Part time)	3½ years	Office Assistant	1957—Business Machines Typing and Office Procedures (Sydney Technical College)		
L. F. Kennedy (Part-time)	7 months	Office Assistant	Bachelor of Arts Diploma in Early Childhood Development (U.K.) Diploma in Education		
E. Pennington (Part-time)	4 months	Office Assistant	—		
J. Dover	15½ years	Head Cook	—		
A. Czerwinski	14½ years	Cook Grade II	—		
N. Stasiuk	20½ years	Cook	—		
E. A. Reilly	2 years	Cook/Domestic	—		
H. Silha	9 years	Cook/Domestic	—		
F. Richichi	34½ years	Cook/Domestic	—		
U. Buczko	3½ years	Cook/Domestic	—		
C. R. Bailey	5½ years	Cook/Domestic	—		
D. Millard	9½ years	Cook/Domestic	—		
A. Edwards	12 years	Cook/Domestic	—		
C. Van Puyenbroek	3½ years	Handyman	—		
G. Aitcheson	3½ years	Stores	—		
P. Truskewycz	22½ years	Seamstress	—		

VACANCIES:

Classification

Deputy Supervisor, SW-5

Residential Care Worker, SW-1 (To be reclassified to Chief Residential Care Worker)

Senior Residential Care Worker, SW-2 (Four positions)

Positions temporarily occupied.

APPENDIX II

Periods of employment of staff leaving South Australian Youth Training Centre since 1 January 1978

Number of staff leaving	Period of employment
	Weeks
2	1
1	2
1	3
4	
	Months
5	1
4	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
4	6
4	7
—	8
5	9
1	10
—	11
29	
	Years
3	1
2	1¼
4	1½
2	2
2	3
3	4
1	4½
2	6
1	10½
20	
53	

McNALLY THEFTS

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

1. Have there been any losses by theft from McNally in the past eighteen months and if so, what are the details?

2. Has the Police Department been called to investigate thefts in any section at McNally and, if so, what are the details and, if not, why were the police not invited to investigate?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. Items of departmental property stolen were: Two lengths of water pipe, twelve pieces of flat steel, small quantity of oil, grease detergent and car polish. These were all stolen from the workshop area.

Items of private property stolen from the car park included:

One motor car, one motor bike, one set of jumper leads, motor bike riding helmet, suit and gloves, one fishing reel, three petrol caps and petrol, one pair of gloves, a cigarette lighter and a car light.

2. Theft of the departmental property was reported to the police, who then investigated it. As far as is known, the offenders have not been apprehended. At least some

of the thefts of the private property were reported to the police by the owners.

RACING INDUSTRY

10. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice): Will the Government be conducting an inquiry into the racing industry in South Australia and if so, when will it be established, who will conduct it and what will be its main purpose?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows: The Government will conduct an inquiry into the racing industry in South Australia. The composition of the committee of inquiry and its terms of reference are under consideration and expected to be finalised shortly. A public announcement will then be made giving details of the inquiry.

TOURIST BUREAU

11. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice):

1. Does the Government propose to increase the advertising budget of the Department of Tourism?

2. Will a branch of the Tourist Bureau be established in Western Australia?

3. Is it intended to provide extra finance to upgrade our Tourist Bureau representation in other States?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Part of the increased budget proposed for the Department of Tourism is being used to improve our representation in other States.

TOURISM

12. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice): Will the Government allocate special funds to regional tourist organisations to generate tourism within South Australia and, if so, what specific areas will receive assistance?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: Provision has been made in the Budget for funds to regional tourist organisations. However, such funds will only be made available where comparable contributions are made by local government and local business. It is not possible to indicate at this stage which specific areas will receive assistance during the current financial year.

NATIONAL SPORTS LOTTERY

13. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice):

1. How much money does the Minister expect to be returned to South Australian sport by a national sports lottery?

2. How much will have to be contributed to a national sports lottery by the South Australian community, as a whole, to achieve this return?

3. What effect will a national lottery have on the lotteries run by the Lotteries Commission for the benefit of public hospitals?

4. What effect will a national sports lottery have on the amount of money raised by sporting groups and other voluntary organisations by means of small lotteries conducted under the Lotteries and Gaming Act?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Details of income, expenditure, local and State effects with respect to a national sports lottery are presently the subject of a

national feasibility study. No further information is available at present.

GROUNDWATER SUPPLIES

16. **Mr. PAYNE** (on notice): Has there been a deterioration in the—

- (a) quantity; and
- (b) quality,

of groundwater supplies in the Langhorne Creek area and if so, what are the details and what plans, if any, are in hand to rectify the problems?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Insufficient evidence is available to enable a reliable assessment of groundwater quality or quantity deterioration in the Langhorne Creek area. One of the prime functions of the Angas-Bremer Water Resources Advisory Committee, which is now being formed, will be to ascertain the significance of water quantity and quality developments in the area (including Langhorne Creek) and to recommend specific water resource management options and strategies.

BREATH-TESTING

17. **Mr. WRIGHT** (on notice):

1. Is it Government policy to introduce random breath-testing of motorists and if so, when is the necessary legislation likely to be introduced?

2. Will "road-blocks" or similar check-points be a feature of random breath-testing?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government is considering legislation to provide a wider application of breathalyser testing within positive guidelines to police officers. It is anticipated that the legislation will be introduced into Parliament early in 1980.

2. Still under consideration.

CO-ORDINATOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

18. **Mr. WRIGHT** (on notice): Will the Government appoint a Co-ordinator of Public Works and if so—

- (a) will the position be advertised;
- (b) what salary will it carry;
- (c) what will be the relationship between the Co-ordinator of Public Works, the Director-General of the Public Buildings Department, the Director-General and Engineer in Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Commissioner of Highways; and
- (d) to which Minister will the Co-ordinator of Public Works be responsible?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The appointment of a Co-ordinator of Public Works is presently under consideration. A further announcement will be made in due course.

DAY LABOUR

19. **Mr. WRIGHT** (on notice): Does the Government intend to reduce the size of the day labour force of the Public Buildings Department and, if so, to what size, how soon will this target be reached, and will the Minister guarantee that there will be no retrenchments as part of this process?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is the Government's policy that there should be a significant increase in the private

sector component of the public works programme. Accordingly, the day labour work force will be reduced by natural attrition and transfer. There will be no retrenchment of existing employees. Retraining and income maintenance schemes have been developed to ensure that no employee is unreasonably disadvantaged.

20. **Mr. WRIGHT** (on notice): Does the Government intend to reduce the size of the day labour force of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and, if so, to what size, how soon will this target be reached, and will the Minister guarantee that there will be no retrenchments as part of this process?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The Government does intend to reduce the size of the day labour force of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. This is in line with stated policy. The reduction in size has not yet been determined and is dependent to some extent on predicted work load. There will be no retrenchments but a firm policy of "no replacement" is being implemented and it is expected that the total day labour work force will be reduced by approximately 350 in 1979-80.

21. **Mr. WRIGHT** (on notice): Does the Government intend to reduce the size of the day labour force of the Highways Department and, if so, to what size, how soon will this target be reached, and will the Minister guarantee that there will be no retrenchments as part of this process?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It is Government policy that more works be carried out by contract. No target has been determined with respect to the Highways Department day labour force. However, the Government has stated that no retrenchments will be made. The Minister of Industrial Affairs has set down procedures and conditions to be adopted by all Government departments and instrumentalities with regard to redeployment of weekly paid employees which is in line with this "no retrenchment" policy.

TROUBRIDGE

22. **Mr. WRIGHT** (on notice):

1. Will the Government continue to operate the *Troubridge* to Kangaroo Island?

2. What will it cost the Government this financial year to maintain the *Troubridge* service?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The cost to the Government for 1979-80, including \$686 000 for refurbishing, will approximate \$1 800 000. The vessel refurbishing will be complete in 1979-80 and therefore no further expenditure for this purpose will be incurred beyond June 1980.

RAILWAYS HISTORICAL SOCIETY

24. **Mr. WRIGHT** (on notice): What assistance, if any, has been given to the Railways Historical Society to relocate its exhibits from Mile End to Dry Creek?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The State Transport Authority has given assistance through technical advice, lease of land and the loan of secondhand materials.

WATER STORAGE

25. **Mr. PAYNE** (on notice): What sites remain for water storage in the Adelaide Hills and when, if ever, is it likely that they will be developed as adjuncts to the metropolitan or near-country water supplies?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The Metropolitan Adelaide Water Resources Study released in June 1979 indicates the following sites for additional water storages in the Adelaide Hills:

Dam	River
Raised South Para	South Para
New Warren	South Para
Stoney Creek	Torrens
Raised Kangaroo Creek	Torrens
Pinkerton Gully	Torrens
Mount Bera	Torrens
Clarendon	Onkaparinga
Baker Gully	Onkaparinga
Tunnel Hill	Onkaparinga
Kondoparinga	Finniss
Turretfield	North Para

If anticipated population growths and demand for water are sustained, none of these sites is likely to be developed for water supply purposes before the end of the century.

MILLIPEDES

26. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice):

1. How much money will the State Government give to the C.S.I.R.O. this financial year to help pay for a study into the biological control of millipedes?

2. Will the Government be making any other finance available in the same period with a view to controlling this pest?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. \$10 000 has been allocated to provide for studies during the remainder of this financial year.

2. No. The provision of temporary control measures such as insecticides is considered to be the responsibility of local government.

ELECTION STATISTICS

27. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice):

1. How many persons were entitled to vote at the recent State election?

2. How many, in fact, voted in respect of the—

(a) House of Assembly; and

(b) Legislative Council?

3. How many informal votes were cast in each of these ballots?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. 826 586—enrolment at 27/8/79.

2. (a) 768 985—voted for the House of Assembly,

(b) 765 033—voted for the Legislative Council.

3. House of Assembly informal votes: 34 048; Legislative Council informal votes: 33 637.

LONSDALE ROAD

28. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): What is the current time-table for the completion of the Lonsdale Road between Sherriffs Road, Lonsdale and Hallett Cove?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: December 1980.

BARKERS GULLY WATER

35. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): When will construction begin on a water storage at Barkers Gully, how long will such construction take and what is the anticipated cost of the project?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The Metropolitan Adelaide Water Resources Study, released in June 1979, indicates that, although Barkers Gully is one of the sites considered appropriate for additional storage, it would not be developed before the end of the century if anticipated present population growths and demand for water are sustained. Cost estimates have not been prepared because of the long-term growth uncertainties in southern Adelaide.

NOARLUNGA CENTRE RAILWAY

36. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Will the Government honour its predecessor's commitment to extend the Noarlunga Centre railway line to Aldinga and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It is the Government's policy to investigate the extension of the Noarlunga Centre line south of the Onkaparinga Estuary when the extent of development in the area is sufficient to warrant such action. The need for, and timing of, this project will be examined in the light of the findings of the Southern Area Study and the desirability of encouraging development of the area.

HACKHAM RAILWAY

37. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Will the Government honour its predecessor's commitment to reopen the railway line from Hallett Cove through Morphett Vale to Hackham, and if so, when will work commence and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It is the Government's policy to investigate the re-opening of the railway line from Hallett Cove to Hackham to meet the transport needs of this area. The timing of such work will depend on the Government's consideration of the Southern Area Study and an examination by the State Transport Authority of the engineering feasibility of such re-opening.

HALLETT COVE STATION

38. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice):

1. Is the State Transport Authority aware of the difficulty that persons desiring access to Hallett Cove Station from the southern end of Hallett Cove Estate have in wet weather?

2. Will the authority provide an all-weather path to the platform and, if so, when, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The State Transport Authority is aware of the difficulties its patrons encounter at Hallett Cove Station in wet weather.

2. The authority plans to upgrade the existing pathway leading to the car park at the station to all-weather standard by the end of November 1979.

SALT DAMP

40. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Is the Government satisfied with the methods currently available commercially for the control and elimination of salt damp and, if not, what plans has it to investigate better methods of controlling this problem?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Government is not satisfied with methods currently available commercially

for the control and elimination of salt damp, and is supporting the Salt Damp Research Committee's efforts to find more economical treatment methods. For a more detailed statement on the committee's activities, the honourable member is referred to the committee's second report. The committee has also published a booklet giving advice which, if followed, should lead to a reduction in the number of new constructions which will be affected by salt damp.

Extensive research is required to discover less costly methods of permanent treatment. The Government is considering the possibility of further funding of the research programme in this area which has been undertaken by the Australian Mineral Development laboratories. In addition, a programme of special research is underway at the University of Adelaide Civil Engineering Department.

SECTION 110a VOTES

43. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): How many persons claimed a section 110a vote at the recent State election and how many of these votes were admitted to the count?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: A total of 4 138 people were issued with section 110a certificates and ballot-papers. Of these, 1 314 were admitted at the scrutiny.

HOUSE SITTINGS

48. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): What sittings of the House are planned for the remainder of the year?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The reply is as follows:

October	16	17	18
October	23	24	25
October	30	31	Nov. 1
November	6	7	8
November	13	14	15
November	20	21	22

If necessary, sittings will be extended, if particular business needs to be finalised prior to Parliament adjourning.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NETBALL ASSOCIATION

51. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): What assistance will the Government be giving to the South Australian Netball Association to help with its trip to Singapore and Penang early next year?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Funds are not available through the Office of Recreation and Sport to sporting associations requiring assistance to travel internationally to compete in sporting events. No assistance will be available as it is considered a Federal Government responsibility to assist teams travelling outside of Australia.

ADELAIDE-NOARLUNGA CENTRE RAILWAY LINE

52. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice):

1. What is the current minimum safe "lead time" between successive trains on that section of the Adelaide-Noarlunga Centre railway line between Woodlands Park and Goodwood?

2. By how much could this be reduced with more sophisticated signalling equipment?

3. Is such equipment on order and, if not, is it to be

ordered and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Three minutes.

2. It may be possible to reduce this time to 1½ minutes by using considerably more sophisticated equipment.

3. No such equipment is on order and is unlikely to be acquired in the near future due to the considerable expense involved.

NOARLUNGA REGIONAL CENTRE

53. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): What financial assistance, if any, has the Federal Liberal Government given, to date, toward the development of the various elements of the Noarlunga Regional Centre?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The projects provided by the South Australian Housing Trust at Noarlunga Centre have been funded from its semi-Governmental borrowings. The Commonwealth Government will directly or indirectly sponsor the investment by Commonwealth authorities such as Telecom but these would not properly be described as financial assistance.

BEACH ROAD SIGNS

56. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice):

1. Is the Government aware that there are roadside signs in the Christie Downs area directing people to the Colonnades shopping centre?

2. Is it prepared to allow the Beach Road traders to have similar signs erected directing people to shopping facilities in Beach Road?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Highways Department is not aware of any roadside signs directing people to the Colonnades Shopping Centre. The signs referred to are presumed to be blue and white service signs directing motorists to the shopping centre's off street parking area which is remote from the main roads and not readily seen by motorists travelling on those roads.

2. This is a matter for consideration by the Corporation of Noarlunga.

NUDE BATHING

59. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): What plans, if any, has the Government for the opening of further beaches for unclad bathing?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: None.

BEACH ROAD ACCIDENTS

61. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): How many traffic accidents occurred on Beach Road between Main South Road and Dyson Road in the 12-month period to 1 September 1979 and how many of those accidents involved—

(a) injuries; and

(b) fatalities?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows: Period 1/9/78-31/8/79* inclusive; total reported accidents: 21. (a) 2 (b) 1. *All reports for August 1979 are not yet available for statistical purposes and it is possible that these figures are not final for the period.

62. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): How many traffic accidents occurred on Beach Road between Dyson Road

and the Christies Beach Esplanade in the 12-month period to 1 September 1979 and how many of those accidents involved—

(a) injuries; and

(b) fatalities?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows: Period 1/9/78-31/8/79* inclusive. Total reported accidents: 41. (a) 3 (b) 1. *All reports for August 1979 are not yet available for statistical purposes and it is possible that these figures are not final for the period.

HALLETT COVE ESTATE SEWERAGE

63. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): When will the Public Works Standing Committee be asked to report on the proposal to sewer the Hallett Cove Estate area?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The proposal to sewer the Hallett Cove Estate area will be referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works by the end of this month.

SEAFORD SEWERAGE

64. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): When will the Public Works Standing Committee be asked to report on the proposal to sewer the Seaford area?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: It is anticipated that a scheme to sewer the Seaford area which is part of an overall proposal for the Port Noarlunga South area will be referred the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works early in 1980.

HOUSING TRUST NOARLUNGA CENTRE

67. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Is the South Australian Housing Trust negotiating with the Commonwealth Department of Social Security with a view to having an office of that department located in the Noarlunga Regional Centre and, if so, when is such an office likely to be established?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Department of Administrative Services has informed the South Australian Housing Trust the Commonwealth Department of Social Security is presently considering locating an office at Noarlunga Centre. There has been no commitment to a location.

MUNICIPAL LIBRARY SERVICE

70. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): How many local government areas in the State lack a municipal library service, and what are those areas?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Eighty-nine local government areas lack a municipal library service. These areas are as shown in Appendix I (below).

Of these 89 local government areas, applications from 21 of them for public libraries are in various stages of approval. Negotiations between a further 33 local government councils and the Libraries Board on the establishment of public library services are in progress. In addition, many of the local government areas are serviced by Libraries operated by the Institutes Association of South Australia Inc.

APPENDIX I

Adelaide
Balaklava

Barossa
Beachport
Blyth
Browns Well
Bute
Carrieton
Central Yorke Peninsula
Clare
Clinton
Coonalpyn Downs
Crystal Brook
Dudley
East Torrens
Elliston
Eudunda
Franklin Harbour
Gawler
Georgetown
Gladstone
Glenelg
Gumeracha
Hallett
Hawker
Jamestown, (Corporation)
Jamestown, (District)
Kadina
Kanyaka-Quorn
Kapunda
Kensington and Norwood
Kimba
Lacepede
Lameroo
Laura
Lincoln
Light
Loxton
Mallala
Mannum
Meningie
Minlaton
Monarto, (Development Commission)
Moonta
Morgan
Mount Barker
Mount Gambier, (District)
Mount Pleasant
Murat Bay
Naracoorte, (District)
Onkaparinga
Orroroo
Owen
Paringa
Payneham
Peake
Penola
Peterborough, (Corporation)
Peterborough, (District)
Pirie
Port Broughton
Port Elliot and Goolwa
Port Germein
Port MacDonnell
Port Wakefield
Prospect
Redhill
Renmark
Ridley
Riverton
Robe
Robertstown

Saddleworth and Auburn
 St. Peters
 Snowtown
 Spalding
 Stirling
 Strathalbyn
 Streaky Bay
 Tatiara
 Truro
 Tumby Bay
 Victor Harbor
 Waikerie
 Wallaroo
 Warooka
 Wilmington
 Yankalilla
 Yorketown

ONKAPARINGA FLOODING

72. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Is there an arrangement between the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the City of Noarlunga to provide early warnings of possible flooding at the Onkaparinga Estuary and, if so, what are the details of this arrangement and is the Government satisfied with it?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: There is an arrangement between the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the City of Noarlunga to provide early warning of possible flooding in the Onkaparinga Estuary. The warning is issued by the Engineering and Water Supply Department's District Foreman at the Mount Bold Reservoir by telephoning the City Engineer of Noarlunga. The Government is satisfied with this arrangement which has worked satisfactorily since its introduction in 1971.

COORONG CRUISES

81. **Mr. KENEALLY** (on notice):

1. Is the Minister aware of a proposal to build a cruise ship for tourist trips from Goolwa into the Coorong?

2. Has a study or report been prepared as to the possible effects of such a cruise ship on the marine, flora and fauna environment of the Coorong and, if so, what were the findings?

3. Will the Minister give an assurance that the environmental effects of such a cruise ship will be carefully monitored?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Some publicity has recently been given to a tentative proposal put forward by Murray River Development Limited for a venture of this nature. I understand that no formal plans have been announced.

2. No such study is possible until a definite proposal is contemplated and detailed plans can be examined. As formal Government approval will be required to operate any cruise ship in this area, such an examination would then be forthcoming.

3. Yes, see 2. above.

HACKNEY REDEVELOPMENT

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

1. What progress has been made with the Hackney redevelopment project over the past six months?

2. What plans does the Government have to continue this project?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to utilise all the land set aside for this project for housing?

4. Is a large supermarket to be built on this land and if so, where and when?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. During the past six months a number of proposals have been discussed between officers of Government departments, St. Peters Council, consultants, and the Trust for the future redevelopment of land remaining vacant within the Hackney Project Area.

2. Action is being pursued to enable the Housing Trust to consolidate the ownership of land within the area appropriate for redevelopment by the Trust.

3. No.

4. There is no proposal for a large supermarket. However, consideration is being given to making land available for a "convenience store" to serve the growing number of residents both within, and adjacent to the area, and as a replacement for the old run-down shops that were demolished early in the scheme. A site has not been selected to this time.

ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT

90. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice):

1. How many people resigned, retired or were dismissed from the Engineering and Water Supply Department during 1978-79?

2. How many people commenced employment with the department during 1978-79?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Weekly paid employees:

Resigned	257
Retired or deceased	173
Dismissed	24
Retrenched (employed under SURS and SYETP)	41
Transferred to other departments	68

563

Salaried staff (Public Service Act):

Resigned	66
Retired or deceased	31

97

2. Weekly paid employees:

SURS and SYETP	21
Apprentices	26
Others	41

88

Salaried staff:

Employed directly to fill permanent vacancies	42
Employed as temporary "extra assistance" for specific period	54*

96

* Subsequently appointed to permanent vacancies	22
Number of "extra assistance" as at 30/6/79 ...	32

54

HOUSING TRUST RENTAL CONCESSIONS

91. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice):

1. What criteria are used by the South Australian Housing Trust for determining eligibility for rental concession, when were the criteria formulated and what, if any, changes have occurred during the past five years?

2. What is the range permitted and at what frequency is the concession reviewed?

3. What has been the cost to the trust in each of the past five years for these concessions and is it intended to continue as at present?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Refer to identical question No. 1 standing in the name of Dr. B. C. Eastick.

LATE NIGHT SHOPPING

93. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice):

1. Has the Government entered into discussions with the Retail Traders Association and/or other retailers with a view to introducing legislation for late night shopping on Friday nights in the suburban areas?

2. Does the Government support, in principle, the concept of late night shopping on Friday nights in metropolitan Adelaide?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. The Government supports the principle of late night shopping.

PEDESTRIAN LIGHTS

94. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): When is it now proposed to install pedestrian crossing lights near Williamson Road to permit the crossing of Bridge Road to and from The Paddocks at Para Hills?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Highways Department is keeping this location under review to ascertain whether a pedestrian crossing is justified at this location.

PLAYFORD POLLING BOOTHS

95. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Is the Minister aware that at many polling booths in the electoral district of Playford there were prominently displayed large boards, at a lawful distance from the polling place, on election day, Saturday 15 September, carrying in large letters the statement "Vote Labor and we'll all be out of a job", and, if so, did he, or other officials of the Liberal Party, procure, arrange, assist in or encourage the display of such signs and, if not, does he approve of that display?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Returning Officer for the House of Assembly District of Playford received no complaint or report of the erection of the notices either during the election or since. In addition, in his visits to polling booths in the district, no such notices were observed.

KESTERS ROAD AND BRIDGE ROAD INTERSECTION

96. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): When is it now proposed to upgrade, widen and reconstruct Kesters Road at its intersection with Bridge Road at Para Hills to its junction with the Main North Road?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Kesters Road, Para Hills, is under the care, control and management of the Corporation of the City of Salisbury, and the honourable

member should approach council to ascertain its plans for this road.

BUS ROUTE RELOCATION

97. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Will the Minister assist in the relocation of the 560 bus route from its present route in the Para Hills area by having it proceed along Nelson Road instead of Liberman Road and thence into Kesters Road, to facilitate the needs of residents in the upper reaches of Para Hills who are currently denied access to this service and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The 560 bus route provides a connection from the north-eastern Tea Tree Gully area to the outer southern suburbs of Salisbury and Elizabeth. It is designed to serve as wide an area as possible while at the same time endeavouring to provide a direct inter-urban-type service between Tea Tree Gully and Elizabeth.

Over the years since the service was introduced, the travel time from Tea Tree Gully to Elizabeth has increased, due to increasing population and traffic in the intervening areas with resultant criticism from the public of the time taken.

Diverting the service via Nelson Road instead of Liberman Road would further increase travel time from Tea Tree Gully to Elizabeth, thus making the service even more unattractive to through passengers. As the service presently travels along Liberman Road through the centre of Para Hills, the State Transport Authority considers that a route alteration could not be justified.

SCHOOL CROSSINGS

98. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): When is it proposed to provide a safe crossing for schoolchildren traversing Montague Road in the immediate vicinity of Para Vista Primary School?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Students attending the Para Vista Primary School are able to cross Montague Road in safety by using the existing flashing light school crossing. The Highways Department intends to replace this crossing with pedestrian actuated traffic signals, but does not expect that this will be possible for two to three years due to other more urgent commitments.

MONTAGUE ROAD

99. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Can the Minister give an assurance that the proposed upgrading, widening and reconstruction of Montague Road, from a point approximately half mile east of its intersection with Bridge Road at Ingle Farm and taking in the whole of the rest of the road to its junction with Main North Road, will proceed as currently scheduled and, if so, can he advise the now proposed date of commencement of works, or, if not, advise what changes are proposed, if any, and why?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The situation has not changed since my predecessor's letter to you dated 30 July 1979.

100. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Can the Minister give an assurance that the proposed upgrading, widening and reconstruction of Bridge Road between its intersection with Montague Road and its junction with South Terrace, Pooraka will proceed as currently scheduled and, if so, can he advise the now proposed date of commencement of works, or, if not, advise what changes are proposed, if any, and why?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The situation has not changed since my predecessor's letter to him dated 30 July 1979.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

101. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Is it proposed to introduce legislation to vary the present system of fixing shop trading hours and, if so, in what manner, why and where?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: No consideration has yet been given to the matter raised by the honourable member.

INDUSTRIAL COURT

102. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Will the Government legislate to provide the Industrial Court jurisdiction to award damages instead of reinstatement in employment in those cases where the court deems it more appropriate and, if so, what maximum sum will be provided and when will the legislation be introduced?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: As indicated in the Governor's Speech opening this Parliament, it is proposed to introduce amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1978, on a range of matters, but Cabinet has not yet decided what matters will be included in the amending Bill.

POLLING HOURS

104. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Will the Government consider the possibility of reducing polling hours on State election days to the hours of 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. in line with New South Wales and Victoria and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

106. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Is the Government investigating the possibility of extending the term of the House of Assembly to four years and, if so, why and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, but the matter is likely to be considered by the Constitutional Convention proposed as policy during the election campaign.

PORT ADELAIDE DOCK STATION

107. **Mr. WHITTEN** (on notice): What reasons did the Minister have for agreeing to discontinue the effectively demanded services at the Port Adelaide Dock Station that will eliminate the jobs of 53 Port Adelaide workers?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Australian National Railways Commission is transferring only one segment of freight traffic from the Port Dock Station to Mile End being the smaller items referred to as "less than car load". The station will continue to operate as a freight depot. There is at present no proposal to vary State Transport Authority passenger services to Port Dock Station. None of the workers affected lost their jobs. Some did elect to retire whilst the remainder were relocated at Mile End and other A.N.R. areas.

PORT PIRIE PASSENGER SERVICE

108. **Mr. WHITTEN** (on notice): How many railway men will become redundant because of the Minister's

decision to agree with the Federal Minister of Transport for the cancellation of the Adelaide to Port Pirie passenger service?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Adelaide to Port Pirie rail passenger service has not been cancelled. The number of passenger trains operating on this line has been reduced from 38 per week to 28 per week. It is understood that the Australian National Railways Commission does not intend that any employees shall be rendered redundant as a consequence of this reduction in the number of services.

109. **Mr. WHITTEN** (on notice): Has the Minister made any arrangements that will enable country people who previously boarded the Adelaide to Port Pirie passenger trains at wayside stations, to travel to Adelaide or Port Pirie?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Bus services operated by Stateliner Pty. Ltd. commenced on 9 October 1979 to compensate for the recent withdrawal of some rail passenger services between Adelaide and Port Pirie. The service also caters for those intermediate tours en route which were affected by the withdrawal.

S.A. FILM INDUSTRY

111. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice):

1. What is the policy of the Government concerning internationalising of the South Australian film industry?

2. Is it proposed that the industry should continue to rely predominantly on local capital, actors and writers?

3. Will the Minister give an undertaking that the South Australian film industry will not be allowed to become the pale image of Hollywood depending on it for its continued existence, as has been the case with the British film industry?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government has no such policy.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.

ICEBERGS

112. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice):

1. Has the Minister or his department had any negotiations with either Iceberg Transport International Limited, or Icebergs for the Future Limited concerning the supply of water from icebergs for South Australia?

2. What is the policy of the Government concerning the ownership of capital of companies supplying such a basic commodity as water to South Australia?

3. What is the estimated cost of supplying water from icebergs to this State, and what percentage of this would be payable to non-South Australian interests in the form of wages, profits, consultancy fees, and other charges?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. The Government has no policy concerning the ownership of capital companies supplying basic commodities, such as water to South Australia. With the exception of some small private schemes, the Engineering and Water Supply Department is the sole provider of reticulated water in this State.
3. It has been estimated that the cost of supplying water by using icebergs would be at least 71 cents per kilolitre. No consideration has been given to proportions of payments which might occur outside South Australia, as the Government has no plans to use icebergs to augment South Australia's water supplies.

ROAD CLOSURES

113. **Mr. WRIGHT** (on notice): Does the Government intend to amend the current procedures for the closure of roads and, if so, what are the details of the proposed amendment?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No changes are proposed to the current procedures for the closure of roads under the Road Traffic Act. However, roads can be closed under the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act and any question in relation to this Act should be directed to my colleague, the Minister of Lands, who administers the Act.

DOG CONTROL ACT

114. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice): What amendments, if any, is the Government considering to the Dog Control Act?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: No immediate amendments to the Dog Control Act are proposed, but a review is being made to identify any difficulties which have arisen since the legislation came into operation and consideration will be given to any necessary amendments when that review has been completed.

PREMIER'S STAFF

115. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice):

1. How many persons are on the Premier's staff?
2. Who are these persons, what positions do they occupy and what are their respective salaries?
3. Are any of these persons not public servants and, if so, who are they and what is the basis of their employment?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. Fourteen (14) persons are presently on the Premier's Office staff.
2. and 3. *Ministerial Appointments (not Public Servants)*

		Salary
		\$ p.a.
Feuerheerdt, R. M.	Inquiry Officer	23 316
Hill, E.	Steno-Secretary Gr. I	11 060
Loughlin, G.	Research Assistant	19 990 + 10%
Stone, M. D.	Press Secretary	19 990 + 25%
Story, C. R. Hon.	Executive Assistant	22 650 + 25%
Quirk, M. E.	Press Secretary	19 990 + 25%
	<i>Public Servants</i>	
Ayling, D. J.	Secretary to Premier	21 257
Conte, M.	Office Assistant	5 452
Harris, H. J.	Receptionist	9 554 + 1 000
*Janssen, L.	Steno-Secretary Gr. III	12 073
Parons, H.	Appointments Officer	12 699
Pfennig, R. J.	Receptionist	8 953
Snelling, M.	Steno-Secretary Gr. I	10 688
Thomson, R. I.	Steno-Secretary Gr. III	12 441

*Mrs. Janssen will shortly transfer to another Department.

MINISTER OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

117. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice):

1. Is the Government aware of allegations that the Minister of Local Government has issued written instructions to his staff that he is to be addressed as "Mr. Minister" and that they are to address each other by their surnames and, if so, are the allegations correct?

2. Is this instruction likely to be copied by other Ministers?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, but these are false.
2. Not applicable.

CABINET MEETINGS

118. **Mr. BANNON** (on notice):

1. Which persons, other than Ministers, regularly attend meetings of the Cabinet?

2. What is the position of each, and for what reason do they attend?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows: 1. and 2. Executive Assistant to the Premier to act as Minute Secretary.

PUBLIC SERVICE TRANSFERS

120. **Mr. BANNON** (on notice):

1. Since 15 September, what officers of the Public Service under the Premier's administration—

- (a) have been transferred;
- (b) have been told they are to be transferred; or
- (c) have been requested to transfer,

from the positions they held at the date?

2. With respect to each such officer who has been transferred—

- (a) what is his name;
- (b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;
- (c) what is his current position and salary;
- (d) was the officer advised that the transfer could not be to certain departments and, if so, what departments; and
- (e) what was the reason for the transfer?

3. With respect to each such officer ordered or requested to be transferred—

- (a) what is his name;
 (b) what was his position and salary as at 15 September 1979;
 (c) to what position is the transfer to be made;
 (d) have any conditions been placed on the transfer;
 (e) has the officer been advised that his transfer cannot be to certain departments and, if so, what departments;
 and
 (f) what is the reason for the transfer?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

Name	15 September 1979		Current Position or Proposed Position	
	Position	Salary \$	Position	Salary \$
Anthonisz, B. V.	Project Officer	16 529	Project Officer, Public and Consumer Affairs	16 529
Archer, P. H.	Project Officer	17 392	Project Officer, Local Government Department	17 392
*Clarke, J. L.	Executive Assistant	17 088	Clerk (CO5), E. & W.S.	15 595
Cox, D.	Clerk	10 428	Clerk (CO1), E. & W.S.	10 428
*Dalton, N.	Secretary to the Premier	21 858	Executive Assistant, E. & W.S.	21 858
*Economou, A.	Inquiry Officer	15 209	Community Welfare Worker	12 589
Fedorowicz, T. K.	Project Officer	16 927	Project Officer, Department for the Environment	16 927
*Janssen, L.	Stenographer-Secretary III	12 073	On accouchement leave—new dept. on return.	
Kay, P. W.	Administrative Officer	14 436	Administrative Officer, Public and Consumer Affairs	14 436
Keys, C.	Stenographer-Secretary III	12 441	Stenographer-Secretary III, Law Department	12 441
		+990 allowce.		
		<hr/> 13 431		
Lewkowicz, G. S.	Senior Project Officer	19 858	Snr. Project Officer, Treasury Department	19 858
*McCauley, G.	Administrative Officer	17 392	Senior Administrative Officer, E. & W.S.	18 726
*Maguire, G.	Research Assistant	19 989 +10%	Research Assistant to Leader of Opposition	17 090 +10%
*Rann, M.	Press Secretary	19 989 +25%	Resigned	
†Ryan, D. M.	Senior Projects Officer	19 858	Being negotiated	
*Steer, B.	Stenographer-Secretary I	10 688	Acting Stenographer-Secretary II, Childhood Services Council (Education Department)	11 434
Strickland, A. J.	Director, Policy Division	31 063	Executive Officer, Public Service Board	31 063
Smith, R. F. J.	Senior Policy Formulation Officer	22 521	Senior Project Officer, Department of Agriculture	22 521
Sullivan, M. U.	Co-ordination Officer	18 726	Project Officer, Department of Trade and Industry	18 726

*These persons are public servants holding Public Service Act positions who were employed on the staff of the former Premier, Mr. D. Corcoran who, as a result of the change of Government, were returned to their substantive or a similar position, or for whom arrangements are in the hand to so transfer them. An exception is Mr. Rann who resigned from his substantive public service position on 4 October 1979.

†Transfers are presently being negotiated for these officers. It is proposed that they be transferred to similar Public Service Act positions at their existing salaries.

Each officer was invited to indicate a preference for a particular department and the Public Service Board has made every effort to accede to such requests. In the case of two officers who are or were political candidates, it was suggested that in their own interests it would be unwise for them to be placed in a central policy-making department. The reason for the transfers in each case (other than for those names marked with a *) was the restructuring of the Policy Division of the Premier's Department. I am not aware of any conditions being placed on any of the transfers.

O'BAHN ROUTE

121. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice):

1. What is the probable route for the proposed O'Bahn bus into the city after passing through the Lower Portrush Road area?

2. Have the St. Peters council and the Walkerville council received detailed plans on the proposed O'Bahn route through their districts and, if so, when were they consulted, by whom, which members or employees were consulted, and what was their reaction?

3. Where in the world is the O'Bahn system currently operating as a full-scale commercial proposition?

4. What studies have been carried out on the O'Bahn system and by whom?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Department of Transport is currently undertaking a technical evaluation of the O'Bahn bus system which will be completed by about the end of November. Further detailed investigations will depend on the outcome of this preliminary work. Determination of precise routes can be evaluated after the preliminary work. If the Government, as a result of the technical evaluation, decides to proceed with a detailed study, the affected councils will be fully consulted about the development of routes. The O'Bahn system is not currently operating as a commercial operation at any location, although proving of the system has been carried out for at least two years at Stuttgart. It is this factor which has prompted the Government to undertake the technical evaluation of this promising new development.

HOUSING INDEMNITY FUND

122. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice): Is the Minister aware of any difficulties that have been evident in Victoria in relation to an indemnity fund for house purchasers that is run by the housing industry, rather than by the Government, as proposed recently by the Master Builders Association?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: An insurance scheme for house purchasers exists in Victoria and is based on industry self-regulation with legislative support. The legislative provisions are contained in the Local Government (House Builders' Liability) Act, 1974. The legislation requires that an approved indemnity be in force where a builder constructs a dwellinghouse. The only approved indemnity in practice appears to be that offered by a trade group, which then acts as arbiter in the case of any dispute.

This arrangement has been criticised on the grounds that the arbiter is a member of the same group as the builder with whom the consumer has his dispute. Considerable publicity has resulted from complaints that have been made in recent months about alleged lack of objectivity in arbitration proceedings and inadequate awards. Discussions are currently being held between the Ministers involved to determine whether any changes to the existing arrangements should be made.

An examination is currently being undertaken by officers of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs of the various schemes that are in operation interstate and the various options available for introducing such a scheme in South Australia. A report will be submitted to the Minister of Consumer Affairs within the next few weeks which will then be considered by the Government.

COMMUNITY WELFARE EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT

123. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice):

1. What are the duties attached to the position of executive assistant to the Minister of Community Welfare?

2. What applications were received for the position other than that from Mr. Robert Worth?

3. If other applications were received, on what grounds did Mr. Worth receive preference?

4. If no other applications were received, what explanation does the Minister have for this lack of applications?

5. Will Mr. Worth be employed under Public Service conditions?

6. What is the relationship between Mr. Worth and the permanent public servants in the Department of Community Welfare?

7. What will be the total salary received by Mr. Worth in this position?

8. What other benefits are attached to the position of executive assistant?

9. Will Mr. Worth retain the right to operate a private legal practice?

10. Has Mr. Worth retired from his legal firm and does he retain any interest in this firm?

11. Is any similar position of employment available for Mr. Jeffrey Heath, the defeated Australian Democrat candidate for the seat of Norwood, who has lost his employment as a consequence of the election?

The Hon. J. C. ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Minister holds two portfolios, Community Welfare and Consumer Affairs. Mr. Worth will act as the Minister's personal adviser and assistant in policy and other matters, as directed by the Minister, in relation to both portfolios. He will supervise Ministerial staff and serve on Commonwealth and departmental committees as required.

2. Five other candidates were interviewed.

3. Mr. Worth was appointed because he had the most appropriate skills and experience for the position.

4. Not applicable.

5. Mr. Worth will be employed on a contract of service to the Government.

6. Mr. Worth will work closely with senior departmental officers, where necessary, to perform his duties.

7. \$19 990 per annum, plus 10 per cent loading for overtime.

8. Telephone rental and official calls will be paid by the Government.

9. Mr. Worth will not operate any private legal practice.

10. Mr. Worth has retired from his legal firm and retains no interest in it.

11. No.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BOARDS

126. **Mr. PAYNE** (on notice):

1. What is the Government's policy for the future operation of community development boards?

2. Will close co-operation in community projects between the boards, Local Government and the Department for Community Welfare be allowed to continue?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. Implementation: All existing community development boards and their members will be encouraged to continue, and to join with their local council or councils in achieving the transition from their previous role to that outlined in the Government's policy.

Over the next month, officers of my department will be sponsoring a series of initial meetings between councils and exiting boards, and will of course be available for continuing advice and support.

Where it is the wish of the particular local authority, a community development board will be established for that council. Where adjoining councils prefer it, a board may be established to embrace more than one council area.

Functions: The functions of community development boards will be: to encourage and assist people to become more involved in the life of their local community; to help local government to develop understanding within the local community on key issues; to promote the development of links and co-operation between organisations and groups within the local community; and to investigate and report to local government on any matter affecting the local community that may be referred to it by the local government, or that in the opinion of the board warrants consideration by the local government.

Operations: Boards will be invited to establish close liaison with voluntary organisations involved in the provision of services for the well-being of the community. Boards should conduct their business as laid down by the council. The number and pattern of meetings is a matter to be determined by each board, and the council.

Boards should assist local government in the general process of identifying and studying local needs, establishing local priorities and planning how best to meet these community needs through the use of local resources.

Membership: Membership of and the selection mechanism for a local community development board should be a matter determined by local government. Ideally, composition of each board should be broad enough to include representation from all the major service providers in the local community, such as education, police, welfare and voluntary organisations, as well as offering opportunity for community service by interested individuals.

Administration: Each community development board will be responsible to its particular local government and will report regularly to that local government. Boards serving more than one council will report to each council involved. Officers of the Local Government Department will be available at all times to advise and assist both councils and boards. The Government will continue to provide financial assistance towards basic meeting and administrative costs of boards during the transition period and/or their early formative stages.

2. Yes.

CONSTITUTION ACT

127. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Is the Government considering amending the Constitution Act to provide changes in the method of redistribution of electorates and, if so, what changes are proposed?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No.

LAW REFORM COMMISSION

128. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Does the Government propose to introduce changes to the current Law Reform Commission and, if so, what are the changes, by what means are they to be implemented and when?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is the Government's policy to establish a full-time Law Reform Commission when funds are available. It is not possible to implement this proposal at the moment because of the difficult financial situation. Consideration of implementation of the proposal will

occur only after full consultation with the Chairman of the Law Reform Committee.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

129. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Is it the policy of the Government to reintroduce capital punishment and, if so, for what offences and why?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No.

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

130. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Is it the policy of the Government to reintroduce corporal punishment and, if so, for what offences and why?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No.

PERSONAL ASSISTANTS

132. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Will the Government consider some more appropriate system of termination of employment for Personal Assistants in Electorate Offices, in the event of the defeat of their nominal employer and, in particular, the possibility of automatic transfer, subject to capacity to perform work, into the Public Service and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes.

COURT STRUCTURE

139. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Is it the policy of the Government to alter the structure or jurisdiction of any of the South Australian courts or tribunals and, if so, which courts or tribunals, in what manner and why?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Not at this stage.

PRICE CONTROL

141. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Is it the policy of the Government to continue price control in South Australia as it currently exists and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Government is in the process of reviewing price control measures as they currently exist in South Australia.

PAROLE

144. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Is it proposed to vary the current system of parole in any way and, if so, in what manner and why?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Government is considering the Mitchell Committee's report on this matter and will decide on the implementation of that committee's recommendations in due course.

CASINO

147. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Is it the policy of the Government to support the establishment of a casino in South Australia and, if so, under what conditions?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No.

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS BILL

149. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Will the Premier undertake to introduce a Bill similar to the "Disclosure of Interests Bill" introduced by the former Government or a Bill substantially in its terms and, in either case, when, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The matter is under consideration.

MINISTERS' FINANCIAL INTEREST

151. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Will the Premier require that his Ministers disclose any financial interest in any construction engineering or like company when the Government transfers some of the present activities of the Public Buildings Department to the private sector in the provisions of maintenance of Government buildings and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes.

FOOTBALL POOLS

154. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Is it the policy of the Government to support the establishment of football pools in South Australia and, if so, under what circumstances?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Government has not yet determined a policy about whether it will support or not support the establishment of football pools in South Australia.

MINISTERIAL CARS

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

1. In relation to Ministerial cars—

(a) when was the decision made to change over to Commodore cars;

(b) who made the decision;

(c) when was the first delivery made;

(d) how many Ministers are using Commodores at present; and

(e) when will the Premier commence to use a Commodore?

2. Is it a fact that the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee will be allocated a Government car and, if so, when will it be purchased?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) The decision to purchase six-cylinder motor cars for Ministerial use, either Commodores or Valiants, was made by the previous Government on 16 July 1979.

(b) Cabinet.

(c) 5 October 1979.

(d) Four.

(e) The Premier's existing L.T.D. is not due for replacement for at least 12 months.

2. The Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee has been allotted a new Valiant Regal which had been ordered for a Minister of the previous Government.

WOODS AND FORESTS DEPARTMENT

195. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice):

1. What was the Woods and Forests Department surplus for the year ended 30 June 1979?

2. What funds were paid to the Treasury as surplus revenue and repayment of loans in that year?

3. What are the estimated amounts for the year ending 30 June 1980?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. \$4 509 299—after allowing for the extraordinary losses associated with the Caroline fire (\$1 163 805).

2. (a) Surplus revenue paid to Treasury for 1978-79—\$2 800 000

(b) Repayments of loans 1978-79: State—\$6 926 338; Federal—\$21 000

3. (a) Estimated payments for 1979-80: To consolidated revenue—\$8 000 000; Loans—\$1 000 000.

(b) Estimated surplus of revenue over expenditure, 1979-80—\$6 604 600.

HACKHAM WEST UNDERPASSES

207. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Is it still intended that pedestrian underpasses be provided at Beach and Honeypot Roads, Hackham West, and, if not, why not and, if so, who will be the constructing authority, when will they be built, and who will meet the costs of construction?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Highways Department has no record of any proposal to install these facilities.

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 271 residents of South Australia praying that the House would legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act were presented by Messrs. Tonkin, Corcoran, and Millhouse.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: HOTEL HOURS

Petitions signed by 230 residents of South Australia praying that the House would oppose any legislation to permit hotels opening their bars on Sundays were presented by Messrs. Tonkin, Wright, Millhouse, and Trainer.

Petitions received.

PETITION: ABORTION

A petition signed by 53 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. Millhouse.

Petition received.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. BECKER: My personal explanation relates to comments contained in my Budget speech of Wednesday 17 October 1979, regarding the Auditor-General's Report.

The comments were made following my appraisal of the current report, and comparing it with the 1977-1978 report, which I now understand was prepared by the present Auditor-General and his staff. I also stated that

the Auditor-General or his deputy could have been intimidated.

Having studied the past 10 years Auditor-General's Reports, I believe I am in a position to make comparative judgments. However, I now realise that my criticisms may have been offensive to the Auditor-General, his deputy, and his officers, and I apologise and withdraw any reflection on their integrity, professional ethics and statutory independence.

QUESTION TIME

URANIUM MINING

Mr. BANNON: In view of the statement earlier this year by the Premier in which he described Roxby Downs as representing for South Australia "a beacon on the hill, a light in the future, and our only hope", will the Minister of Mines and Energy say what contracts have been entered into since 1972 for the sale of uranium from mines operating currently in Australia, and whether these contracts provide grounds for the Minister's optimism about the economic viability of uranium sales from South Australia in the 1980's?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not have details of all contracts entered into in Australia during the period referred to by the Leader. I will seek a report about this matter and bring it down to him. The information I have relating to prospective sales of uranium is that prospects will be good from about the mid-1980's. I will get a more detailed report from the Leader relating to the other fine detail that he requested.

FOOTBALL PARK LIGHTS

Mr. RANDALL: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport outline the result of investigations carried out relating to the floodlighting of Football Park? In *West-side*, the local newspaper, of 10 October 1979 an article appeared about the future of the floodlighting of Football Park in which the following was stated:

The new State Government is investigating the SANFL's plan to light the West Lakes stadium—a promise made to Albert Park voters before the recent election.

The report continued, later:

It resolved that before a Liberal Government would introduce such legislation, it would investigate whether:

- the lights dimmed in intensity and
- what methods of screening could be introduced to lessen inconvenience to residents.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: On attaining office the Premier appointed the Minister of Marine and me as a Cabinet subcommittee to investigate this matter. Obviously, any legislation referring to this matter that passes through this House will be the responsibility of the Minister of Marine. We found that we were faced with a situation where the previous Government had given a commitment to the South Australian National Football League that it would implement the recommendations of the Royal Commission into floodlighting of Football Park. The member for Henley Beach was quite correct when he said that our Party gave a commitment, whilst still in Opposition, that it would investigate the situation to ascertain whether some alternative proposal could be found that would pay more than lip service to the rights of the people of West Lakes, to West Lakes Limited, and to the Woodville council.

At the same time, the Government was concerned that

the sporting public of South Australia should have a venue provided with lighting for use in conjunction with night sporting events. Inextricably bound with that question was the question of provision of lights at Adelaide Oval. I think it is obvious to sporting followers that there is no room in a city the size of Adelaide for two stadiums to be lit to this intensity, because the capital cost of installing lights such as these is about \$1 000 000. The money required to service a loan for an installation of that type, for the installation itself, and to maintain those lights would be about \$250 000 a year. I make that point because the question of lighting Adelaide Oval bore heavily on the Government's decision in this matter. There were intensive negotiations involving the Minister of Marine, myself and all parties concerned. I am led to understand that the South Australian Cricket Association does not intend to proceed with the installation of lights at Adelaide Oval.

That, therefore, left the Government in a situation where a stadium had to be lit for the sporting public of South Australia. After further negotiations with the South Australian Football League and West Lakes Limited, the Government has decided (and the South Australian National Football League has agreed) to accept all of the recommendations of the Royal Commission except one. The recommendation that the Government has altered is that the intensity of the lights be reduced from 1 500 lux to 1 000 lux. Sporting members in the House will be aware that Football Park at Waverley is lit to the intensity of 1 000 lux, whereas the Sydney Cricket Ground is lit to 1 500 lux. I understand that the lights have faded at Waverley to about 850 lux, but, after discussions with the football league, it has been agreed that 1 000 lux would be suitable for the league's requirements and for television requirements. However, all of the other recommendations of the Royal Commission will be instituted, including the restriction on the number of nights per year—25—on which the football league may hold night functions at Football Park.

URANIUM

Mr. WRIGHT: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say which sites are being considered for the proposed uranium enrichment plant? Is a site near or adjacent to the Adelaide metropolitan area under consideration and has this option been suggested by Urenco-Centec, on the basis that they would require access to the Adelaide labour market and facilities?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: No discussions have been held yet between the new Government and Urenco-Centec regarding details of an enrichment plant, nor has the site yet been decided.

PAY-ROLL TAX

Mr. EVANS: Has the Premier examined the statement attributed to the Leader of the Opposition, in which the Leader stated that the Liberal Party pay-roll tax incentives were falling apart at the seams? If so, what comment has the Premier to make about these statements?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have watched with some interest the performance of the Leader of the Opposition over the past two or three days. I think honourable members can see how much I am trembling in my shoes! I find it remarkable that such unsubstantiated statements, based on I know not what, can receive such prominence. The Government does not believe that pay-roll tax

incentives are falling apart at the seams, and it is not what will be shown when the necessary legislation is tabled in this House in proper time, after I have given notice of it today.

I cannot understand the Leader's motives in behaving as he has, other than to say he is obviously grandstanding for a headline, because there is nothing wrong with the pay-roll tax incentive scheme. A circular has been prepared and will be posted out, I think within the next 24 to 48 hours, to all employers who pay pay-roll tax. Notice has been given of the legislation which will come before this House in the proper way and in due time. The announcement that the pay-roll tax incentives would apply from 1 October was made on 1 October and, indeed, in one of his conflicting statements over the past 48 hours, the Leader admitted this. The inference is quite clear. The Government is concerned to provide as many jobs as possible for young people and we believe that this is one of the finest incentive schemes yet devised.

One of the pleasant things about the office at the present time is that people are telephoning continually to say that they have put additional young people on their pay-roll in anticipation of the benefits applying from 1 October. That, to me, is indicative of the general feeling of confidence that is being restored in employment in South Australia. If the Leader will accept some advice (perhaps even fatherly advice, because I have had some experience in the place where he is sitting), I would suggest that he make sure that he has his facts right and that he is on firm ground before he starts making fatuous statements.

URANIUM

Mr. PAYNE: In view of the surprising answer given by the Minister of Mines and Energy to the question asked by the Deputy Leader, can the Minister say whether he is still confident that construction on the proposed South Australian uranium enrichment plant will begin in 1980, and what advice the South Australian Government has received from the Commonwealth, the Australian Atomic Energy Commission, and Western Mining on the economic viability of such an enrichment plant? I ask the question in the light of the Minister's statement to the press that he thinks a market for our enriched uranium will be available in 1985.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have made plain that I intend to make a long statement to the House during the Address in Reply debate in which I think all the questions being raised by the Opposition will be answered.

Mr. Payne: Answer the first one now.

Mr. Duncan: Who is going to write the statement for you? Certainly your confusion is indicative of the fact that you couldn't prepare such a statement.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is before the House.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If a decision is made in due course to construct a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia, I believe that we could make a start in 1980. I think the Mayor of Port Pirie would concur in that view, if one is talking about sites. In relation to economic viability, in due course I will make available to the House the reports of the two technical experts who were commissioned by the previous Government to go overseas and investigate the whole range of uranium questions, including uranium enrichment; then the information which the Opposition is seeking, and which it has already, will be made more abundantly clear.

HILLS FACE ZONE

Dr. BILLARD: Can the Minister of Environment say what is the current situation with regard to the inquiry into the boundary of the hills face zone of the metropolitan planning area, and when a report can be expected? Can the Minister give an assurance that the Government will not approve changes which will significantly reduce the area, or change the nature of the hills face zone within any local region?

Early this year an inquiry was set up to see whether adjustments could be made to the boundary of the hills face zone to remove a so-called anomalous situation. Initial submissions were called for on 28 February, and two waves of applications were received. In the first wave, 68 applications were received. The public was given an opportunity to put submissions relating to them and those submissions closed on 15 June. A further 34 applications were received in the second round, and the opportunity to make submissions closed on 3 August. Unfortunately, it quickly became apparent that the terms of reference were framed so loosely that a great number of applications—

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

Dr. BILLARD: One of the problems that arose out of the inquiry was that some applications affected a great number of users. One application which affected my electorate was an application by the South Australian Land Commission. Therefore, many people are concerned that any possible doubt as to the outcome of this inquiry be removed as soon as possible.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I thank the member for Newland for his question. I am very much aware of the interest he has shown in the need to preserve the hills face zone and of his involvement with local residents' groups in his own area. I commend him for the interest he has taken in this matter.

I am pleased to say that I had the opportunity last week to talk with His Honour Judge Roder, who told me that he is at present assessing individual submissions to the inquiry. The judge has had discussions with many organisations which have made submissions suggesting substantial changes to the area of the hills face zone, and has indicated to these people and the organisations that he considers their submissions to be beyond the terms of reference of this inquiry. It is important to note that considerably more submissions were received than was expected when the inquiry was set up. However, the judge is hopeful that he will be able to bring down his report early in the new year.

Some months ago, I, too, queried the reported submission of the South Australian Land Commission, which was made to the inquiry. I believe this submission was considered to be one of those which were outside the terms of reference of the inquiry, and I mentioned that point earlier. The Government recognises the hills face zone provides Adelaide with a unique backdrop to the city and, we believe, an irreplaceable open space for its citizens. The Government will not be changing the present nature of the hills face zone.

URANIUM MINING

Mr. HEMMINGS: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say what procedures will be adopted during the mining of uranium at Roxby Downs to minimise the danger to miners from radon gas emitted when uranium ore is broken up and from dust particles laden with the radioactive by-products of radon gas? We are awaiting the

full report of the South Australian Health Commission into the incidence of lung cancer amongst Radium Hill miners. The evidence available at present, however, indicates that, of the miners who worked underground at Radium Hill for more than 12 months, 40.9 per cent of those who are dead died of cancer. Of those working above ground at Radium Hill, the comparable cancer incidence is 15 per cent. The hazard of radon gas and radioactive dust is, of course, not confined to underground mining and I am sure the Minister will be well aware of the tragic consequences of contamination amongst the Navajo Indians in the United States.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have already stated that a committee has been set up, comprising representatives of the Department for the Environment, the South Australian Health Commission, the Department of Mines and Energy, and the Department of Transport, acting in concert with similar committees of all the other States of Australia and the Commonwealth Government to establish a code of conduct in relation to the mining of uranium as uranium mining proceeds in Australia. There will be no mining operations in South Australia until that code is established and until the Government is satisfied that the mining of uranium is entirely safe.

The Minister of Health has already answered a question in relation to the statistics regarding the preliminary study of the Radium Hill mining which took place some years ago. The statistics are quite inconclusive, and the member for Elizabeth sought to use that information to distort the facts. The Minister of Health would be able to give more precise details in that regard.

I think that, in the broad, about 3 000 people were engaged on the Radium Hill enterprise (as quoted by a Labor spokesman). It had been identified, by looking through cancer registers, that 56 people had died, 16 of cancer.

Mr. Payne: Aren't you worried about people dying?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course we are. The statistics are inconclusive, and the survey is not completed.

Mr. Duncan: Let them die, he says; let them die.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth has had too much conversation across the Chamber. I ask him to desist.

PRIVATE CONTRACTORS

Mr. ASHENDEN: Would the Premier inform members of his Government's intentions in relation to the use of private contractors in South Australia being given priority over interstate competitors?

I have been contacted by a constituent whose business is the preparation of artwork and the printing of brochures and who therefore employs a number of South Australians. He brought to my office a copy of the official programme that has been printed for the coming Adelaide Festival of Arts. He was concerned that the printing was carried out by a company in Richmond, Victoria, and he was given no opportunity to quote for the work. He believes, quite rightly, that our Government should provide the industry of our State with the opportunity to prepare such material, and I seek, on behalf of my constituent and the many small businesses in our State, an assurance that the new Government will be much more sympathetic to their involvement in State Government and Government authority contracts than was the previous Government, under whose aegis the printing was done interstate, and which had so little concern for the businesses of South Australia.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not aware of the details the honourable member has quoted in that specific instance. Obviously, it would be desirable for whatever work can be provided in South Australia to be performed here, thus adding to employment opportunities of people in South Australia. There is a practice of providing some preference to individual States by their own State Governments. I am not at all sure that that is specifically a good practice but, unfortunately, it is one that is adhered to by, I think, all other States at present and, accordingly, South Australia must also adhere to that practice. Wherever possible, the South Australian State Government will always let work of that sort out for tender when it comes under its control and will always, wherever possible, give preference to tenders from local suppliers.

URANIUM

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether an environmental impact inquiry will be commissioned into the effects of uranium mining at Roxby Downs? If so, who will undertake this inquiry and will there be public hearings and participation? The importance of a properly conducted inquiry into the potential hazards of uranium mining was underlined by the assessment report on the proposed Nabarlek uranium project by the Department of Science and the Environment. That report showed differences between the estimates of radiation exposure made by the mining company and by independent authorities.

The report stated that Queensland Mines had made estimates of radon daughter or by-product exposure and gamma ray exposure for workers. However, it stated that independent estimates were made by the Australian Atomic Energy Authority and by Australian Radiation Laboratories, based on field data, which obtained results five to 10 times higher for radon daughters and significantly higher for gamma ray exposure. The report also stated:

Gamma radiation can affect human tissue from a distance and, due to the high ore grades in the Nabarlek deposit, some pit workers may be exposed to doses that approach the limits specified by the code of practice.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: An e.i.s. inquiry will be conducted by the Department for the Environment.

REDCLIFF PROJECT

Mr. OLSEN: Did the Premier read the report in the press yesterday attributing to the Leader of the Opposition the statement that the Redcliff petro-chemical project would almost certainly go ahead. If so, what is his reaction?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I saw that report, and I am glad that the member for Rocky River has raised this matter, in which he is interested, the project being located close to his district. The report made clear that the Leader has not really learnt his lesson. I would think that, having been part of a Government that made premature announcements, before any firm agreement or contract was signed, as though projects were about to happen immediately, the Leader and members of the former Government would have learnt that that was not a good policy. This Government will not make statements until it is sure that projects will go ahead and this applies very much to the Redcliff project. The feasibility studies for Redcliff have been announced and discussed. They were,

very properly, announced when they first came up for discussion. The Leader knows as well as I do that Dow Chemical is still engaged in a feasibility study that has been made necessary by the long delays that have occurred since the project was first put forward. The study will, in fact, be ready, we understand, in March next year.

I know that it hurts members opposite, but I simply say that I am prepared, having discussed the matter with officials of Dow Chemical in Michigan only a few weeks ago, to say that I am hopeful that the project will go ahead; but I am not able to say positively that it will, and neither is the Leader. I think that what the Leader is trying to do is get some sort of kudos for the former Government for having obtained the Redcliff petro-chemical project. If the Leader wants to take the kudos for getting this project now, I think he had better take the blame for what the former Labor Government did in this State in 1973 and again in 1974 in losing this project for South Australia. I point out that had the project been allowed to go ahead (and the former Minister of Mines and Energy knows this full well) in 1973, when it was first put forward, and if it had not been blocked by the actions of the Federal and State Labor Governments of the time, there is no doubt in my mind that a petro-chemical plant would be constructed and operating in South Australia now.

BREEDER REACTORS

Dr. HOPGOOD: Is the Minister of Mines and Energy prepared to admit that, in suggesting that the development of the fast breeder reactor would help solve the problem of the disposal of plutonium (as he did on 11 October), he was committing a schoolboy howler of the same order as suggesting that "*pax in bello*" can be translated as "freedom from indigestion"? Is this indicative of the state of the Minister's knowledge of the nuclear fuel cycle and, if so, what confidence can the House place in any statement on this subject issued by the Minister? The Minister said on that occasion that if the fast breeder reactor was developed the fuel for that reactor would be plutonium, which would help reduce the problem of the dissipation of plutonium from other projects. I would like to quote briefly to the House from the book *Nuclear Power*, by Walter Patterson, which, at page 75, states:

It is also possible to design a reactor with a conversion ratio greater than 1: a "breeder" reactor, which produces more fissile material than it consumes. At the end of its sojourn in the core, fuel from such a reactor emerges containing more fissile nuclei than it contained when new. Of course, it also contains the usual complement of ferociously radioactive fission products; recovering the new plutonium is not easy. Nonetheless, the concept of the breeder plays a major role in present planning by the nuclear industry.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Some of the material produced in nuclear reactors can be reprocessed for use in fast breeder reactors. If that option is adopted on the world scene, enough fuel will be produced to provide energy for centuries.

CITY SCHEME

Mr. SCHMIDT: Will the Premier say what allocation has been made this financial year to Community Improvement Through Youth (CITY)? CITY relies solely on financial assistance from the State Government and directs its energies mainly towards community projects, while at the same time assisting unemployed youth. Since the election, I have been approached by a number of

groups involved with CITY, one being the Noarlunga Youth Activities Committee. CITY has been involved in my area, particularly in the past 12 months, and has contributed much to the Noarlunga community and its growth. Since the Budget was brought down last Thursday week, some concern has been expressed about the future of this organisation.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am delighted to support the remarks made by the member for Mawson and to endorse them thoroughly. The work of CITY has earned it the admiration of everyone in this Chamber and in the whole community. This programme has been recognised for its thoughtful approach to the problems of the unemployed, particularly the problems of young people who are placed in that unfortunate situation. When the Budget was brought down on Thursday 11 October, CITY was allocated \$289 800, an increase of \$54 000 for this year. Believe me, CITY has earned that increased allocation because of its determined efforts in doing what it is for the community. CITY, with its constructive employment projects, is community-oriented and deserves every support we can give.

URANIUM

Mr. KENEALLY: My question is directed to an unusually reticent Minister of Mines and Energy. Will the Minister during his forthcoming negotiations with Urenco-Centec, about a proposed uranium enrichment plant for South Australia, ask for a report on the security and safeguarding of Urenco's European plants? I will give the Minister time to obtain advice. It was reported in *Time* magazine three months ago that the Dutch Government has admitted that an agent in Holland's Almelo enrichment plant, operated by Urenco-Centec, stole plans which have enabled Pakistan to build an enrichment plant with a capacity to produce weapons grade fuel.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I missed the first part of the question. If the honourable member had spoken more clearly, I would have heard the first sentence. I will answer that part of the question that I heard.

The SPEAKER: So that there can be no misunderstanding, I will ask the honourable member for Stuart to restate his question, and the question only.

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister during his forthcoming negotiations with Urenco-Centec, about a proposed uranium enrichment plant for South Australia, ask for a report on the security and safeguarding of Urenco's European plants?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The answer is "Yes". I make one observation. At the weekend, the Leader of the Opposition, I think, accused me of talking up the uranium issue; I think it is fairly obvious today who is doing the talking up.

VEHICLE LOADS

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Transport say whether a decision has been made relating to vehicle load mass associated with the transportation of primary products? Last week, when I asked the Minister a question on this matter, he said that the request would be considered and a decision made within a few days.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Indeed, the member for Goyder did ask me that question last week and I believe that I said that I hoped to supply an answer this week. The Government has considered the question of allowing a 40

per cent tolerance for farm vehicles at harvest time, and in fact the Government has decided to instruct the Road Traffic Board to reinstate the 40 per cent tolerance that applied until, I think, two years ago. I point out that the Government considered the safety aspects of this proposal very closely because it is a most important question, and the Government is satisfied that, in allowing farm vehicles to have this 40 per cent tolerance, but at a maximum speed of only 50 kilometres an hour and also to a maximum distance of 80 kilometres, the safety factors were evident, bearing in mind the very good safety record that primary producers have had in the past. This tolerance applies to the carriage of grain, grapes, fruit and vegetables.

VITRIFICATION PROCESSES

Mr. TRAINER: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy explain whether the vitrification processes (which were reported to have impressed the Premier with regard to the adequacy of waste disposal programmes when he visited the Marcoule plant in France this year) can commercially vitrify waste from the main stream of light water reactors or only waste from older gas-cooled reactors with graphite moderators that are being phased out? Does the Minister wish me to repeat the question?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I think the honourable member was asking me to explain the vitrification process, which consists of converting liquid wastes by calcination into solids then incorporating them into ceramics or glass. Another process developed on the Australian scene is called the synroc process, which also incorporates the solid wastes in a crystalline-type structure for ultimate disposal.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Can the Minister of Health say what the Health Commission's response will be to the claim of the Adelaide Children's Hospital Board Chairman (as reported in the *Advertiser* of 20 October) that the services offered at the hospital will have to be cut as a result of its reduced Budget allocation and also that, while the hospital's board is prepared to work with the commission, the idea of working for the commission is not on.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: At the annual general meeting, at which I was present, the Children's Hospital Board Chairman made some fairly strong statements about the impossibility in the eyes of the board of working within the Budget allocation which had been presented to the board by the Health Commission. All the letters that went out to the hospitals advising them of their Budget allocations contained the message that, if any hospital was in genuine difficulties and could make out a well substantiated case for additional funds to enable it to maintain its services, that case would be considered by the Health Commission. That is what will happen with each of the hospitals. However, the point must be made that it is quite clear (as demonstrated by the Public Accounts Committee report) that savings can be made in hospitals.

Mr. Duncan: I don't think that report mentioned the Children's Hospital.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: True, it did not mention the Children's Hospital. The Children's Hospital, like other hospitals, has a board of management that has dedicated itself to the efficient running of the hospital. The fact remains that, if the Government is to be able to implement

its health policy in terms of placing stress where we and members of the whole community believe that it should be placed—in the fields of preventive medicine and the development of community health—the money must come from somewhere. As we are not going to get additional money, there must be a redeployment of funds.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The hospitals are the greatest consumers of funds in the health budget. The question is whether those funds can be reduced while at the same time maintaining and, if possible, improving services by virtue of eliminating waste and reassessing those services which are not being fully used.

Most of us could point to services in almost all the hospitals that have been continuing year after year without the assessment that would bring them up to date with community needs.

Mr. Payne: Can you name some?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The honourable member asks for some to be named. Assessments are taking place and all hospital boards have been asked to make those assessments. This brings me to the next point of the question.

The Children's Hospital Board Chairman said that the board was willing to work with but not for the Health Commission. I consider that that statement is well founded. I think a situation has been allowed to develop in the Health Commission where the autonomy of the hospitals has been threatened. Plenty of documents have gone out from the Health Commission. I heard one hospital board Chairman describe such a document as being "a bureaucratic Bible in loose-leaf form". A continual stream of instructions, inquisitorial questions and directions has been sent to the hospitals during the tenure of the former Minister. This indicates that the Health Commission, in respect of the hospitals, was really operating in a fashion not so different from that of the old Hospitals Department. That is not how the Government wants the Health Commission to operate. We intend that the hospital boards will be allowed to develop their managerial powers. They will be given the right by this Government to exercise managerial authority within the constraints of the State Budget and within the Government health policy.

I am in the process of preparing a specific statement that will spell out to boards the kinds of freedom that this Government will give them which they did not enjoy under the previous Government and which they are looking for. When they have that freedom I believe their ability to live within their budgets will be greatly enhanced because they will not have impositions put on them requiring them to do what the Health Commission and the socialist Government tells them to do whether they like it or not and whether or not they believe it is good for their hospitals.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say where, if a large settlement is established at or near Roxby Downs, the water required for industrial and mining purposes and for residential use will be taken from?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The companies involved in the project, Western Mining Corporation and British Petroleum Australia Limited, are in the process of spending about \$50 000 000 to find the answers to such questions.

H. C. MEYER

Mr. WEBSTER: Can the Chief Secretary give an up-to-date statement about the investigations carried out into the sinking of the dredge *H. C. Meyer* at Port Adelaide on 2 October 1979?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Yes, I can bring the House up to date on the investigation into the sinking of the dredge. Today the body of the night watchman, the late Mr. Wally Patro, was found and the police have been so advised.

The departmental inquiry which commenced on 9 October is being undertaken by a committee headed by the Manager, Marine Affairs (Captain N. R. Carr), with the Superintending Engineer of the Department of Marine and Harbours (Mr. L. B. Taylor) and an Investigating Officer of the Law Department (Mr. N. Lenton) as members. The first stage of the inquiry was completed on 18 October, with evidence being taken from 23 witnesses. The evidence revealed that the hull of the vessel was damaged. However, insufficient evidence is available at this stage to establish the cause of the damage, when it occurred or whether it was critical to the stability of the vessel. The inquiry has been adjourned until such time as the dredge has been refloated and cleaned, when it is intended to carry out a complete inspection. Following this inspection, it is expected that further evidence of a technical nature will be necessary. Subject to the progress with salvage, it is expected that the inquiry will resume during the early part of December 1979.

It is expected that the physical work of salvage visible on-site will commence probably late in November or early December. The department is awaiting final details from the salvage expert (Sir John Williams), but work has been undertaken in sealing off the accommodation areas of the vessel and in assembly of equipment necessary for the salvage. Progress with this complicated task of salvage is regarded as satisfactory, although at this stage there is only minimal work visible on the site itself.

PREFERENCE FOR UNIONISTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say whether Cabinet has directed that unionists should not be given preference in Government employment, and, if it has not, why not? I well remember in 1968 when we came into office one of the first things we did was to cancel the Cabinet directive or minute directing that preference should be given to unionists in Government employment. I have done some homework on the matter and find that the same cancellation took place in 1933. In 1965, it was reinstated by the Walsh Government as soon as it came into office, and I made sure that we turfed it out in 1968. I have no doubt when Dunstan came back in 1970 it was reinstated. I wonder whether the present Government has cancelled the directive so that there is now no preference to unionists in Government employment; it is simply on merit, presumably.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am grateful to the member for Mitcham for asking this question. This matter, of course, has concerned my Government since it came into office and has concerned my Party for many years. The matter has been considered and an instruction prepared withdrawing the terms of the previous directive. At the same time, we are making clear that the Government believes that the trade union movement is a proper avenue for people to show interest in their industrial affairs and encourage members of the Public Service, and indeed all workers, to join the appropriate union. We are also

making it quite clear that nothing should be done to bring any pressure to bear on those people who have a conscientious objection to joining such an association.

OAKLANDS PARK ROAD

Mr. OSWALD: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Highways Department has any current plans to construct a carriageway and water table along the eastern side of Morphett Road at Oaklands Park, a busy arterial road in my district? The section of road to which I refer is a major north-south arterial road with a heavy density of light and industrial traffic. Although it was an electoral promise for some time by the previous administration, the eastern side of this road has never been constructed, nor has any temporary water table or footpath ever been considered. The condition of this road, which is a Highways Department responsibility, has now deteriorated to such an extent that when it rains it is almost impossible for children to use this side of the highway to get to school, and elderly people have great difficulty in negotiating holes and vast sheets of water in getting to shops and buses.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am not aware of the exact details to which the honourable member refers. However, the whole matter of Morphett Road, its resealing and, in fact, its extension, is the subject of Government policy. We promised before the election that it would be investigated, and that process is now underway.

It would depend also very much on the result of the southern area study that is due to be on my desk within two or three weeks. The study will refer to all the points the honourable member has made. However, I will instruct the officers of the Highways Department to investigate the specific request made on behalf of his constituents.

URANIUM

Mr. O'NEILL: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say what will happen to water used in industrial and mining processes at Roxby Downs after it has been contaminated with uranium, and, if water is taken from the artesian basin, will it be returned to that source?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I think I answered that question earlier when I said that the companies involved are spending \$50 000 000 on a feasibility study to answer those very questions which are troubling Opposition members.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy inform members whether preliminary investigations into the feasibility of the Redcliff petro-chemical plant have considered using rail transport to a southern port for export of products and, if not, will the Minister have that alternative considered? Most people support the establishment of the petro-chemical plant. However, many of my constituents are concerned at the possible effects of an accidental spillage in the prawn and scale fish breeding and nursery grounds. If the products were rail freighted to a southern port, potential damage to these nursery grounds would be minimised.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is a good suggestion. I do not know that it has been examined in detail, but we shall certainly examine it as an option.

URANIUM

Mr. BANNON: How does the Premier reconcile his statement made a few minutes ago, attacking my optimistic forecast on the Redcliff project, with his own statement on Redcliff, made to the House on 11 October, at page 18 of *Hansard*, as follows:

I am confident of a favourable result.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I can see no problem in reconciling it. I am confident of a favourable result. I am not going to make any more statements about it until a final contract is ready for signing.

VEHICLE CONVERSIONS

Mr. LEWIS: In view of the number of fires and explosions in automobiles, the most recent being in New South Wales, can the Minister of Transport reassure citizens of South Australia, in general, and electors in Mallee specifically, that it is safe to have gas conversions or duel fuel-type conversions done to their automobiles by properly accredited tradesmen in South Australia? What form does this accreditation take, and are there risks associated with back-yard conversion work?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I think that the honourable member has referred to the incident reported in this morning's *Advertiser*, in which a taxi from Newcastle which had been converted to l.p.g. exploded, and the driver was blown through the window. He was badly burned. My officers investigated the situation and contacted the New South Wales Department of Labour and Industry, which is the relevant department in New South Wales. They have informed me that the gas tank in the back of the taxi was cracked and that letters have had to be sent to many firms and individuals in Newcastle who have had l.p.g. conversions, warning that the gas tank that had been installed was likely to be cracked and that leakage of gas from the tank in the boot, where it was usually placed, placed the driver and occupants of the taxi in great hazard.

I can reassure the honourable member and the citizens of South Australia, and those in his own district, that stringent safety precautions have been put in train by the Government. He may recall that only last week, I think it was, I laid on the table regulations incorporating a code of practice for the installation of l.p.g. conversion equipment requiring that the installer of the equipment must be licensed. He must install the equipment under stringent safety precautions, and, more important, supply the person whose car is to be converted with a certificate, at the completion of the conversion, stating that it has been installed in compliance with the regulations.

URANIUM

Mr. McRAE: Mr. Speaker, you will be surprised to know that my question is directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy.

Mr. Millhouse: You have been concentrating on him today.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McRAE: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say what procedures will be adopted at Roxby Downs for the disposal of uranium tailings? I am led to understand that it is standard practice in most uranium mines to erect large tailings dams to enclose and contain uranium tailings. Recently, in New Mexico, 100 000 000 gallons of water and 1 100 tonnes of uranium tailings escaped from a dam which met all of the United States Government's prescribed licensing requirements and which was considered ideal for the purpose. The *New York Times* reported that readings taken immediately following the incident showed levels of radioactivity way above safety standards, and said the mishap may have been the biggest such release recorded in the United States. In view of the acknowledged hazards from radon gas and radon by-product exposure from uranium ore, the disposal of tailings at Roxby Downs should be clarified.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is one of the matters which will be considered during the course of the company's feasibility study, and the Department for the Environment will be heavily involved in relation to coming up with a satisfactory answer that will assure the Government that we will not proceed until we are satisfied that the matter is completely safe.

BUS LICENCES

Mr. ASHENDEN: Can the Minister of Transport inform the House of the Government's intention in relation to the licensing of buses owned by school councils? I have been approached by a school council in my district that would like to purchase a bus for the use of its students. However, in order to operate the bus at no loss to the school, the council would be required to charge fares to the students when using the bus. The council was advised by the previous Government that, if it should go ahead with the project, the council would be required to abide by exactly the same licensing conditions as do buses operated by the State Transport Authority, meaning that the council would be subject to extremely high licensing costs. Will the Government introduce a policy that would be more sympathetic to school councils wishing to show more initiative by providing their schools and students with facilities for educational use?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I thank the honourable member for his question and for being good enough to apprise me of it a short time ago. I should be pleased to investigate the situation for him. In particular, I point out that the carriage of schoolchildren is an important facet of community life, and one in which stringent safety precautions should apply. I am investigating the requirements that both the S.T.A. buses and other, including buses used by the Education Department, have to meet for the carriage of students.

The position that applies at the moment is that school councils may operate buses for the carriage of school children without holding a licence issued by the State Transport Authority, provided there is no charge for the transport of the children on the bus. I point out that in those cases I would want to see that the requisite safety precautions are still adhered to. Nevertheless, where there is some form of payment, a licence from the State Transport Authority (containing, in the main, conditions similar to those applying to private bus companies) is necessary. The conditions of a licence require that the bus must be owned or leased by the school council and that only schoolchildren enrolled at the school, and the supervisors, shall be carried on the bus. For reasons of safety, there are also restrictions on the carriage of luggage

in the passenger compartment. The vehicle must therefore be certified as roadworthy by the Government's central inspection authority.

At 3.12 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 18 October. Page 204.)

Mr. PLUNKETT (Peake): I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election as Speaker of this House. I do this in all sincerity; I did vote for you, Sir, unlike some of your colleagues on the other side. I overlooked congratulating you last Tuesday, Sir, when I made a brief speech to the House relating to the important matter of the Thebarton Community Centre; I had only 10 minutes then to speak about that subject, and I felt that that matter should be raised without delay. I am sure, Sir, that the many years of experience you have had in this Parliament will stand you in good stead in your new position.

I take this opportunity, too, to acknowledge the fine service that my predecessor, Don Simmons, gave to the District of Peake and to the Parliament of South Australia. Mr. Simmons served the State in several capacities, first, as Chairman of the Industrial Development Committee from 1970 to 1973, a time when the committee was active in giving guarantees for the development of industry and approving lease purchases of factories constructed by the Housing Trust. During that time he was also an active member of the Industrial Development Advisory Committee. He was elected as the first Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee in 1973. During his term of office that committee actively investigated adverse comments made by the Auditor-General relating to several departments, including the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Highways Department, Woods and Forests Department, and Department for the Environment.

In 1975 he was appointed Minister for the Environment. In that capacity he was responsible for implementing the beverage container legislation and introducing noise control legislation. In 1977 he was appointed Chief Secretary. During his term of office he implemented a major inquiry into the operation of the Fire Brigade, made important changes to the Police Regulation Act, and had almost completed legislation into the field of correctional services that would have made a considerable improvement to existing practices. All in all, he was diligent in promoting improved financial and administrative practice in Government, and he served the public of South Australia as a whole.

He was interested in promoting the welfare of constituents in his district, particularly those of ethnic backgrounds. In that respect he was most interested in the Thebarton Community Centre which, hopefully, I will soon see get under way.

The member for Mallee intimated his support for the concept of the Thebarton Community Centre in reply to my brief speech in this House last Tuesday. I have some further information about the format of the pilot project.

During 1972-73 a study was undertaken by a team comprising two half-time workers who worked 20 hours a

week for six weeks, and one full-time co-ordinator who worked for 10 weeks. Several steps were taken by the team in order to obtain the widest possible representation of the citizens of Thebarton. Step one was when the idea was publicised through schools and the local press and by the distribution of 1 200 pamphlets, which were written in Greek, Italian and English, to all householders in the area.

Step two involved the delivery of more pamphlets to local businesses and churches. These pamphlets had reply-paid tear-off strips attached. Also, a further 5 540 private homes received a questionnaire. In step three community leaders and local organisations were contacted by the project team. Realising the difficulties presented by the area and its multi-lingual groups, the project group organised neighbourhood groups to discuss the questionnaire in more detail.

Step four involved the employment of 13 interviewers to do a detailed survey of the 5 540 homes. Those interviewers were also interpreters. Of these homes, 741 were selected on a random basis; of these, 426 home owners were successfully interviewed. They comprised 7.8 per cent of the community surveyed. During step six, the architects set up simulation games (such as, "If you had X amount of money to spend, what sort of things would you like to see in a community centre?") in which parents at the school and community members participated. The final step taken by the project team was the setting up of the Residents Association to take up the matter of a community centre as an issue. This association was subsequently re-named the Thebarton Community Association.

Contact with other departments and organisations was maintained at all times. The following list gives an indication of the wide range of these contacts: Department for Community Welfare, Department of Sport and Recreation, Department for Public Health, Hospitals Department, Department of Further Education, South Australian Police Force, South Australian Libraries Board, Adelaide University, Crown Law Department, Government caterers, Department of Labour and Industry, State Planning Office, Public Buildings Department, Department of Transport, Engineering and Water Supply Department, Housing Trust, and Australian Government departments such as Tourism, Recreation and Sport, Bureau of Census and Statistics, Education, Employment Service, Health, Postmaster-General's and Social Securities. Local organisations contacted were Meals on Wheels, St. John Ambulance Brigade, Mothers and Babies Health Association, sporting clubs, and charitable organisations.

Information was obtained from overseas on a number of school-based community centres. These centres included Rowlinson in Sheffield and Sutton-in-Ashfield in Nottingham, United Kingdom. The area of Thebarton is one which is socially and economically depressed: it is deprived owing to a lack of community recreational facilities and poor educational environment. The Thebarton Community Centre would provide community facilities centred on the secondary school, which would alleviate the effects caused by the current deprivation of the Thebarton community. I am convinced that the centre would be worth while in the interests of the students and the welfare of the community.

Strong support was shown by the community for some of the following facilities: a large multi-purpose hall; a swimming pool; an oval; a multi-purpose gymnasium; a range of smaller rooms for clubs and indoor activities; a restaurant; landscaped gardens; parks; library; art, craft facilities; child care centre; and a variety of administration services. I have been the member for Peake for only a

short time; however, I have, of course, been closely associated with the area since well before my election.

My district is in the western part of Adelaide; it is an urban area with a relatively high industrial component. Both before my election to Parliament and since, I have been concerned at the need for community resources and social services in this part of Adelaide. These services are even more necessary because the population is mainly older Australian and migrant families which, I believe, have a greater need of help in many areas. Of course, as I said when I last spoke in the House, the former Labor Government had been actively pursuing a policy of overcoming the deficiencies in community services in my area. But State Government can do only so much, and the lack of facilities for community use is still significant in comparison with other areas.

There was a time when the Federal Government made a commitment to cultural and leisure facilities, which was of considerable help to State Governments. In the last Budget of the Whitlam Labor Government, \$6 300 000 was allocated to the cultural and leisure facilities programme. These funds were not only for inner suburban areas, but, as the member for Rocky River will know, also helped large recreation centres such as that at Kadina. The Fraser Government discontinued the programme as soon as it took office and payments since then have been for outstanding commitments only. The State Labor Government in South Australia took up the obligations, which the Commonwealth Government had left standing when it withdrew from the scheme, and continued to help local government to provide facilities for recreation and leisure. You, Mr. Speaker, will know that in your district a major centre is planned for Clare, with a State Government commitment of over \$200 000.

It is obviously economically sound to provide multi-purpose facilities. I hope this present State Government will press ahead with any plans to build such facilities. I cannot stress enough the need for community recreation facilities in my area. Because of the development of industry, there is hardly an open space between Mile End and the sea. The one available area is 60 or more acres known as the Thebarton pughole. This needs to be developed as an area for community recreation, and I hope that the Minister responsible will have a close look at doing something.

Peake has a large number of migrants from non-English speaking countries. Some areas have the highest proportion of migrants in the State—as high as 33 per cent. At some schools, 75 per cent of children come from homes where English is not the spoken language. This is the dominant social fact which affects everyone and for which appropriate services must be provided. The main social problem in my district is a lack of community identity and sense of belonging. In the past, service delivery was inappropriate, particularly regarding the recognition of cultural differences. This can be remedied through community involvement, community participation and community decision-making.

In the meantime, the youth of this area has nowhere to go. Unemployment is rife. More and better programmes are needed for youth. Previously, a few small programmes for youth were organised; more are needed, especially for the unemployed and those in need of care. This year, so far, there is no certainty that suitable programmes will continue. I seek a positive statement on this issue. In this area, job training, social survival skills, and care and welfare for youth are needed. We need better community health services in the area, directed towards preventive measures rather than treatment. I am pleased to hear that the Minister of Health supports the concept of preventive

medicine, and I hope that she will ensure that the people in my area receive that facility.

Community arts have an important part to play. A community arts officer, Mr. George Katsibris, has been appointed through a grant from the Australia Council. He is located within the Thebarton Community Centre to serve the whole of the western region.

I am very concerned about unemployment and the need to create job opportunities for South Australians. I am sure that all members share this concern. However, I believe that the present state of Australia's economy (and I emphasise that it is a national problem) is causing particular hardship for the people of my district. Of course, the electors in Peake comprise a very wide cross-section of the community. There are large areas of modern and relatively expensive housing, and many professional people have found that living in the western suburbs has a lot going for it, especially since the previous Labor Government provided services and facilities that match those of more affluent areas. However, by and large, the people in my district are ordinary working men and women, and it is these people who are bearing the brunt of the present economic situation, which is made worse by decisions of the Federal Government, such as the dismantling of Medibank.

For the past few years, members opposite have been knocking South Australia. The Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, took every opportunity to try to convince people that South Australia was a lousy place to live. It is interesting that now the Liberal Party is in Government it suddenly finds things are not as bad as it had made out. But the Liberals are not saying that too loudly. The Treasurer's Financial Statement states: "There have been some signs recently that economic activity is beginning to pick up." Later, it states: "While the employment position is still far from satisfactory, there have been some signs recently that economic activity is beginning to pick up." Members should compare this with the Premier's election policy speech and all those advertisements by the Liberal Party and their friends depicting South Australia as a lost cause.

I do not believe anyone can really swallow the suggestion that in three short weeks the economy could turn right around. The Premier obviously thinks people will swallow that. Members will recall that, when he opened the Colonnades Shopping Centre at Noarlunga, the Premier said that the centre was "A symbol of the new found confidence in South Australia." He said the same thing, I am told, at a function recognising the progress of The Savings Bank of South Australia. The Premier claims credit for achievements that were planned and built under a Labor Government, and it seems he is also trying to take credit for the healthy state of the South Australian economy, the true condition of the economy, which was maintained by a Labor Treasurer despite Canberra's policies, which have created unemployment and hardship throughout Australia.

The people of my district, who have suffered from these policies, as have many other South Australians, resent the gloom and doom of the Premier and would like the truth. The facts are clear. South Australia's economy has shown a healthy rate of recovery in 1979. The recovery began well before the September election. It was under way when the Premier was insisting that all was lost.

I would like to mention some important areas where the facts are clear. Employment in South Australia rose by 3 300 between January and June this year. These are the latest figures and they show that the rise in the State was slightly above the national increase. Job vacancies rose in South Australia. This is the case whether you use the

figures of the Commonwealth Employment Service or the number of "Wanted" advertisements in the *Advertiser*. According to the seasonally adjusted figures of the C.E.S., job vacancies rose by 18.5 per cent in the first six months of this year. The last figures for July and August show a further increase of 13.5 per cent. Along with this increase in vacancies there was a fall in the level of unemployment. The figures of the C.E.S. show a drop of 2 000 since January of this year.

All of this good news was occurring when the Premier and his Party were in Opposition, knocking South Australia and spreading gloom and confusion. Now that they are in Government, my electors are looking to see whether they will run the State so that these benefits continue to come their way. This is especially so, with the unemployed, who want the Premier not to boast about something which he didn't do but to create work and jobs.

This Budget does not look as though it will do that. It has some good points, all of them carried over from the Labor Government's programmes. Other members have placed on record the consequences of abolishing the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. I would like to remind members that during 1978-79 almost 3 000 persons found work through the scheme and 360 went on to permanent employment. Also, of the funds spent on the scheme, over \$1 000 000 went on materials. This is a direct boost to industry and would have been responsible for maintaining jobs across a wide range of companies.

The Opposition, as my Leader has said publicly, will not knock South Australia for the sake of a few headlines, but we do want performance and the people we represent want promises honoured. We will be watching to see that they are, and to see that the Premier's boasting is exposed.

Last Tuesday, I referred to the ignorance of the member for Glenelg for claiming that it was impossible to get balance sheets and rules of trade unions. The honourable member left immediately after he had spoken, and he was not in the House when I spoke. It is no fault of mine if he does not wish to listen to other members. He took notice of what his colleagues told him, and apparently they misinformed him. I shall enlighten him about what I did say concerning him. I quote from *Hansard*, as follows:

I turn now to the remarks made by the members for Glenelg and Henley Beach. I had to ask whether the member for Glenelg was a new member. I was surprised at his contribution. I thought he was a new member, and I felt sorry for him. I was President of the Australian Workers Union prior to coming here and the things he had to say about unions are not correct. I can supply him with a balance sheet, audited twice a year, from the Australian Workers Union, South Australian Branch, and a copy of the rules of that union can readily be obtained.

One of my colleagues has pointed out that it is quite simple to get the audited report of the Australian Workers' Union, and also other reports, if one likes to do some research on the matter in the library in Canberra. I made a promise about this and I have the constitution and the rules. I would like the honourable member to sit down and read this, and I hope that the next time he speaks about trade unions he will be better informed, at least as far as the Australian Workers Union is concerned.

Mr. Mathwin: It's a Federal union.

The SPEAKER: Order! At the commencement of the honourable member for Peake's speech I failed to indicate that it was his maiden speech and to ask members to show the courtesy applying on such an occasion. I should have thought the honourable member could complete his remarks without interjection.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I needed protection against the vicious attitude of the member for

Glenelg towards unions. This substantiates my support for you, Mr. Speaker; you are very fair in the way in which you treat members on this side of the House as well as members opposite. I am very pleased that I supported you for the position of Speaker even though I know that it was an unpopular situation for the other side.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I support these Bills. My remarks will be divided into three sections: first, I will look at the method of presentation of the Financial Statement; then I will look at the question of Commonwealth-State relationships in financial matters; and last I will comment on some of the problems facing the Government within the constraints which I acknowledge. With regard to the form of presenting the Financial Statement of affairs, this is the second year the Revenue Account and Loan Account have been taken together, and this is a considerable improvement. Given the construction of the financial affairs of the State, the Budget as a whole must be, in broad terms, balanced. Therefore, the transfer of moneys from one account to another as required is imperative.

It is also the second year of the valuable practice of including within the Budget papers comments on various matters raised by the Auditor-General in his previous report, with a note of what action was taken and of the current position. Last year in the Budget debate the then Leader and the then member for Mallee drew attention to the continuing and somewhat ridiculous tradition of the entire House attempting to engage in a line-by-line analysis as one committee, following the second reading of the combined Budget Bills. Referring to Budget and Estimates committees, the then Leader said:

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

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

I fully agree with precisely that procedure. In fact I find it difficult to see how any balanced examination is possible without that procedure. Furthermore, there is the recurrent evil of a department's spending up to the last cent of its estimate as part of a programme of maintaining high allocation. In other words, it may be that we reward inefficiency in budgeting and punish the efficient. I find it quite obvious that reforms along these lines should proceed, and I trust that the Government will not find the whole thing suddenly unattractive, just because it is a Government.

I believe that no Minister and no public officials ought to fear inquiry, providing that the inquiry is objective and that it is understood that, as well as the immediate expenditure, regard must be had to the overall objectives of the Government.

On a note of caution, it would be absurd to let what ought to be a very objective exercise lapse into a witch hunt. I have no doubt that one of the things that the last election showed was that the general community of South Australia demands a Government, of whatever political complexion, that will be more and more accountable, responsible, and open in its dealings, and that people are quite concerned about this. It is impossible to make much sense of the Budget papers before us without referring also to the inter-relationship between the moneys that are available, or in some cases not available, to us and the budgeting practices of the Commonwealth.

Australia as a federation has had some great successes, and it has also had great difficulties, but one of its great successes has been its method of tax equalisation so as to eradicate as far as possible economic inequalities between the States. It is well known in other federations, and the United States is a good example of this, that there are certain areas which are blighted and very poorly off compared with other regions.

Mr. Evans: You could draw the same comparisons between metropolitan and some country areas.

Mr. McRAE: I think the member might be stretching his point a little there, but I have not got his specific regions in mind. This concept of fiscal equalisation was developed by a great man, Professor Giblin, in the 1920's and 1930's. As a member of the original Grants Commission, he made what I think was a most significant contribution to the theory and practice of federalism. No longer is it possible, I think, to simply look upon federalism in a lawyer-like way, or in the way of a political scientist. It must be looked at in the reality of financial relationships between the component parts. In this particular area, its key role in federalism can hardly be over-emphasised, because the fiscal equalisation is the essential link between two of the principal objectives of Federal Government; that is, diversity and, at the same time, equality. Moreover, it is too often claimed that equality can be achieved only with centralisation and that there is therefore an essential conflict between equality and federalism. In my view, that is to confuse equality and uniformity.

The systematic process of fiscal equalisation makes it possible for a claimant State to provide the same services as do the standard States, without having to impose higher taxes and charges, but it does not oblige it to do so. In terms of equality, a federal system with a comprehensive system of fiscal equalisation is thus equivalent to a unitary system with an additional degree of freedom.

However, it should be realised that tax equalisation is related purely to income tax, and that none of the States are currently benefiting from the Prime Minister's shrewd manipulation of oil prices and tax. There is no question that one of the Prime Minister's few successful moves in the past 18 months has been the way in which he has been able to manipulate oil prices, bringing Australian produce into line with world prices, thus engendering additional research and exploration in gas and oil fields, but neatly, at the same time, very greatly satisfying some of his major supporters and contributors to his political Party, and simultaneously reducing his taxation problems markedly. Indeed, were it not for the tariff on oil imposed and collected via the service stations, the Commonwealth budget would be in grave difficulties indeed.

Since the Second World War there have been some notable developments in Australian financial relationships between the Commonwealth and the States. These are neatly summarised in a report prepared by Professor Russell Mathews entitled *Issues in Australian Federalism*. Professor Mathews is the Director of the Centre for Research on Federal Financial Relations at the Australian

National University. The group was set up in 1972 by the Whitlam Government. Under the heading, "Financial Relations after World War II", he states:

The distinguishing characteristics of Australian fiscal federalism after World War II were Commonwealth financial domination combined with lack of State financial responsibility. These conditions resulted from: the uniform income tax arrangements and the reliance of the States on Commonwealth general revenue grants as a substitute for their own taxes; High Court decisions which made it difficult for the States to impose broad-based consumption taxes; Commonwealth control of the Loan Council; and a growth in specific purpose grants for Commonwealth-determined programmes and policies in fields of State Constitutional responsibility.

Both Labor and non-Labor Commonwealth Governments pursued policies which had the effect of increasing central power, but the centralising tendencies became more pronounced during the period of the Whitlam Government, when political and financial issues combined to produce a bitter confrontation between the Commonwealth and State Governments.

Throughout the post-war period, the States had objected to the loss of income tax powers and to the formula used to calculate tax reimbursement grants (later called financial assistance grants). They also complained about the increasing burden of State indebtedness, which resulted from the fact that the Commonwealth used its surplus taxation revenue to make special loans to the States in support of their works programmes. Largely because of these special loans, by the late 1960's the Commonwealth was in the unique position for a national Government of being a net creditor in relation to all other sectors of the economy.

The States were also critical of the growing use of specific purpose grants, especially those which included matching or other revenue conditions, on the grounds that they imposed the Commonwealth's spending priorities and made it difficult for them to respond to what they perceived as the needs of their communities. Between 1972-73 and 1975-76, specific purpose payments to the States more than quadrupled . . .

Although adjustments were made from time to time in taxation, grants, debt arrangements and expenditure functions, the fundamental fiscal disequilibrium remained . . .

Although the States did take action to increase taxes under their own control throughout this period, they showed little interest in having income tax powers restored to them. Instead, they concentrated on attempts to relate the level of financial assistance grants to income tax yields, which by the 1970's were increasing very rapidly indeed as a result of the interaction of the progressive rate structure and inflation. The States' approach to fiscal federalism was thus based on maximising the level of Commonwealth grants rather than restoring State financial responsibility.

That is one of the problems we face. I quote comments made by G. S. Reid in *A monograph on New Federalism in Australia*, as follows:

The expression New Federalism has been coined by politicians, both in North America and Australia, in the context of electoral suspicion of central government initiatives. New Federalism can be interpreted, therefore, as a tactical expression used in the competitive struggle for national power in federal systems. Mr. Whitlam's New Federalism put a federalist gloss on policies which sought the expansion of the power of the central government. Mr. Fraser's initiatives claimed an intention to reverse "the flow of power to Canberra" and to restore federalism.

In office, however, Mr. Fraser's Government has sought to conquer the powers of the States by means which some students of politics would call subtle, and others would call devious.

Mr. Whitlam's New Federalism was more explicit in its intention than Mr. Fraser's. On getting to power, Mr. Whitlam sought to implement his plan but forgot that the Opposition could exploit de Toqueville's prediction that there was "no surer means of courting the majority than by inveigling against the encroachments of the central power", Mr. Whitlam failed.

Comparatively, Mr. Fraser's tactics have been dissembling. He has moved in the direction of Mr. Whitlam's goals while claiming publicly to be heading elsewhere. It is difficult to determine whether this was the original intention of the coalition's *Federalism Policy*, or whether in the real world of intergovernmental conflict other forces influence politicians in office.

New federalism, it appears, lives in democratic rhetoric, not in reality.

That is the fact of the matter. Since we have now completed the first stage of the new federalism, we should be proceeding with the second stage of the new federalism arrangements; since no single State is in any way likely to impose a separate income tax, I think that we are thrown back into a re-examination of the base for distribution. That is one of the matters that were properly raised by the Treasurer in his papers. He correctly draws attention to the difficulties that will be created, as it becomes obvious to the Federal Government that the States are not going to support the continuation of new federalism, and considerable and complex bargaining then proceeds between the various States and the Commonwealth to determine what the ongoing system will be.

It is almost impossible, I think, to leave this area without saying that circumstances must sooner or later, in my view, force a new consideration by all Australian Governments to reconcile the conflicting needs of centralisation and decentralisation, of independence and inter-dependence within the Australian federal system. In this area, we are very long on theory and very short on action.

In specific terms, one of the greatest dangers that South Australians face is that, in the reconsideration by the expanded Commonwealth Grants Commission, the taxation base for the share of income tax benefit that was gained in 1975 by the railways agreement and the transfer to the Commonwealth may well be under challenge. If that is the case, it would further narrow the total sum available to this State from its share of income tax revenue. I think it is impossible, as an Australian, not to acknowledge also that the larger States, while admittedly having tremendous advantages from the centralisation of industry in New South Wales and Victoria, are paying a disproportionate amount of income tax towards the maintenance of what might be termed the outlying States. I see these frictions as presenting basic dangers to the whole system, and not just being part of a process of tinkering with the formula.

First, the basic problem that confronts the Government would confront any Government anyway. We, regrettably, are in a position where our population increase is almost zero. Furthermore, we are at the stage of transition from a large population growth to almost no population growth, where a vast majority of labour-demand services have already been provided. So that, for instance, each year, on current reckoning we must see an ever-decreasing demand for new water resources, sewer works, schools, hospitals, and, in fact, most public works. That factor must be seen in combination with the present resentment of taxation levels. The fact is, you cannot simultaneously reduce taxes, maintain services and employment, and most certainly you cannot do those things while, at the same time, fulfilling the high level of anticipation of economic reward that every Australian wants, and what he

has been led to believe, since 1960, is his right and that he will receive it.

As the Budget shows it, the five measures set out on page 5 of the Financial Statement put it nicely, as follows: employment will be progressively diminished to take into account the loss of revenue. There is no other way of interpreting those remarks; it is quite logical, indeed inevitable, to balance the equation. On the other hand, I can see the Government points to long-term mining and power development that one is meant to assume will redress and balance the equation.

As I have pointed out before, unless in the community there is a rapid reassessment of what we really want and where we are really going, we will be heading for absolute disaster. It seems to me that, unless we can as a community decide one of two things (either that we take effective measures to increase the population by migration, taking with it the short-term disabilities but accepting that, in the long run, this will create new demands for services, and hence employment; or alternatively, make drastic changes in the tax structure along the lines I set forth in a grievance debate last week), we will have an ever-increasing number of unemployed. The point will be reached where the whole social fabric will be split.

Because of the major inbuilt constraints on the main access to revenue, one of the major avenues for the generation of funds and hence, employment, still open to State Governments is the area of public utilities and instrumentalities. The instrumentalities such as the State Bank, the Savings Bank, the Electricity Trust, and so on have always been a tremendous advantage in helping the State in times of difficulties, because of their capacity to build according to need at the time that the need arises. Put bluntly, we are not caught totally by the law of supply and demand.

This is even more the case in a State where only half a dozen truly significant individual corporations have their head office and, hence, the importance of a rescue operation for the Bank of Adelaide. In this area, I think that the record of this new Government has been deplorable. I outright accuse Mr. Fraser and Mr. Howard of attempting to use the opportunity of the difficulties of the Bank of Adelaide and its finance subsidiary to centralise the banking system still further. I believe that it is a deliberate policy on the part of the Federal coalition Government to monopolise the banking system in Sydney and Melbourne, reducing again and again the total number of banks involved in the system. Furthermore, I believe that they have set up the public finance inquiry with a deliberate view to maintain the privileges of the banks, while imposing the ever-greater responsibilities on valid competitors of the banks, such as building societies, credit unions, and other organisations. I am ashamed to think that the Premier has before him a Government-commissioned report by a properly qualified accountant that he simply refuses to table. I believe that he refuses to table it because it discloses that, with no risk to the people of the State, by a Government guarantee of \$30 000 000 or \$40 000 000 (not the provision of the moneys, but merely the guarantee of the money), within two or three years, the Bank of Adelaide and F.C.A. could be rescued from their dilemma.

I believe that, when the Premier went to negotiate with Mr. Howard and Mr. Fraser, they were far too tough and rugged and too prepared for him; they brushed him aside. I do not think that is good enough. Often I heard the Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, demand openness in government, and we have a right to expect that. Every South Australian citizen does; in particular,

the small shareholders and the employees of the bank and the finance corporation are entitled to know what is in that report.

I could tell them what is in the report, because I know people in the previous Government who have seen it, but that is nowhere near a satisfactory situation. The report should be tabled in this House, but I assume that would be some embarrassment to the Government. I cannot accept the bland assurance that there will be no increase in unemployment if the merger proceeds; that is ridiculous. You have only to go to small country towns and see the Bank of Adelaide and the bank taking it over side by side in separate buildings. They are not going to build a patio between the two and keep two sets of accountants, two sets of bookkeepers, and two sets of clerks; that is ridiculous. It has never happened before, and it will not happen now.

I think every South Australian has a right to see this Government acting responsibly in this matter. I believe, therefore, that the Liberal Party is attempting a desperate gamble, that the missing part of the equation, that is, jobs, will be provided by the mining companies, either directly or indirectly. Redcliff should present no problem, but the Roxby Downs development is plagued with conscientious difficulties. I stress that the people concerned with conscientious difficulties are from all age groups, both sexes, all income levels, and every political Party. It is a pure fact of life, if one looks at Gallup polls: the great majority of South Australian women are most concerned about the development of Roxby Downs. I can see further vast difficulties, and vast problems at every stage. I cannot tell what an appropriate answer would be. I guess the only fully democratic answer is to call for a referendum, but where we would end up if the result was 50/50 or 45/55 I am not quite sure, either. I find it difficult to accept that the Liberal Party really does have a mandate to proceed with Roxby Downs, in those circumstances.

The problem of young people is that, even taking the best possibility of the Liberals, which, with their mandate, they are entitled to have on this, I do not see that the unemployed are, in any significant way, provided for in the interim; that is to say, there cannot be an increase in employment, given the benefit of every doubt being given to the Liberal Party, generated by mining for the next two or three years.

Granted, there is tax relief provided under certain circumstances, but, to counter that, I have referred already to the slashing of staff that will occur if the merger of the Bank of Adelaide goes ahead. The State Unemployment Relief Scheme has been totally removed, and the public works areas still available are being run down. Given all those circumstances, there cannot be an increase in employment. In fact, it is the opposite—there must be a continuing decrease in employment. I would have thought, granted the problems caused by the declining population, that there were some areas that could produce employment and, also, long-term advantages. One often referred to by the Auditor-General is the continued construction of Government buildings for the use of the civil service, as opposed to tenancy arrangements by the Government. I think that that suggestion should be considered. Secondly, I think that there should be an immediate acknowledgement by the Government that the construction of a major hospital at Salisbury-Elizabeth is necessary and should be given priority.

I consider, too, that the Federal Government has treated Adelaide shabbily in terms of its works programme. For example, the airport facilities at West Beach are run down and totally inadequate—they are

shameful. There is no Commonwealth court block. With the exception of the Taxation Department, there is no major Commonwealth office block. South Australia is being treated badly indeed, and I hope that the Federal Government will be asked for assistance in this matter.

One other suggestion, just using a little imagination, is that there is no reason why we should not receive funding, on a Loan basis, for a significant recreational development planned for completion in the 150th year of foundation of the settlement of South Australia. The Dunstan Government put forward a similar proposition which it proposed funding from its own revenue. That would not now be available. The Victorian Art Centre was provided for on a Loan Council agreement and I cannot see why that could not happen here.

I suspect (in fact, I know) that, in order to honour its tax promises, which in our distorted standard of values have been sold to people, the unemployed again are doing the paying. How then is this Budget fairly commented on, granting all the benefits and all the doubts? I suggest that, ironically, by looking at three groups one can find just where this Budget goes. The small business man has very little to look forward to. Traditionally, he has been the backbone of the Liberal Party. He has no joy in what is to come—centralisation urged on by Fraser and Howard. Huge banking organisations and mining construction companies are not going to help the small business man. Those things are into a whole complex of corporate activities.

I turn now to the unemployed young. Tremendous promises were made by the Liberal Party to those people at the last election, and now we find those promises cannot be honoured. It was a question of honouring the tax promise or honouring the employment promise; they could not do both, so they decided to honour the tax promise. It is disgraceful that they made the promise in the first place, but they did and now they are caught with it. I hope that the young people will see through the shallow thinking of the Liberal Party in its ever being bold enough to make such a promise.

One other striking Liberal advertisement during the campaign concerned the bandit. There was an implied promise there that victims of crime were going to be helped, but I see nothing in this Budget about recompensing victims of crimes. There is no change in police procedure offered. There is no change in court procedure. I hoped that there would be a compensation scheme for the victims of crime, but that was just a callous way of gaining a few more votes. All these chickens will inevitably come home to roost; there is no way out of that. As time goes by, the Government will find that this year is only the beginning of its problems. This is a minor problem compared with what will have to be faced up to next year and the year after that. I do not gloat over any of that, because the whole thrust of what I am saying is that it is so dreadfully sad that we have a community so divided, so distorted in its values that it puts the saving of a relatively small tax ahead of the misery of unemployed people.

Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder): I rise to support the measure before the House and to commend and congratulate the Government, and the Premier, on the presentation of the first Budget which will be one of many Budgets the Liberal Government will present. The speaker who has just resumed his seat said, when speaking of the previous Government and its intentions, that in the future chickens will come home to roost. I suggest that that is exactly what happened on 15 September last to the previous Government—the chickens came home to roost. The

people of South Australia saw exactly what was happening and did what they thought was best for the future of this State. We have also heard much about promises made in the policy speech of the present Liberal Government. The Opposition is hardly being fair in saying that the promises have not been kept when the life of this Government has been only about three weeks.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. RUSSACK: The life of this present Government has been only a little over three weeks, so I suggest that the reaction of the people of South Australia has been nothing but commendation for the way in which the Government has set about its task and has gone ahead with honouring the promises made. What amazes me is that the Opposition is pointing out promises made by the Liberal Party during the election campaign, yet it says that Roxby Downs was not a promise. Roxby Downs was mentioned time and time again. In a policy speech made by the Premier, a statement was made about Roxby Downs and the future needs of exploration in relation to fuel and energy supplies. The statement is as follows:

Exploring and developing the enormous resources of Roxby Downs, as well as other resources, will create thousands of new jobs and bring in millions of dollars to South Australia over the next decade. South Australia is lucky because it has energy reserves in a world which is short of energy. Many countries have no option other than to use nuclear fuel to supply the energy needs of their people. We have a responsibility to supply uranium to those people, under the strictest safeguards. It will help the world energy situation, and will help South Australia, too. At the same time, I recognise the very real and genuine concerns that some people have about nuclear fuel. But if we are to guarantee our future energy needs without resorting to nuclear fuel, we must develop alternative energy sources for South Australia now. A Liberal Government will establish an Energy Fund into which uranium royalties will be paid. That fund will be used for the future energy needs of the State.

The Premier stated that the Government would explore all the possibilities, while adhering to the best safeguards known. There would be mining; South Australia would honour its moral obligation to other countries that do not have the resource but need nuclear fuel and energy.

That statement was made during the election campaign and the Government has set about honouring the promise made. I suggest, because of the barrage of questions directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy, that the Opposition is concerned about the indications of a development which will be a worthwhile industry to this State and its people and which will benefit not only this nation but also those countries that need the raw commodities and resources that Australia is fortunate to have. The Premier further stated:

The Liberal Party won't impose double taxation. We have no plans for a new State tax. More tax will not make this State great again. It will destroy it. A Liberal Government will cut State taxes and we can afford to do it. Our cuts have been carefully costed.

Another document, a summary of Liberal Party policies, produced and released under the name of the Treasury, states:

A Liberal Government will abolish succession duties as from 1 January 1980.

Honourable members on the other side have stated in definite terms that succession duties affect only the wealthy. That comment has been heard this afternoon, and on many other occasions, but I suggest that this is a matter of how one defines a wealthy person. I have

obtained a schedule of succession duties, which states, in part:

Where the beneficiary is an ancestor or descendant of the deceased (a descendant includes a legally adopted child and a child who has been brought up as part of a family but never formally adopted) . . .

Children of parents, if left an estate valued at less than \$20 000 (which is not a large sum in today's situation), would have to pay duty at the rate of 15 per cent. On amounts exceeding \$20 000 but not exceeding \$40 000, the duty would be \$3 000 plus 17½ per cent of excess over \$20 000.

Mr. Hemmings: What about the really wealthy people who will gain hundreds of thousands of dollars?

Mr. RUSSACK: In any situation in life, there is always a consideration apart from the normal, or apart from the situation in which the majority of people would be involved. Take the case of a home built by parents 20 years ago, at a cost of £5 000, or \$10 000. The cost of that house today, if it is in the metropolitan area, could have increased three or four times. The house may be left to two children. Therefore, one can assume that \$20 000 or more would be the share of each child. Each beneficiary would have to pay (if the amount was over \$20 000) \$3 000 tax, plus 17½ per cent of the excess over \$20 000. So, succession duties affect average people. In a family where the breadwinner dies and the only possible means of support is a family farm or a small business, it is often necessary for beneficiaries to realise on the thing that brings in their income to meet the expense of succession duties.

Mr. Hemmings: What you are saying is that a small farmer or business man can gain from the abolition of death duties?

Mr. RUSSACK: I have explained the situation and given one example, but there could be many examples of the average person being caught up in succession duties and the impost on people. The abolition of succession duties was the first of the economic promises. The people of South Australia will see this promise honoured. The second promise concerned the abolition of gift duties from 1 January 1980. In answer to the interjection of the member for Napier, many people have worked for a salary or wages and have accumulated a certain amount of money. These people have been thrifty and they wish to give something to a son or a daughter, or pass on money to a relative. In this State, a gift duty had to be paid on any amount exceeding \$4 000. Gift duty will be abolished as from 1 January 1980. One economic promise which will be of great benefit, especially to young people, is the abolition of the stamp duty on the purchase of a first home or housing allotment up to the value of \$30 000. A saving of \$580 in \$30 000 will be involved. Young people often have to borrow that additional money, thus extending the life of the mortgage.

Therefore, to a young couple endeavouring to establish their own home it will be of immeasurable benefit, and I would commend the Government for abolishing this tax. I remind Opposition members that the Government set no date for applying this measure. In the interests of those endeavouring to acquire their first home it has been dated as from the date of the election. That is going the second mile as far as a promise is concerned. This measure is of great benefit to young people, but the previous Government did not do anything of this nature; it increased the stamp duty on the purchase of a home or of land.

The abolition of land tax on the principal place of residence will bring South Australia not only into line with the other States but will be an improvement on the

position in many of the other States. Taxes of this nature are a burden on the home owner. Land tax has increased over the years. If we go back a couple of decades, land tax was just a nominal figure. When the war ended and my wife and I acquired a property, land tax was 4s. 6d. On that same property today, land tax is about \$20. The valuation has increased out of all proportion, but the point is, Mr. Deputy Speaker—

Mr. Max Brown: Some land, if it's \$20.

Mr. RUSSACK: It is only 50 feet wide. This measure will be of great assistance to the average landowner and to the person who is acquiring his principal place of residence. It will encourage such people to be thrifty and to buy their own home. Members opposite probably do not want people to own their own home.

Mr. Max Brown: That's not fair.

Mr. RUSSACK: You wouldn't encourage it.

Mr. Max Brown: We've encouraged them to own their own home.

Mr. RUSSACK: That is not the impression that members opposite give us. The next main proposal is the one about which we have heard so much. I heard the Leader of the Opposition say yesterday, "Where are all the jobs the Government promised would be created?" I suggest that we should be given a chance; after all, Parliament has been sitting only two weeks. As far as pay-roll tax is concerned—

Mr. Keneally: There's not one Minister in the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RUSSACK: On a pay-roll of \$70 000 the existing tax is \$333, but will be reduced to nothing. On a pay-roll of \$100 000 the existing tax is \$2 833, but will be reduced to \$2 133. On a pay-roll of \$125 000 the existing tax is \$4 765, but will be reduced to \$4 416. To obtain the overall cost therefore \$500 must be multiplied by the number of firms whose pay-roll falls into the range of \$72 000 to \$120 450. That is the approximate range of seven to 12 employees. I would like to quote the latest figures supplied by the Bureau of Statistics which show that as at December 1978 the division of South Australian enterprises by employment size was as follows: those organisations employing from one to four—

Members interjecting:

Mr. KENEALLY: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I draw to your attention the fact that for the past five minutes or so there has not been a Minister in the House. Is this contrary to Standing Orders?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course there is a point of order. With great respect, Sir, it is certainly the practice of the House always to have a Minister here and it is a very poor reflection on the member who is actually speaking if there is not a Minister in the Chamber.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I should point out to the member for Mitcham that I did not uphold the point of order, and I suggest he read the Standing Orders.

Mr. RUSSACK: In South Australia as at December 1978 there were 18 239 businesses employing one to four employees, and the number of employees was 40 743. The number of firms employing five to nine employees was 5 427, making 34 762 employees. The next range is the area in which pay-roll tax will be of great assistance. There are 2 322 enterprises employing 10 to 19 employees with a total number of 30 699 employees. I will not quote the remaining figures. However, the pay-roll tax exemption and the increase in the exemption will be of great benefit in encouraging employees to employ more people. The encouragement has been applied mainly to young people under the age of 20 years.

Last Sunday week I had the privilege of attending the

opening of a recreation centre on an oval at Hamley Bridge. The building was there possibly because of the SURS scheme. Everyone realises that there has been a limited benefit from that scheme. Despite the fact that there is a new Government, the former Minister of Labour and Industry opened the building. I guess that was because the people concerned acknowledge the fact that he was the Minister when the money was made available. At that function the Deputy Leader, as he now is, said that the present Government was to discontinue the SURS scheme and the money that was previously applied. He omitted to say two things: first, that any committed scheme would be completed, and, secondly, that the purpose of discontinuing the SURS scheme was to rechannel the money into the additional rebate of pay-roll tax so that there would be the possibility of there being some permanent employment for those seeking work and not just casual employment.

When I was in Stockholm last year the unemployment figure was only 2 per cent. I was told that local schemes were operating that enabled people to be employed on a temporary basis but the people were being taxed to such a degree that saturation point had been reached. The people with whom I was speaking were involved in local government and in an organisation equivalent to a Federal local government association. One gentleman said that his taxation was so high that, if he had an increase in salary, 80 per cent of that increase went back into taxation to keep the employment schemes working. I suggest that that is ultimately what would happen with the short-term schemes; taxation would have to be increased to keep the schemes working. To confirm what I have said, I have received a letter from the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who has written to members, as follows:

As you are no doubt aware, Cabinet has decided that, after the completion of projects which were committed by the previous Government, the State Unemployment Relief Scheme will be discontinued. As at 1 October 1979, there were applications for grants totalling \$19 000 000 on which decisions had not been made by the previous Government. Included with that letter was a draft copy of a letter that could be written to people who were inquiring about their applications. The draft letter states:

The Government is most concerned at the high unemployment levels in this State and one of our major concerns is to create new long-term employment opportunities. However, we do not believe that unemployment relief programmes are the most effective way of tackling the problem.

We believe that the best long-term solution is through development of the economy, expansion of the private sector and the consequent creation of permanent jobs. You may recall that prior to the recent State election we promised to make substantial amendments to pay-roll tax to stimulate employment. The promises we made then and which will be implemented are as follows:

1. The basic exemption level for pay-roll tax to be increased from \$66 000 to \$72 000, tapering back to the minimum exemption at a pay-roll level of \$131 500.
2. The wages and salaries of all employees aged less than 20 who are engaged after 30 September 1979, who are engaged in full-time employment, and whose employment constitutes a net increase in the firm's total employment will be excluded from a firm's annual taxable pay-roll.
3. A special pay-roll tax exemption of \$12 000 for every employer whose total employment is increased by the engagement of one full-time employee under 20 years of age and a special exemption of \$36 000 for every employer whose total employment is increased by the

engagement of two full-time employees, each of whom is aged less than 20.

4. A rebate of pay-roll tax will apply for existing decentralised processing and manufacturing industries.

The Government considers that these incentives will be far more effective in creating long-term employment than the continuance of the relief programme, which was designed only to provide short-term employment. While the Government will honour all commitments made by the previous Government for projects funded by the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, we consider that any future projects of the kind that have been carried out in the past under that scheme should be financed by other means.

Provision is made in the State Budget for financial assistance to be given through other means, such as grants for community welfare projects, grants and subsidies for the development of public parks, grants for recreational camps, grants for worthwhile local government projects, and subsidies for the development of tourist resorts and facilities. Local governing authorities may be able to use funds from the State Grants Commission for these purposes. If any projects already approved for funding under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme cannot be completed because of the change in Government policy, I would be willing to consider whether we can do anything to assist in completing them.

The Minister of Industrial Affairs is involved in the same department as is the SURS scheme and he has explained why the SURS scheme has been terminated. In addition, he has given an assurance that those committed works will be completed and, if there are any problems, the department or the Minister can be approached and every endeavour will be made to assist those projects so that they may be completed.

I would like to say many other things but time does not permit. I would like to say how local government will be recognised in the Constitution and funding will be channelled through that source.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before calling on the member for Florey, I point out that this is a maiden speech and I ask honourable members to accord to the honourable member the normal courtesies, that is, that he be heard without interruption.

Mr. O'NEILL (Florey): I would like to address my remarks to the problems that currently beset this country and this State in the area of industrial relations. I am pleased to note that the Premier of this State has said, if somewhat pompously, that he believes trade unions are proper bodies and they are entitled to exist. I am sure that trade unions are very grateful for that. I would like to say something about the current trend in Australia and the preoccupation with emergency service legislation that seems to be sweeping the countryside. The latest outbreak of the epidemic is in Queensland, and I would suggest it will be about as effective as has been similar legislation that has been carried in the past. It is brought in with a great fanfare of trumpets and accolades as to its effectiveness, and in the main it falls by the wayside because, clearly, history shows that such legislation is ineffective.

The problems associated with industrial relations have been with us ever since the industrial revolution. The employers of those days were somewhat harsher in their treatment of employees than are the employers of today; it might even be fair to say that they were considerably harsher. I think we should put to rest the illusion that is created at times that there is no need for workers to be concerned about taking action, that the good employers

are the creators of all the amenities and reasonable wages that from time to time are paid. This is not a fact; any gains that have been made by workers since the beginning of the industrial revolution are attributable to actions taken either by them or by people in similar areas who have been able to indicate to the employers by one means or another that there is a need to improve conditions and wages. During the latter part of the last century in Australia the trade union movement, which had developed rapidly in world terms and was a trend-setter, came to the conclusion after the very violent industrial repression that occurred in the 1890's that it would have to look at Parliament.

It coincidentally occurred that the colonies of Australia were looking at a federation. In the debates leading up to the formulation of the Australian Constitution, discussion was conducted around the matter of conciliation and arbitration. In a vote on whether or not it should be a matter for the Constitution, it was agreed by a small majority that the matters of conciliation and arbitration should rightly be entrenched in the Constitution.

It is interesting to note what are the objects of the subsequent Act. They are as follows: to promote goodwill in industry; to encourage and provide for conciliation, with a view to amicable agreement, thereby preventing and settling industrial disputes; to provide a means for presenting and settling industrial disputes not resolved by amicable agreement, including threatened, impending and probable industrial disputes, with a maximum of expedition and a minimum of legal form and technicality.

I will not bore members with all the details. Later, the objectives are as follows: to encourage the organisation of representative bodies of employers and employees and their registration under this Act and to encourage the democratic control of organisations so registered and the full participation by members of such organisations in the affairs of the organisations.

It is clear that it is legal and desirable in Australia to promote the formation of trade unions and to encourage them to be involved in industrial matters. I note that the Liberal Party's platform partly supports the objects of the Federal Conciliation and Arbitration Act. However, I think it probably has its wires a little crossed in some of its interpretations. Nevertheless, we reached a situation where the people of the day thought that conciliation and arbitration were the best ways of going about things. Many people on both sides of the fence in Australia have their doubts as to how good it is. Obviously, the Prime Minister has some serious doubts about its efficacy, because he is introducing certain Draconian legislation to bring under Government control the justices of the Federal commission.

Going back to the early days, the unions desired to get some fair play in industrial negotiations. They were heartily sick of the terrible conditions that had been inflicted on them by the employers of the day and the failure of industrial action in the face of legislative action by the Government of the day. They were convinced that the solution lay in Parliament. I suggest that history dictates that they did not solve the problem by handing it over to Parliament.

Over the years, successive conservative Governments have used the Acts (there are seven or more in Australia) thus creating a confusing situation, to deprive workers of the right to withdraw their labour. The way in which they have done it has been involved and convoluted. They create the illusion that the Conciliation and Arbitration Act provides for a system of fair play which allows workers to go into an arena where there is an umpire, and that fair play will be the order of the day.

Unfortunately, the workers have believed this, often to

their detriment. They have overlooked that the main purpose of the Act is to keep people at work, because that is where they make money for the employers. The whole idea as far as the employers are concerned is to develop a system to keep the workers at work for as long as possible. When they can no longer afford to have them out of work, the employers will ensure that any dispute is quickly resolved.

In the early 1950's the Menzies Government, at the behest of employer organisations, set out on a deliberate course to destroy the basic wage concept, which had served the country reasonably well over the years. At least, it stabilised the wages situation to an extent greater than did subsequent systems. That system, which has existed since 1904, was based on a concept of a basic wage for people in the community as regards their basic necessities, together with a margin for skill, depending on the occupation involved. Nevertheless, the aim of the employers was to destroy that system, because they wanted to increase the share of the gross national product that would go to them in the form of profits.

The Government of the day set about accommodating them, and gradually destabilised the basic wage system until we reached the new era of the total wage situation for employers and employees. In these fair hearings before the courts, when the workers were supposed to obtain justice, there was a significant change during that process of getting rid of the basic wage, where the argument that the wage should provide for what the people needed was dumped for the new proposition that it should be based on the capacity of industry to pay. That became the new criterion. People promptly forgot, in considering the decisions handed down, that that was the criterion: the ability of industry to pay.

Even with the most effective statistical procedures, it was difficult to obtain any statistics that were less than six months old. Most statistics are 12 months old, or even older, and most of the arguments relative to the case were similarly aged. Nevertheless, when a rise was granted based on the ability of industry to pay (referring to industry's ability a year to 18 months earlier), on receiving the decision the employers would immediately put on a turn and say that, because of the increase, the employer would have to increase prices, and start the whole process off again. The workers ascertained that they were not making much headway in this fair and just arena, to which they could go to have an umpire decide on their claims.

Then we reached the area of total wage, which was supposed to be the new era. The only way in which workers could get an increase, having had their wage initially set under the new system, was on the basis of new skills acquired or, in some instances, new disabilities involved in the processes. The real intention of the total wage was to effect a greater transfer of wealth from the wage-earners to the private sector. That, history will show, was very effective.

The situation did not change so far as workers were concerned, and if we consider statistics over the years we will find that, except for a brief period from 1972 to 1975, the share that workers in Australia have got over the years has been pretty static; they have not been able to make great inroads into the profit area at all. One of the things I think we should now look at is the dangers that are going to come from the courses of action taken by employers in their pursuit of a greater and greater share of profits.

People try to force the responsibilities for all industrial dispute, all industrial upheaval, on to the trade union movement. However, we have a situation in the power industry, for instance, which is a classic example. Over the years, in the area of generation of electricity, there have

been changes in technology and fuel which have raised the productivity in that industry enormously. The number of men now employed in the industry is considerably less than it was 10 years ago. The coal-fired boiler gave way to the oil-fired boiler, which caused a drop in the need for maintenance men, transportation facilities, and people in maintenance areas, as well as a reduced number of seamen, and so on down the line, because less facilities were required to handle oil than to handle coal.

Now oil has given way to gas-fired boilers in South Australia. In a number of other areas where coal is still used it is used in different forms, which has allowed technology to do away with more and more workers. The funds that have been provided for the development of this technology, and for new equipment, came from the efforts of workers who worked through the hard times. They got nothing for it, and there is obviously nothing there for their successors.

We see the example of Queensland, where power workers have been involved in a disputation over a reduction in working hours. We find that, rather than meeting the power workers demands, as some other States have done (including some that are Liberal governed), the Queensland Government has taken on the workers in a confrontation. This, we are told in today's *News*, has led to a situation where thousands of workers have been stood down and industries are closing. There are traffic jams. Level crossings are blocked. Homes are without power. Raw sewage is flooding into the Brisbane River. The police have reported an increase in breakings because burglar alarms are failing, and so on. All this is because a situation has developed where the Queensland Government will not allow the workers in the power industry to participate in some of the monetary benefits that have flowed from their efforts in the past.

The responsibility for this clearly lies with the people in the Queensland Government who support that type of policy. The lesson is there for Governments which try to repress workers. There will be no joy in this confrontation for the Queensland Government. It can pass all the Draconian legislation it likes, but in the long term the people involved in the industry will achieve their aims. I am concerned about developments in South Australia which may lead to a situation where we will have industrial action occurring here. I sincerely hope that the South Australian Government will not resort to the type of activity that the Queensland Government is engaging in at the moment.

It has been brought to my attention that, because of the indicated intention of this Government to transfer people from Government departments into areas of private enterprise, where private enterprise is doing Government work, there could be serious disruption of the affairs of trade unions. In a circular I received from the Trades and Labor Council of South Australia, attention was drawn to an extract from the industrial relations handbook which referred to dual employees. It stated, in respect of "dual employees" that there are difficulties in respect of the conditions which govern people, how they may be employed, and who has the responsibility. It states:

An employer may hire out or tend an employee.

I think that is a shocking state of affairs, that we can have come to a situation in a so-called democratic State where the Government puts up a proposition that it will hire out men and women like horses or machines. I think that that is disgusting. That same article stated that an employee is not a chattel to be transferred at the will of one employer to another. That is an interesting comment about what might be the case shortly in South Australia.

I have received a considerable amount of material from

the Minister relating to procedures laid down in respect of transfers from one department to another. On the surface, one might think that it is quite fair and reasonable, but there are some questions that are not answered. For instance, what happens when a Government employee of some years standing is transferred to a private employer and, because that person has worked hard in the service of the Government over the years (and might be getting on in years) and is not as active as he was in his youth, he finds that the demands of the private contractor in the pursuit of profit are greater than the demands he experienced in the Public Service, and he cannot stand the pace. What is the situation? Does that private employer have the right to sack that Government employee on the spot as being not able to carry out the duties required of him, citing inefficiency, neglect of duty, misconduct or such sufficient causes? Does that private employer put in a bad work report, which goes back to the department, thus putting on the department the onus of sacking the individual concerned? There are many questions unanswered in this proposition.

I am sure that one thing that must have occurred to some of the unions, particularly the Australian Government Workers Association, is that under this proposition that union stands to suffer a large reduction in membership because, despite all the assurances given by the Government about no reduction in the Government work force other than by attrition (and I assume that means natural attrition), it appears from this document that somebody with a little initiative could work out a number of ways to unload unwanted Government employees.

As somebody with almost 10 years experience in the trade union movement as a trade union organiser and 20 years as a worker, I can tell honourable members that, if it is left to private employers, there are plenty of them who can work out quite ingenious ways of unloading workers, disadvantaging workers, or precipitating industrial disputation. So, despite the assurances given by the Minister in respect of the procedures and conditions relating to the transfer of departmental weekly paid employees, I am sure that there is considerable cause for concern by those departmental employees about their future.

A decision is imminent in the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission regarding the Metal Trades Award, which concerns directly about 350 000 workers in factories and foundries throughout Australia and a flow-on to hundreds of thousands of other workers. A report in today's *News* stated:

The award follows a long battle by metal industry workers for a new deal. Their last award expired in 1974.

The results of the work values case will be known soon. That case is a classic example of what I referred to a few minutes ago regarding the way in which the workers of Australia are led up the garden path by a combination of Government and employer tactics. These skilled people (much maligned), are very important to Australia. Their importance to Australia will certainly come to the fore shortly. They have been involved for four years in trying to alter the Metal Trades Award. The due processes were followed, but at times, admittedly, because those people involved became frustrated, industrial action was resorted to. These people were immediately taken to task and accused of disrupting the country and of lacking intelligence because they were led by evil trade union leaders who had misinformed them as to the situation, who have power over them and make them do things that they do not want to do. Nevertheless, after four years, a result is imminent.

A report in a daily newspaper last week stated that a

metal employer spokesman indicated that the sum involved should be about 50c to 90c. That comment is interesting and reflects on the intelligence of metal industry employer representatives. I have noted some strange comments over the years, but that just about takes the cake. After four years of waiting, with a wage claim of \$25 that sounded reasonably large at the time, an industry spokesman now gets up and suggests that between 50c and 90c should be awarded. If ever there was an invitation to industrial disputation, this is it. It will not be the fault of the trade union movement if the men react angrily.

In our national capital, Draconian legislation has been introduced and rammed through the House by the Federal Government. Some people may not be aware of a connection, although they should be; it is pertinent now because of the talk of the projected uranium industry in South Australia and the hundreds of thousands of jobs that it is claimed will be created. The reason for this Draconian legislation, in my opinion, is that, as has been demonstrated in other countries and referred to in this House today, there will be a need for a massive security organisation to be mounted. Security will be enforced on people in South Australia and Australia by Federal and, perhaps, supplementary State legislation. I imagine that some sort of special so-called security force will be created, a repressive force, which will stand over workers on the job, as is done in other countries. People will be subjected to a continuing process of search and interrogation when entering or leaving plants. It also appears, from other legislation apparently divorced from the industrial arena but very relevant to the case, that people may be under all forms of surveillance in relation to telephones, listening devices, and the interception of mail.

All this so-called security derives, we are told, from necessity; if a uranium-producing plant is established in this country, we will need that legislation, and security will be needed to control the work force. This is rather frightening. I referred to this matter previously when I said that one of the problems that confronts us is the "It can't happen here" syndrome. Many people believe that, but the process has already started. I do not wish to suggest that members on the other side are all fascist-minded and want to see workers in concentration camps or in chains, but I think they are ignorant of the effects of the course of action on which they are setting the State. A lot of problems that relate from authoritarian societies, or that accrue as a result of authoritarian rule, derive from industrial measures taken in areas that need heavy security, merely to provide profit for people. In this case, I think the profit would concern mainly people who do not live in Australia. The whole system of life in Australia will be altered so that people in other places will make billions of dollars.

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

Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park): First, I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to Speaker in this House. I am sure you will display the partiality, decorum and dignity so befitting your office. I congratulate my colleagues on their election, and I also congratulate my colleagues the members for Florey, Ascot Park, and Salisbury on their election. I believe that the manner in which the member for Salisbury delivered his maiden speech will serve as a warning to honourable members opposite that, even though on this side of the House the numbers have been somewhat diminished, we will be a strong and active Opposition.

I refer to two of the Premier's pronouncements, as follows:

1. That our financial planning recognises the importance of Roxby Downs.
2. We will do everything we can responsibly to encourage and assist its (the State's) growth.

I submit that the indecent haste of the Government's proposal to exploit minerals at Roxby Downs will not be the answer, as has been suggested, to many of the economic and unemployment problems in this State. It comes as no surprise to me and to other members on this side that the Government acted hastily regarding Roxby Downs, particularly when one looks at those companies wishing to exploit the minerals there. Moreover, when one looks within the overall framework of the Australian commercial, financial, and political establishments, it can be seen that a number of powerful groups or factions are involved. One group, the Collins House group, has its offices, as its name suggests, in Collins Street, Melbourne.

Here we find, too, the registered offices of North Broken Hill Holdings Ltd., Broken Hill South Ltd., Western Mining Corporation, and E. Z. Industries Ltd. The Collins companies are strongly associated with B.H.P. and this grouping has strong links with the A.N.Z. Banking Group and the National Bank. We are all aware of the influence of the A.N.Z. in this State during recent months; moreover, it comes as no surprise to me to recognise once again the influence of the Collins House group and big business in this State in pushing this Government to agreeing hastily to the mining of uranium and other minerals at Roxby Downs. This Collins House group has close political ties with the Liberal Party in this country and, in particular, in this State.

I turn now to the so-called economic benefits that will accrue to this State through the mining of uranium. I refer particularly to the economic considerations and the wider social consequences of the mining of uranium as outlined in the Fox Ranger Report.

If the pro-nuclear lobby was hoping that the weakness of its case on the wide range of safety questions would be partly offset by acceptance of the claims regarding the economic advantages of uranium mining and export, then it must have been terribly disappointed by the findings of the Ranger inquiry. In the first place, the commission has firmly rejected the argument that the industrialised Western world is currently facing or is likely to face in the foreseeable future a severe energy shortage. On the contrary, the report explicitly states:

... while the economies of countries heavily dependent on imported oil have been adversely affected by increases in world oil prices, it is incorrect to say that there is a presently existing world energy crisis which will create disastrous economic effects . . . and it is clear that it is incorrect to suggest that there are energy impoverished nations which need Australian uranium for survival.

In this regard, the report makes the pertinent point that "total world coal resources are so large that they will not be approaching depletion for many decades, even if the rate of energy use continues to increase exponentially as it has this century".

According to the Fox Report, the only major immediate world problem in the energy field is the availability of liquid fuels. If this is an accurate assessment of current energy needs, then it is difficult to disagree with the commission's view that Australia's uranium can do little to improve the situation. The report indicates that, without recycling of fuels, reserves of uranium would amount to only about 5 per cent of presently estimated fossil fuels. It is precisely for this reason that the three Commissioners have argued that the most valuable contribution that

Australia could make would be to concentrate on such alternatives as the production of liquid fuels from coal and the provision of coal at economic prices as a replacement for oil. In the longer term, the commission advocates the development of technology to utilise solar energy with a view both to low and intermediate grade heat applications as well as electricity generation.

In addition to its stress on the need for the rapid development of alternative energy resources other than nuclear power, the commission repeatedly emphasises that energy conservation is both feasible and desirable. It notes that "the major energy consuming nations have embarked on energy conservation programmes of varying intensity, and that they are being given high priority". Extrapolating from present trends, the report predicts that energy conservation "will have a significant effect on total energy consumption by the end of the century". Believing that "societies may come to value more highly in future things not included in conventional measurements of economic activity", and that zero economic growth may become a socially feasible and desirable goal, the commission advocates the introduction of additional policy measures "to achieve desired reductions in the growth of energy consumption", and makes one of its principal recommendations a national programme of energy conservation.

Another argument suitably squashed by the report is the preposterous suggestion that nuclear energy is likely to solve the economic problems of underdeveloped countries. According to IAEA projections, which have had to be revised downwards, by the year 2000 the Third World would still account for only 10 per cent of world nuclear capacity. The obvious point to note about these countries is that large power-generating units are not suited to their needs, and that the much smaller units required are generally uneconomic if based on nuclear power. Where nuclear energy grids exist they are more likely to supply electricity for the affluent minority in the cities than the rural masses. Accordingly, the commission's main recommendation in relation to underdeveloped countries is not for Australia to make available its uranium resources but rather to participate "in international efforts to develop those forms of solar energy technology most suited to the needs of developing countries".

Regarding the future of the nuclear industry in the advanced industrial countries, the report once again presents a much less optimistic picture than the pro-nuclear propaganda would suggest. Having noted the marked reduction in the number of new orders for nuclear power stations which occurred during 1974 and 1975, the commission goes on to indicate the high probability of a reduced rate of commissioning of new stations during the next decade. Apart from the depressed demand for electricity since 1973, the report explains this trend by reference to the large increases in the capital costs of building and commissioning nuclear stations in recent years. According to an OECD study, the total capital investment required for energy programmes may thus be so high as to conflict with other economic objectives. In the view of the commission:

electricity authorities generally may experience difficulties in raising finance for heavy capital expenditures in the decade ahead . . . since nuclear plants are more capital-intensive than coal-fired plants, it seems probable that the relative cost position of nuclear plants may be adversely affected by these financing difficulties.

The commission also questions the cost efficiency of large nuclear stations and concludes that "smaller-scale coal-fired generating plants may prove to be more economic than large coal-fired or nuclear generating units".

As for the direct benefits that are likely to accrue to Australia from the sale of uranium, the report estimates that additions to national income generated by uranium exports would rise from less than 0.1 per cent of projected national income in 1980-81 to about 0.5 per cent in 1990-91, and would fall to about 0.4 per cent by the end of the century. In relation to foreign exchange earnings, it is estimated that uranium exports would grow to 5 per cent of total earnings in 1991-92 but would subsequently decline to about 3.4 per cent at the end of the century.

In this context it is worth noting that the commission rejects as too high the estimates of potential Australian uranium sales presented to it by the Australian Uranium Producers Forum, the Australian Atomic Energy Commission and Pancontinental Mining Ltd. Even more sobering are the inquiry's findings in relation to the possible contribution to employment. It is calculated that at an initial production rate of 3 000 tonnes of U_3O_8 a year the Ranger operations would employ about 600 during the construction period of two years. Thereafter, the operation would employ 250 people. Even if production were doubled, the impact on manpower requirement would be minimal, resulting in additional employment for 400 people in the first two years and 150 people thereafter. To the extent that the operation would draw largely on skilled or semi-skilled workers from the south, the mining of uranium cannot be expected to have anything but the most negligible effect on the national or even local level of unemployment.

I refer now to the wider social consequences of nuclear power. Although one of the most disappointing aspects of the report is its treatment of the social consequences of a plutonium economy, it is worth noting that the commission was sufficiently concerned with the issue to regard it as an important reason for reducing the growth in energy consumption. Significantly, the commission received no evidence contrary to that submitted by the critics of nuclear power, who argued that increasing dependence on electricity distributed through a centralised grid "would require administration by a remote and bureaucratic technical elite, lead to a great concentration of political and economic power, and be vulnerable to large and expensive technical mistakes and failures".

While no effort was made to assess the argument that "the large scale and complexity of nuclear power will reduce the opportunity for greater public control of decision-making and may threaten democratic procedures and civil liberties", the commission agreed that many countries will be forced to take account of these considerations in their energy policies. Presumably, the social and economic implications of nuclear power will need to be an integral part of the Australian uranium debate.

I now turn to the social implications of this Government's economic strategy in relation to the mining of uranium; that is, of course, the health and welfare and the necessary safeguards for those workers who will be required, if this Government has its way, to extract uranium and other minerals at Roxby Downs.

Although the mining companies and the Government assure us that the mining of uranium poses no unusual hazards for those employed in it, the real situation is far from comforting. Since the nineteenth century, uranium mining has been associated with high death rates from lung cancer; in the years 1877-78, 75 per cent of all deaths among mine workers at Schneeberg, in Germany, were from lung cancer, and the problem continued with little change into the 1930's when it was realised that the agent responsible was radon gas. However, the rate of cancer among uranium miners has remained high. Exposure to

radon and radon daughters (the radioactive decay products of radon) in Australian mines will be regulated by a document known as the Code of Practice on Radiation.

Before we can judge whether this code will be effective in safeguarding the lives of miners we will need to know: what radon is; how radon is measured; how its decay products (radon daughters) cause cancer; and something about the provisions of the code of practice, and the proposals of the miners.

Radon is the heaviest of the inert gases; it is 7.7 times heavier than air and therefore tends to collect in the bottom of depressions, particularly under conditions of stillness and atmospheric inversion of the sort that frequently occur. Radon is formed by the decay of uranium 238, through thorium 230, through radium 226 and thence radon 222. Radon decays; it produces polonium 218 and polonium 214. These radon daughters are high energy alpha particle emitters. It is these heavy charged alpha particles that are responsible for causing cancer.

The concentration of radon decay products in the air is measured in "working levels". Miners' exposure to the radon decay products is measured in "working level hours" and "working level months". A "working level", or wl, is a unit designed by the U.S. Public Health Service in 1957 to give an idea of the amount of alpha particle energy likely to be delivered to the lung by the polonium 218 and 214 in one litre of air. This is equal to 1.4 (100 000 000 000) electron volts of alpha energy.

The code of practice limits miners' exposures to radon daughters to four a year and two wlm each three months, as well as specifying a number of protective and monitoring procedures. Miners are not allowed to be exposed continuously to more than 0.33 wl. For this reason, the time taken for radon daughters to reach this concentration is important.

Figures for the likely concentrations of radon daughters in Australian mines are not scarce; they are many, and contradictory. It is still not known what the concentrations of radon will be at the mine surface. Estimates presented to the Ranger Inquiry varied from concentrations of 0.75 wl after 12 hours with no air movement for the Ranger project, to an upper limit of radon emission by J. E. Cook of the AAEC that would have given 30 wl at Ranger in the same period. The inquiry eventually settled for a figure of two wl after a period; as we do not know how many hours, "many hours" without wind is, it is therefore not possible to discover how long it would take to reach 0.33 wl.

The Pancontinental Environmental Statement for the Jabiluka project gives us a figure of 0.33 wl in 2.7 hours. If we round the figure to three hours, we get one wl in nine hours and three wl in 28 hours without wind. Pancontinental's figures, like Ranger's, are based on the assumption that radon will somehow diffuse evenly into the entire pit, rather than collecting in nooks and crannies in the pit and on the pit floor as one would expect. Radon daughter concentrations on the floor of the Jabiluka project pit will tend to increase steadily because it will be out of the way of the wind. The cross-section of both the Jabiluka and the Pancontinental pits will tend to exclude almost all air movement that would otherwise blow away radon gas. I would also submit that the economic costs with respect to the danger to health and welfare of workers in uranium mines, and the likely genetic effects on as yet unborn generations far outweigh the short-term profit motivation of those large mining companies and this Government. I refer of course to the so-called protective measures for workers mining uranium.

The greatest amount of research on the health effects of radon gas and its radioactive decay products has taken place in the United States. It is clear from this work that there is a causal relationship between exposure to radon gas and its daughters and lung cancer. Studies of uranium miners were started in 1950 by the U.S. Public Health Service, and medical history and cause of death of about 4 000 miners were recorded and correlated with their exposure to radon daughters. A study released in 1967 found a total of 62 cancers observed per 10 expected, and a significant excess of cancers at all levels of exposure, down to the lowest. A report by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health stated that epidemiologic evidence supported by pathologic observations had left little doubt that airborne radiation was the major causal factor in the excess of respiratory cancer among uranium miners as a group.

It pointed out that miners were often misclassified into too high exposure categories, which would tend to exaggerate the exposures at which cancers were produced. Miners who smoked were likely to have 10 times the risk of lung cancer of those who did not smoke. Smoking and exposure to radon seem to have a multiplier effect.

It concluded that the risk of cancer rose steeply at low exposures, and less steeply later on, so that relatively small exposures would be more dangerous than one would expect. Excess lung cancers were statistically significantly down to and including exposures of 120 to 360 working level months, and a probability that cancer would be induced at much lower exposure levels.

I also submit that the so-called protective measures enunciated by big business, the uranium producers' forum, and supported by this Government, are inadequate and will result in unnecessary exposure and deaths and disabilities to those workers engaged in uranium mines and must, therefore, become an economic burden on this State.

The installation of air-conditioners and filters in the cabs of mining machinery is intended to protect the miners from radon decay products and from dust. Their actual effect, however, is to increase their exposure to the most damaging of radon's decay product. The dust is filtered from the air, but not the radon itself, as it is an inert gas.

Most of the dose of the lungs comes from unattached ions of polonium 218 and 214. When dust is in the air, these ions become attached to the dust particles. Removing the dust from the air thus only increases the concentration of unattached ions by about two to three times. More of these ions then attach themselves to the miners' lungs than when the air is unfiltered. Since there is a constant replacement of radon, which is not filtered from the air, there is also a constant replacement of polonium 218 and 214 and their ions.

When dealing with technical problems such as radiation protection, there is a tendency for those in the field to forget that real people are involved, and die of cancer when the technical fixes proposed fail. There is also a tendency to forget that protective measures have to be implemented by people. To adequately protect uranium miners, we will need more than theoretical estimates of radon concentration for a whole open-pit mine.

We have to know what concentration of radon daughters a man crawling underneath a tonne dump truck with a flat tyre on the pit floor will receive. How will he react when we in our wisdom tell him that, if he is to avoid getting cancer, he must wear a respiratory or gas mask when he does this job, and/or give up smoking?

We have to know what will be the dose to the lungs from polonium 218 in his air-conditioned truck cab as it makes its journey up the side of the open-cut. What will it be in

the cab of a rock drill on the pit floor? What pressures will mine management exert on the radiation-protection officer that the code demands the mines appoint? How will management react when the radiation-protection officer suggests the mine be closed for a period of, say, eight hours in the interests of safety? How will they react when expensive alterations to procedures are suggested in the interests of radiation protection? Will corners be cut? What exposures in working-level months will real people working in inelegantly untheoretical conditions in the dust and heat and diesel fumes at the bottom of a large hole in the ground be subjected to? What will these exposures do to them, and how many years will be taken off their lives as a result?

The mining companies and the Government have yet to answer these questions. Will we witness, assuming that uranium mining is carried out in this State (and I do not believe it should, because of inadequate safeguards), a similar situation to that which has occurred in the U.S.A.? I quote the following press report:

U.S. Government studies have shown a high proportion of uranium miners who worked before there were any safety regulations are dead or dying of lung cancer. According to one study of 3 500 uranium miners, 200 have already died of cancer against a rate of fewer than 40 deaths that normally could be expected among 3 500 people.

"We are witnessing a tragedy," Dr. Leon Gottlieb, of the Public Health Service in Shiprock, New Mexico, told visitors representing a United States Senate committee. "There is an epidemic of lung cancer among former uranium miners of the late 1940's and 1950's," he said.

The question now is whether the Federal Government, the only customer for uranium at the time, will assume any financial responsibility. This was the subject of a hearing conducted recently in Grants, New Mexico, the self-proclaimed "uranium capital of the world", by Senator Pete Domenici, a member of the U.S. Senate subcommittee on aging.

So far, uranium miners afflicted with lung cancer, silicosis and fibrosis have missed out on benefits that supposedly compensate workers for occupationally induced diseases. If they got sick in Colorado, Colorado says they caught the disease in Utah. So the miners have been dying with no money for medical costs, their widows or their children.

A Bill to compensate the miners, offered steadily and unsuccessfully in Congress for years, is patterned on the law that provides compensation to coal miners who suffer from black lung disease.

Mr. WRIGHT (Adelaide): My first task, Mr. Speaker, is to congratulate you publicly on your elevation to the high office you now hold. I have had the opportunity of observing you since I entered Parliament in 1971. I have always found you a fair politician, who spoke the truth as you saw it. I have no doubt that you will continue to uphold that high tradition, and your performances over the past four or five sitting days have indicated to me that it was an excellent choice in elevating you to the position. I wish you well and hope that you are able to keep decorum, and that all members will be given the opportunity of expressing themselves.

I also congratulate the member for Eyre. I am sorry that he is not present. He probably would not expect me to congratulate him, but I am doing so on the basis that, under your guidance and training, and with some tempering from members, he will apply himself to his position and, in those circumstances, also extend to members absolute fairness as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees.

I will deal with some varying subjects today but, first, I

will deal with page 11 of the Budget papers wherein the Premier devoted almost three-quarters of a page of his speech to the abolition of SURS—the demolition of probably the one and only State scheme in this area of any major significance in Australia. Although we had the RED scheme under the Federal Government some years ago, I do not believe that it operated, on a dollar for dollar basis or on a value basis, nearly as well as the SURS: most recipients of the scheme, such as councils and welfare organisations and so on, certainly agree with me.

It is interesting to note that the Premier, when singing his swan song as regards SURS funding, devoted three-quarters of a page to making excuses for its abolition. I think that he will rue the day that he cancelled SURS as a means of creating jobs. On page 7, the Premier devoted only 10 lines to the new Government's proposals relating to incentives, establishment payment schemes, pay-roll tax concessions and so on. One would almost say that he placed them in the miscellaneous box.

This suggests to me that the abolition of SURS needed some explanation by the Government because, clearly, it was a popular scheme. It was well received in this State and, while the Liberals philosophically could not agree with that scheme, they were aware that the Government had received strong recognition throughout the State for its efforts in that area.

It must be said clearly that the position of the Liberals on this matter is philosophical; there is no question about that. I do not believe that a Liberal Government wants to see unemployment any more than does a Labor Government, but it is a fact of life that all of the capitalist countries throughout the world have been forced to introduce job creation schemes. Those schemes have been successful. In all the countries I had the opportunity to visit as Minister, those schemes have had a tremendous effect upon the economy, as I believe they had on the South Australian economy during the currency of that scheme. The Government allocated a sum of about \$56 000 000 to that project over four years.

It is also correct to say that the State Ministers of Labour in about September of last year carried a unanimous resolution calling on the Federal Government (and at that stage there were three Liberal State Governments) to introduce job creation schemes. The Federal Government, as usual, took no notice of its State counterparts. In fact, Minister Street refused to participate in the debate but, quite reluctantly at that stage, decided he was prepared to pass the resolution on to the Prime Minister. I never received a reply from the Prime Minister about that matter, and I doubt whether any other State Minister did, either.

It is also significant that on 13 October this year a report appeared on the front page of the *Australian* stating that the Premier of Western Australia (who is running into tremendous difficulties in that State, irrespective of the mining conglomerates and the supposed investment of money in that area) is calling strongly now for job creation schemes to be implemented by the Commonwealth Government. He was very critical of the position and accused the Prime Minister of sitting back and doing nothing about unemployment in this country. Quite clearly, there is no question about where the responsibility lies to regenerate the economy. I have said before (and say again) that it is not possible for States to regenerate the economy. They can do a little here and a little there, but the total regeneration of the economy must be created federally. It can be created only by the States getting more money to use for capital works projects and the like. Premier Court now realises that that is the situation. What Premier Court is doing is backing up what his Minister of

Labour did in about October last year when State Ministers reached a unanimous decision about this matter and called on the Federal Government to do something about creating jobs in this nation. Unless it does, unemployment will go on and on.

That was clear in the August Budget. The Federal Government actually budgeted for an increase of 50 000 people per year in the number of unemployed. I do not know how the Liberals can sit back and, because of philosophical reasons, say that it is now their intention to demolish overnight the very useful schemes that were operating in South Australia under a Labor Government.

I want to place on record my next remarks because of what the member for Goyder said about my not saying certain things at the opening of a function at Hamley Bridge last week. I was not aware of what the Government was doing; I did not receive a letter from the Minister, as other members obviously did. I did not make a strong political speech at that opening. I was given the opportunity of opening that project because the previous Government and I had been involved. I was pleased to do that. The significant thing about going to Hamley Bridge was that there were at least three people (who would have been farmers, councillors or people on the committee of the football club, and the like) who all said to me unequivocally that it was about time the Federal Government and various Liberal Parties changed their philosophy regarding job creation. Maybe it is the Liberal Party that is not up with what is happening. It is a fact that those people said that to me. We now have Premier Court saying it, so that is good company. I believe that SURS gave unemployed people in South Australia an opportunity they would never have got if that scheme had not been introduced. It is difficult to establish exactly how many people were employed under SURS, but certainly many thousands were given the opportunity to work. Because of that work, circumstances arose which enabled some employees to gain full-time employment. That is certainly the case with council and other community projects. Under SURS some people worked for the first time in their lives. Some of them had been unemployed for 12 months, 18 months or two years when they went to work for SURS as nothing more than labourers. Those people came out of that scheme knowing something about bricklaying, wiring, plastering, or erecting roofs. They were able to get much general experience under SURS which gave them knowledge and which enabled them to go and find permanent work somewhere else.

I know that literally thousands of letters have been received from people expressing appreciation of SURS. There are many letters at the Department of Labour and Industry from people who supported this scheme—charitable organisations, councils, football clubs, soccer clubs, cricket clubs and all the people who benefited under SURS. Mainly, there was tremendous satisfaction with SURS by employers and employees. There was much job satisfaction and resultant satisfaction with the quality of work that was performed. I believe that dollar for dollar and value for what was spent SURS was the best scheme ever introduced into the Australian economy to try to help those poor, unfortunate people who could not find work. We are now faced with the situation that SURS has gone except for those commitments established by the previous Government. I understand from a member who spoke today that those commitments will be honoured and the projects carried on.

I want to deal now with what I believe was the major assistance area of SURS, the assistance given to people who were unfortunate enough to be living on their own, elderly people who could not afford to bring in a

carpenter, painter, or handyman of any sort. The introduction of the handyman scheme was an original idea and probably the first of its kind (not only in Australia but in the world) to be funded by Government departments. While it was controlled by councils, it was funded by the Government. After the scheme had operated for three or four months I decided to investigate whether it was being received well in the community.

I examined the situation to see whether the quality of work was good, whether the workers going into people's homes conducted themselves in a proper and efficient manner, and just how the scheme was being accepted. So, I wrote to 680 people who had been recipients under the SURS handyman scheme. To my utter amazement, I received a 60 per cent reply. I do not think there has ever been any type of survey held on any basis, to see whether people were satisfied with a project or service received under Government assistance, in which a 60 per cent reply has been received from those surveyed. Each and every one of the letters I received was heartbreaking. The people involved could not afford to get things done for themselves. They begged that the scheme should be continued in case they needed more assistance. It was significant that many people mentioned friends and said that they hoped the scheme would continue because these friends were in trouble. The SURS project has been tremendously acceptable and was conducted well.

I want to place on record, because this is the first opportunity I have had to do so and today's debate will probably be the last time I will be talking about, the tremendous assistance that the Government, and I personally, received from the public servants who were running the scheme more directly than I was. These people dealt on a person-to-person basis with the proponents of the scheme. I want to mention two people in particular: Mr. Bartlett, the senior officer in charge of SURS, and Mr. Wally Bean, who did a tremendous job in this area, built up a rapport with these people, and gave first-class service to them. It is only proper that these two people be recognised in *Hansard* and by the present Government.

A lot was heard during the election campaign about the job rot in South Australia, how the previous Government had created a situation in South Australia whereby there was no confidence in the State, and that business people were critical of the then Government's attitude about various matters. These business people were not very critical when they received handouts and incentives from that Government. Let us cast our minds back to the job rot (if it existed, and I do not believe that it did), and to the Whyalla shipyard, where 2 000 jobs were lost through no fault of the previous State Government but because the Federal Government took away the subsidies. It would be difficult to know what subsequent problems occurred because of the closing of the shipyards at Whyalla. At a minimum, however, 2 000 jobs were lost.

It is difficult to understand why the employers in this State directed all their venom towards the previous State Government and none towards the Federal Government. If one considers what was happening in 1979, one can see that the employers jumped on the band wagon too late. Through 1975, 1976, and early in 1977, South Australia was holding up much better than were the other States. Recovery had not really commenced in New South Wales and other States at that time, but South Australia was holding up. From 1977 to August 1978, there was a tremendous decline in the employment situation. Following 1978, and through to 1979, 4 300 new jobs were created in the South Australian manufacturing industry, representing a 4.2 per cent growth in this State, compared

with a 1.8 per cent growth for Australia as a whole.

All sorts of allegations were directed at the previous Government, particularly during the election campaign. It was said that the Government was responsible for the downturn in the economy. It is well known now (and people are beginning to realise this) that the job rot had declined and the economy was starting to move again. Evidence of that was seen today in the unemployment figures. There has been an upturn. Last month, there was no decrease at all; this month, the unemployment figure has decreased by about 686, I think. Surely no-one could say that what little has been done, if anything, by the present Government, could have had an effect on the economy at this stage.

Mr. Millhouse: The Liberals will say it, though.

Mr. WRIGHT: No-one could say that with any honesty. It is quite evident to me that nothing has been done by the Government to this stage. Despite the Premier's saying today that he has received many phone calls about the promised scheme, nothing has been done. It is not in operation, in spite of a grandiose announcement made by the Premier on 1 October at the Employers Federation luncheon, at which there was a record crowd (like a football match; people came to see the new Premier perform). The scheme is not in operation at the moment.

One other allegation made against the previous Labor Government was that South Australia was the poorest State and people were worse off in South Australia than were people in other States. It was said that people in South Australia were not earning as much and not spending as much as those in other States, and that the Government was to blame. I have never been aware, and I do not suppose anyone else has, that it is the Government's responsibility to determine wages. Surely, the wages of people in any State are determined by the arbitration courts, and that is as it should be. The Government should not be the wage setter; that is the responsibility of the courts.

If one looks at some figures to combat this allegation, one will see that, as at 1 August this year, in Victoria the annual income was \$5 757; in New South Wales, \$5 638; in South Australia, \$5 418; in Western Australia, \$5 284; in Tasmania, \$5 192; and in Queensland, \$5 113. It is quite clear to me, and evident to anyone who examines the situation, that South Australia was running third in that category. It is not right for anyone to have said, at any stage, that South Australia was the poorest State.

Because of this, it was said, South Australia lost population. That allegation was made time after time from the Opposition benches when we were in Government. It was said that people were not staying in South Australia because of lack of job opportunities, lack of income, and so on. However, in Victoria there were 10 500 migrants between 1977 and 1978. No-one said anything about Victoria; some of those migrants may have come to South Australia. In Tasmania, which has a lower population than South Australia, 2 100 people migrated in that same period. Yet, only 1 800 people migrated from South Australia at that time.

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

Mr. WRIGHT: In speaking about the deficiencies in the argument about the number of people who had migrated from South Australia, it is evident from the information that I have obtained that South Australia was probably better off in regard to migration than were other States, because the evidence shows clearly that other States were losing as many people as South Australia was losing. Therefore, I do not think that the criticism in that area was justified.

The other subject that I wish to discuss in the remaining six or seven minutes concerns the reference in the Budget to the downturn in investment in South Australia. The Premier has stated specifically in the Budget papers that investment in South Australia was running at 2 per cent and that it was the attitudes, philosophies and policies of the A.L.P. which were keeping investment away from South Australia. In rebutting that argument, I am relying on two documents, the first of which is put out fortnightly by W. D. Scott, under the title *Economic Advice to Business*. Most honourable members who have followed this situation would understand that W. D. Scott is trying to advise businessmen on where investment is going and on what investment really means. In the volume dated 13 August, under the heading "Carpetbaggers' choice", the report states:

Over half the \$29 400 000 is in connection with projects in Western Australia and Queensland (in which States, a quarter of Australia's CDP originates). But those who are tempted to waltz their matildas north and west to follow the money, should be warned.

This is an important warning to people. The report continues:

Only a part of the expenditure in connection with projects in Western Australia and Queensland is actually spent in those States. Some is spent overseas, and a good deal is also spent in New South Wales and Victoria. And within any State only part of the intrastate expenditure is in the area of the project; a good deal is spent in capital cities and regional centres. However, the concentration of planned expenditures on projects located in Western Australia and Queensland is good news for those economies.

The report continues:

After Western Australia and Queensland, New South Wales and Victorian projects account for one-third of total expenditure, and South Australia one-tenth.

The next part of the article is important, and states:

It is amazing how often one can, with little error, estimate the position in South Australia by dividing Australia by 10. The Northern Territory, despite wide publicity about uranium projects, is scheduled to host only 3 per cent of projects measured by total identified expenditure.

Even without the previous Government entering into the field of uranium, as opposed to what is happening in the Northern Territory, it was evident that, although the then Opposition and employers at that time were castigating the Government for not having obtained investment in South Australia, it was clear that investment was running parallel with our population per capita and that, in fact, we were enjoying 10 per cent investment at that stage.

The second page of that report indicates that the South Australian share of the \$29 430 000 was estimated at \$3 030 000. That is relatively clear evidence of the real situation regarding investment in South Australia.

It is clear that the Redcliff project will proceed (there is little doubt about that, irrespective of what the Government wants to say about it), and it is clear from the report by W. D. Scott that investment was being more than considered in South Australia, because I understand that the report is almost completely accurate.

To further support my argument that the South Australian economy was not on a decline greater than that of any other State, I refer to an article by the A.N.Z. Bank report *Business Indicators* of July 1979, which states:

There has been considerable media coverage over the past year of the economic difficulties of South Australia and of the problems posed by the State's narrowly based economy. Indeed it is true that it was South Australia's heavy dependence on a number of key industries—motor vehicles, iron and steel, home appliances, farming and home

building—and the deterioration of circumstances in these industries which produced the slide in South Australia's relative economic performance from late 1977. However, more recently, trends in a number of these industries have strengthened suggesting stronger economic growth could emerge during late 1979 and 1980. Even so, the rate of economic growth is likely to remain below the national level.

The report continues:

This strengthening in retail sales appears to have contributed to a lift in business confidence and in recent months there has been an upsurge in demand for bank finance for business development.

It also states—

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This is a strange Budget debate, because the present Government cannot be blamed for the detail of the Budget itself. We all know, those of us who have had any experience, anyway, that it takes months to prepare a Budget and, through no fault of its own, and through no merit either, the present Government is saddled with the work, which was done by its predecessors, and the only people to blame for that are the damn fools in the Labor Party who threw Government away to the Liberals, so that the Liberals are saddled with a situation whereby they have a Budget which, apart from one or two cosmetic changes, they have inherited from their predecessor.

Even the language of the Budget speech is precisely the same, and it is obviously written by the same public servant who has been writing Budget speeches for some time. A few sentences have been put in (and this is what we have all done in our time) just to make it sound good but, by and large, 98 per cent or 99 per cent of the speech is just as it would have been if the Labor Party had been in office.

There is not one word in the speech of the vaunted Liberal Party policies, which were to make the State great again. I have yet to find out what the word "great" imports, what greatness is in this context, but it was a good slogan during the election campaign, and perhaps we will find out its meaning as time goes on.

We have a strange situation, and doubtless the Labor Party will go pretty easy during the debate on the lines, because the lines are really its lines rather than the Government's lines. I do not propose to be critical of the Budget. The real test of this new and still rather surprised Government is in the future, and we shall see how it goes.

Already there are three matters that, in my view, the Government has come out of it very badly and the Premier has shown himself to be weak. In these matters the actions of the Government have not been matched to the words which they uttered during the election campaign, and I propose to remind honourable members of some of the words that were uttered by members of the Liberal Party during the election campaign. The only quotes I have at the moment are by the then Leader of the Opposition, now your successor, Sir, as Leader of the Party. Let us see what he said in his television speech about waste in Government and extravagance, and how things were going to be cut down, and then we can match that with performance so far. I will quote a few of the staccato sentences which probably looked pretty good on television—I did not hear them. The Leader stated:

It is the State Government's responsibility to cut back on wasteful and extravagant Government spending and to get the best value for the taxpayers, dollar. We will cut out waste and we can afford to cut State taxation. We can make this State great again, and we will. We must smarten up the style

of Government.

Mr. Whitten: How does he spell "great"?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will leave that to the honourable member. These are the sorts of thing that the Premier said in his televised policy speech. I have a complete set of these documents, so we will be able to match promise with performance in due course.

Let us turn to the Liberal Party's economic development policy. Perhaps the Minister had some hand in that, although if he had I think it would have been rather better than it is. Nevertheless, on page 2 he says "But Government must increasingly test every area of Government expenditure and enterprise to minimise cost and to ensure that the benefits to the community of Government intervention far outweigh the costs involved."

It is when we come to the Liberal Party's Treasury policy that we get the most quotable quotes of the lot. They say, "Governments must always be conscious that the money they spend comes from taxes paid by the people who elect them. The Liberal Party does not believe that bigger Government is better Government or that bigger spending makes for better programmes." There are a few things here said about the Public Accounts Committee. I will come to those in due course.

Mr. Max Brown: About the cars—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I may say a few words about that. This is the last of these quotes for the moment: "The Liberal Party is committed to the principle of smaller and more efficient Government as well as that of limited Government."

Well, those are the quotations but so far, in performance, we have seen very little of these promises. Honourable members probably did not even notice an advertisement by the Australian Democrats; it was not a very big advertisement, as the Australian Democrats had little money during the campaign and we could not afford to advertise as the Liberals and the Labor Party did, but we did have a cartoon which Alf Hannaford drew for us entitled "Tweedle Des and Tweedle Dave". It is remarkable how alike those two gentlemen are physically, and indeed, apparently, in their outlook. We hoped, when we put the cartoon in that it would not come to pass, but it looks to me remarkably as though the Liberals, like the Labor Party before them, are more intent on enjoying the fruits of office, working the levers of power for themselves, getting the perks, than on doing anything else. It is a matter of "Do as I say, rather than as I do."

That is what I believe has happened in the last few weeks. There has been no attempt whatever to set an example of moderation in Government expenditure here and at Government levels, the political level of Government where that example should be set, if the honourable gentlemen and lady opposite are at all genuine in their protestations that they made before the election.

There are, as I have said, three matters that I want to mention: first, the size of the Cabinet; secondly, the appointment of Ministerial staff; and thirdly, the use of Government motor cars. I will not disappoint my friends on this side; it is linked to the Public Accounts Committee—in some way it is to make that body more efficient. Let us start with the size of the Cabinet.

Mr. Abbott interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member for Spence can make his own speech in due time, if he has not already done so. Let me develop the theme as I would like to do. Ten years ago there were nine Ministers of the Crown; we worked damned hard for our money, but we managed to get through the work. Gradually, as time has gone by, four more Ministers have been added so that there are now 13

and, indeed, the whole history of the last 10 years in South Australia bears out what my wise uncle, who had been a member of the Victorian Parliament and subsequently a member of the Federal Parliament as a Minister, once said to me: the history of Australia is littered with examples of Labor going into office, inheriting a pretty good financial position, squandering money, and going out, and then somebody else having to clean up the mess.

Here I say, in all fairness, and the Government has had to admit this, that certainly, in the immediate term, the books are pretty well balanced; certainly there has been a hell of a lot of squandering of money in the last few years. The Liberal Party members have gone along with it and apparently are still going along with it. We had had an increase in the size of Government; their shadow Cabinet was even one more, with 14 people in it—two of them had to be dropped.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One ring-in, not even in the shadow Cabinet, was appointed a Minister. It was comparatively easy to drop the member for Eyre and the member for Hanson from the shadow Cabinet. What the Premier should have done, of course, was immediately to reduce the size of Cabinet to no more than 10; that is one more than 10 years ago. It will now be virtually impossible, once honourable members opposite have enjoyed the fruits of office, ever to reduce the size of the Cabinet; it has got to be done at the beginning if it is to be done at all.

We are told that what we are going to see, at least on paper, is that there will be a reduction in the size of the Public Service and of Government activities, but apparently an enormous and over-large and swollen Cabinet, members of Parliament simply enjoying the fruits of office. That should not have happened and that was the first test which, in my view, the Premier has failed. Let us remember that this is not a matter only of status and of swanning around in a big Government car. This costs money. I do not know, because it is hidden nowadays, how much a Minister costs. I should think that every Minister must cost the State, and that is the taxpayer, at least \$200 000 per annum. It cannot be less than that. Looking at the office of the Minister of Agriculture, at page 71, looking at random, we are going to vote \$107 000 for his office; that does not include his salary, his car, his driver or anybody else. There we have at least \$200 000 per annum per Minister and that could have been cut down.

The second test which in my view the Government has failed is with regard to Ministerial appointments. Ten years ago, as far as I know, there were no Ministerial appointments at all; the Cabinet relied entirely on the Public Service. We did, in the Hall Government, appoint one press officer for the Premier and one for the rest of the Ministers. After that, of course, Don Dunstan said—and he was quite open about this—that when he got back into office he was going to employ so many press officers that the media would be blanketed with Government propaganda and Government handouts.

The idea was that the Opposition would never get a look in, and the Labor Party would be in office indefinitely. That was the Labor Party's grand plan, but it failed, and again at the expense of the taxpayer. I calculated only a few months ago that the press officers and other Ministerial appointments would cost at least \$750 000 a year in salaries. In my view, there should not be, and need not be, any Ministerial appointments; yet, we find the present Government gradually doing just the same thing, but more blatantly and absolutely hypocritically (because it condemned the Labor Party for doing it), as its

predecessors had done.

What do we find? There are press secretaries. Why are they necessary? All they do is stand between the Minister and the Leader of the Opposition or the people. Why can a Minister not speak to ordinary people, if he is telephoned by them? There is no reason in the world why that should not happen. It is really counter-productive, and some of the ex-Ministers would agree with that now. The present Government is hell-bent on doing the same thing and, worse still, it has imported already into its Government equipage political patronage. What do we find? Within a fortnight of the election their white hope in Mitcham, Mr. Robert Worth, who had tried twice to win the seat, gets a job that is worth more than if he had won the seat and become a member. He is a vice-Minister to the Hon. Mr. Burdett, the Minister of Community Welfare. I said to John Burdett that a Minister was appointed to do the job himself, not to get someone else to do it for him; that was a prize example of political patronage. No apology has been made for it, and there was no reason for it, either.

We find from the press that Mr. Robert Nicholls, one of my constituents, who stood for Unley for the Liberal Party, has had some promotion in the Public Service, no doubt because he was a Liberal candidate at the election. This is a bad thing. If the Government was sincere in saying that it wants to cut down on waste and extravagance, all the things I read out (and you could catch them many times), this sort of thing would not be happening. All we do is Tweedle Dave instead of Tweedle Des.

I come now to the third matter, namely, the question of Government motor cars, a matter I have raised before in the House. Government motor cars seem to be, amongst politicians, not only here but elsewhere, the status symbol. The more cars and the more people who can ride around in them with a driver, the better. They all cost money.

Mr. Wright: Did you have one when a Minister?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but not when I was the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and I will say something about that in a minute.

Mr. Gunn: Did you ask the previous Government for one?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have never asked for a Government motor car.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: You're looking for more staff now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have written to the Premier, as the Deputy Premier knows, and said that the burden in my electorate office is now greater.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Members might at least, unless their minds are entirely closed, let me explain. I knew that that would come up sooner or later. The week after the election, I wrote to the Premier and said that the burden in my electorate office has built up to such a stage that it is too heavy for one person to carry and invited him to get the Public Service Board to have a look to see whether further staff (and I thought that a junior typist would do) was required. It has not come yet. I said that, in my view, I needed it and that the board should inquire. It is all very well for Government members to throw these things across the Chamber, but let them be fair and honest in what I have asked for. A good deal more has been held out, by implication, to my colleague in another place by this Government. So, let it keep its words within bounds.

Returning now to the question of motor cars, I point out that, when I first came into Parliament (a long time ago now), the only people who had Government vehicles were

Ministers. I think that there were seven at the time, or possibly eight. You, Mr. Speaker, or your predecessor, at that time, Sir Robert Nicholls, had the use of a car when he needed it to go on trips to his district in the country, but not the regular use that you and your immediate predecessors have. Certainly, no member in the other place (including the President), except the Ministers, had cars. However, little by little, more and more people have been given motor cars. I will not go right through it, but I will take up the tale in 1975 when, as you may recall, Mr. Speaker, we had an election and we had a tied House. To survive, the Labor Party had to rely on Mr. Connelly, the member for Port Pirie, who came here to be the Speaker.

Mr. Mathwin: He was an Independent.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I do not blame him for going back to the Labor Party, of which he had been a member all his life, when it had to have him. The point of the tale is that Mr. Langley, the member for Unley, was extremely disappointed that he could not get the Speakership, but only the position of Chairman of Committees. In August 1975, as a sop, Mr. Langley, as Chairman, was given a Government motor car. Two months later (and undoubtedly to keep the Liberals quiet), the Deputy Leader (now the Deputy Premier) was given a motor car. I obtained this information in answers to Questions on Notice, and there is no doubt about the dates. There was a deal between the Parties, and we had two more motor cars. I do not deny that a Minister needs a motor car if he is to carry out his job properly—at least, we did, when there were fewer of us than there are now. But I know that the Deputy Leader does not need a car to carry out his duty, because I held that job for three years. That is how the number of cars grew, in 1975. The same tale could be told about other motor cars. Here we have, as I understand it, the member for Hanson, as a sop for being omitted from the Cabinet (and God knows why he should need a sop, because he is one of the greatest embarrassments to everyone in the House), being given a Government motor car. How on earth one can possibly suggest that the Public Accounts Committee will be more efficient because the Chairman gets a Government motor car, I do not know. It is a plain political sop to him, because he was not good enough even to be included in this Cabinet.

Regarding the Public Accounts Committee, I want to say a little about what the Government was going to do about it, because it is in its policy. It has not carried that out; it has been remarkably quiet about whether it will carry it out. I have checked *Hansard* and, when the committee was proposed (the present one as it has to be pursuant to the Public Accounts Committee Act), the Deputy Premier simply moved the motion and the appointments were made, but not a word was said about any changes—no fear! The member for Flinders was not included as a member of the committee, either, and that had been mooted at one time. You, Mr. Speaker, probably know this; you may have been privy to it, but other members may not have been. This is what the Liberal Party said in its policy:

Until now this committee has examined expenditure after waste and extravagance have become apparent. The Public Accounts Committee will be reconstituted and strengthened to give additional clerical and research support.

In my view, if the Government really wanted to strengthen the committee, it would appoint a Chairman with some ability in these matters, but that has not been done. We will test them out in due course to see whether these things will be done. The Government's policy continued:

It will comprise six members—
it has five now—

three from each side of the House, with an independent Chairman.

I do not know about the independence of the member for Hanson—he does not look too independent to me. He is one of those unfortunate members who speaks before he thinks, if he thinks at all. That is the measure of his independence as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. We had a damn good example of that last week, and he had to get up and apologise today for the quite scandalous things he said about the Auditor-General.

I noticed that when the Leader pressed the Premier on that point the Premier did not say that he agreed with the member for Hanson. He got as close as he could to disowning him by saying that it was a personal opinion. Fancy having a man like that as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee when he holds such an opinion of the Auditor-General with whom (and with whose officers) he will have to work as Chairman of that committee. Yet he is to be given a Government car at taxpayers' expense when this Government is cutting down on extravagance in government. Have you ever heard of such hypocrisy!

In my view (and I made this suggestion during the election campaign as part of our policy), there should be a majority of Opposition members on the Public Accounts Committee; then we would get a bit of action in government. I must say, with very great respect to those members of the Labor Party who are my friends (and I am not sure how many I have), that, looking around at them now, I am not as enthusiastic about that view as I was at the time I put it forward. The Liberal Party says that the committee will have an independent Chairman. Dr. Tonkin says that this will ensure that it meets regularly and follows a disciplined programme of work. He says that clerical research and investigative facilities of the Auditor-General's Department will be available to the committee. He says nothing in that little bit about giving the Chairman a car.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you want to get on the committee yourself, Robin?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not want to be on the committee but a friend in my running group last Saturday morning, when we were talking about this matter, suggested that I could at least approach the Government for a pair of running shoes. I do not know whether that request will fall on deaf ears.

The SPEAKER: I do not find that item in the Budget.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have not seen that line in the Budget—maybe next year, Sir. That is the position that we have reached. I do not blame the member for Hanson. He is in a Party, like the Labor Party, and a lot of their members, try to get everything they damn well can out of this game. If he can get a Government car good for him personally, but it is a bad thing, in my view, that a Party that comes into office pledged to stop extravagance and to reduce the size of government to cut out waste, saying that it can reduce the Budget by 2 per cent simply by cutting out waste, then, out of sheer weakness (and there cannot be any other thing) gives a man who does not need it to carry out his official duty as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee a Government motor car. Let me say to members of this side of the House to show that I am fairly impartial—

Mr. Duncan interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Elizabeth is on the committee as well.

Mr. Duncan: The worst thing about it is the rest of the committee is going to be dragged around town in this car so that he can justify it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope the member for Elizabeth will resist the temptation. Just to show that I am not really concerned about the member for Hanson (I never have been; I am quite detached about this), I will read from a letter that I wrote to the Premier on 3 October, as follows:

I write to you before the formal appointment of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the Chairman of Committees about their being granted Government motor cars.

As you know, I have in the past protested about the holders of these offices having such vehicles available to them. I believe it to be a waste of public money and quite unjustified.

The best time to cut out this perk is before there are incumbents of the offices. I therefore write to ask that you withdraw this unwarranted privilege forthwith.

I must say that because of the crush of work in my office the letter was not typed until after the Deputy Leader had been appointed and had no doubt started to use the car. Certainly, the Chairman of Committees had not been appointed. It was a fortnight before I received a reply to that letter. It was written in the same style as Dunstan used to use to me when he got a letter he did not like. There is not a thank you for my letter, but merely:

I have your letter of 3 October 1979 regarding provision of Government motor cars to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and to the Chairman of Committees. I do not intend to change the existing arrangements.

No fear he doesn't; he has too many debts to pay to be able to take perks away, yet that is what he said he would do.

I come back to the theme I believe is central to all this. I agree that government has got too big, that there is too much waste; but we ought to be setting an example of restraint to the community and particularly to the Public Service, and we are not doing so. We are doing what people outside believe all politicians do; that is, do the best for ourselves whatever we may have said or done when we were in Opposition. That is a bad thing and I hope that the Government, having failed these three tests, will take some note of what has been said by me and by others and do better in the future.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I want to quickly deal with three matters with which the member for Mitcham dealt. I think that it would be true to say that everybody on this side of the House would know, without the member for Mitcham telling us, that the Budget document in front of us is basically a Labor Government Budget. I do not think that that is a surprise to anybody. I say to the member for Mitcham that I find it rather boring, to say the least, that he has argued strongly on the basis that the present Government (and certainly the past Government) should cut down on costs. He dealt particularly with the supposed massive cost of the supply of motor cars. On this sort of matter I nearly got run over a dozen times myself. I am not going to debate the argument about cutting down costs. I think that opens a grave debate as far as any Budget is concerned.

Let me say to the member for Mitcham (and I hope that he does not mind my saying this) that we should remind ourselves that he acts in a grandstand way, as he has on so many occasions in this House, when, for example, politicians receive an increase in wages and he does not accept the increase, simply because it is unparliamentary, or something like that. Yet on television he will, without any shadow of guilt (in fact, with a halo around his head) say that he has to have two jobs. He then says that he has to have two jobs to live, and he pursues the argument very vividly on most occasions on the basis that we ought to

have a situation in which a Parliamentarian should have two jobs to survive.

Let us look at the Government side, which is perhaps not representative of ordinary working-class people, although I say that with the greatest respect to members opposite. The Deputy Premier at one time was a schoolteacher.

Mr. Whitten: A poor one, I understand.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Whether he was or not I will not debate, but what I am saying is that even in the case of the Deputy Premier, how could he hold down two jobs, one as a schoolteacher and one as Deputy Premier?

It is ludicrous to say that a person can work as a Parliamentarian, devoting, in some cases, his life to the interests of the people of his district, and also work as a schoolteacher or, in the case of the member for Hanson, a bank teller, or in the case of the member for Glenelg, a broken-down painter. Yet that is the basis of the argument of the member for Mitcham. He says we have to cut down costs. If the Government goes to the extreme in this situation, I presume that all members will have to work outside and come here on a part-time basis.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I wonder how we'd get a quorum?

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is a point. I believe that the Budget we are debating at present is basically the same Budget that the Labor Party would have introduced if it was still in Government. I do not think anyone would deny that. The only difference is that attached to these papers is a considerable decrease in spending. The Government has been able to present this document basically because the management of the previous Government was economically sound. That management was carried out despite the unreal role of the Fraser regime in introducing any positive, genuine and human programmes to aid the ordinary people of this country. I say that particularly in respect to people's rights to work.

The immediate result of the current document is an attack on the previous Government's State Unemployment Relief Scheme. The scheme, which is now to be phased out under the current Budget, has played a worthwhile role in my district. News of the scheme's discontinuance has not gone down well in my district. Over the years, this scheme has introduced projects such as the Whyalla-Stuart Park reserve, which was established on a \$20 000 labour cost and a \$7 900 material cost. I also point out that labour costs amounted to \$5 an hour; considering the total labour cost of \$20 000, many hours were worked. The scheme was also responsible for the Recreation Centre Plaza, which cost \$12 740 in labour and \$4 900 in materials.

I believe that the most humane scheme ever to come from SURS was the handyman scheme. A limit of about \$10 000 was placed on this scheme; it worked out at about, \$350 limit for each house and 17c in the dollar for labour. I believe that that scheme did a wonderful job, particularly in relation to aged people who were incapable of doing odd jobs around the home. The present Government has made a chronic mistake in phasing out this programme altogether. The former member for Davenport (now Minister of Industrial Affairs), speaking to my motion last year on unemployment, said (page 875 of *Hansard*):

Mr. Hayden and the Labor Party (and apparently the member for Whyalla) are prepared to advocate that, to help solve the unemployment problem, we should increase the inflation rate and therefore increase the Government deficit. That is not credible.

It is unfortunate that the member for Whyalla and the member for Morphett particularly were not prepared to consider in a constructive manner what the Federal

Government is doing. In the recent Federal Budget the Government has allocated a total sum of \$240 000 000 for what it calls "manpower programmes". In other words, programmes have been adopted to encourage young people and other unemployed people to take on jobs.

I find that statement incredible. I point out that the Federal Government, by currently holding down inflation (and I have real doubts about whether it is currently holding down inflation) is spending millions of dollars in unemployment payments to produce nothing.

I have personally found, and am still finding, that it is difficult to accept that young people, or, for that matter, older people, supposedly take on jobs that, in fact, do not exist. Already in this State, the Government is cutting out the only scheme that is providing at least some employment for the unemployed army and providing real improvements for the many facilities within communities generally, and certainly within my own. The Premier, in his Budget speech, concerning SURS and its abolition, stated:

While my Government is most concerned at the high unemployment level in this State, we do not believe that unemployment relief programmes are the most effective way of tackling the problem. We believe, strongly, that the best long-term solution is through development of the economy, expansion of the private sector and the consequent creation of permanent jobs.

I find that statement incredible. In my opinion, this fallacy has been emanating for some time from the Federal Liberal Government. In my area alone, this policy did nothing for the private sector. It did nothing in regard to the multi-million dollar complex at B.H.P.; it certainly did nothing for the Whyalla shipyard and did little for private industry already established in Whyalla. Unfortunately, in many areas the scheme has been disbanded.

I can only say, on the rosy side, that, fortunately for my own district and for the Budget generally, the steel industry is beginning to lift. In fairness, it could be said that the Redcliff project might be a goer, although there has been some discussion about that. The Federal Government (and now the new State Government will presumably do this) has provided large sums to companies and employers generally for the purchase of machinery for computer techniques. This has done away with jobs, boosted production and taken away, by an increase in unemployment caused by these techniques, the market for products. If we are not beginning to realise that factor in unemployment, God help us. Absolutely nothing is being done for the highly labour-intensified employment opportunities. Techniques are simply being produced that do away with employment possibilities.

It would be true to say that there has been over many years a continuous attack by the Labor Government and its supporters on the wage standards of workers. We have bought products overseas derived from labour-intensive industries, simply because of the so-called high wage cost in this country. We did buy from Japan, and we all know we bought goods of all kinds from Japan—motor cars, ships, electrical goods, and so on. Now that the country has increased the wage structure and provided a better standard of living for its workers, we have turned to South Korea. In the meantime, we allow the unemployment figures of this country to grow. Unfortunately, they are continuing to grow. I plead to the Government members to reconsider such things as SURS; in my opinion, these were very good projects.

I think I would be failing in my duty if I did not turn to a matter which nearly every other speaker in this House has referred to, this being of course the much debated question of uranium. I think we are referring to it mainly

because the Government, on its election, promised 10 000 jobs in this area. I believe that the debate on uranium has obviously taken a two-pronged road. The pro-uranium agitators, if I can call them that, have adopted simply an economic role; those people are able to see only actual profits; royalties as far as the State Government is concerned. If we do not believe that, let us look at Western Mining.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. MAX BROWN: When the Tonkin Government gave Roxby Downs the go-ahead in the press, mining companies' ego and willingness to become involved in Roxby Downs became a question of "mine at all costs". On the other hand, the anti-uranium proponents believe, rightly or wrongly, that this generation has to decide the fate of the future of mankind in respect to health, safety, and a proper environment for our children and their children to live in. Some believe quite strongly that uranium should remain in the ground forever. Others believe that it should be mined only when and if safety precautions can be found. Personally, I am more inclined to be on that road than on the other.

I am glad that the member for Eyre is now present. In reply to his query the other evening of whether I had voiced my views on uranium in my own electorate, let me say, "Yes, on many occasions." Only a few weeks ago, a Gallup Poll in this state showed about 40 per cent of electors were in favour of uranium mining. I find it fairly difficult myself to agree that the present State Government has a mandate on this question. The member for Eyre mentioned how much European countries and the United Kingdom were sold on the nuclear energy question. I will only deal with one case, although there are many in Europe. I wonder sometimes what is the future in France for these people employed in this industry, and what might happen to the plutonium waste accumulated by this country already.

I was interested in two editorials of the conservative daily newspaper, the *Advertiser*. One was written, ironically, before the report on the after-effects of uranium mining in America, and the other, of course, was written quite soon after the report became public knowledge. The editorial dated 31 July, headed "History closing in", states:

History is closing in on the South Australian Government—

that was when the previous Government was in power—

The intensifying oil and energy crisis, with its grim fall-out of inflation, economic recession and unemployment, makes the Labor Party's refusal to authorise development of the gigantic Roxby Downs copper-gold-uranium deposits ever more difficult to sustain in logic. The sincerity of those who have framed this policy is not questioned. . . .

The last part of the editorial states:

Spokesmen for both B.P. and Western Mining are quick to acknowledge that they have no assurances of any imminent change in A.L.P. policy. But the chairman of Western Mining, Sir Arvi Parbo, says he has "no difficulty in believing it will be changed in due course".

There is argument about how much employment would be provided by the project, but jobs for thousands would undoubtedly be generated over a long time. Exports and royalties would have a marked effect on the entire South Australian economy. There are risks in mining uranium, just as there are risks in mining coal, or drilling for oil or natural gas.

I find that comparison rather hard to stump. How much risk are we supposed to gamble when people's lives are

concerned in the question of mining? The editorial continues:

However, there are now about 190 operating nuclear power stations in the world and 300 others under construction. No fatal accidents involving the peaceful use of nuclear energy have so far occurred in any of these stations. The energy crisis can only increase the role of nuclear power. Can South Australia stand indefinitely against the world?

Bearing that in mind on 31 July, it was rather ironical to find in the *Advertiser* on 4 September, after the mining accidents in America, a report headed "Uranium mining deaths". Again, I want to deal only with part of the report. It states:

The exploitation of human beings never can be condoned despite the fact that it is perfectly acceptable to some regimes around the world.

With very great respect, referring to the previous editorial, I wonder whether it was acceptable to the *Advertiser*? The editorial continues:

Reports that United States Government studies show that many of the pioneer uranium miners in the United States are dead or dying are tragic enough. But worse still are the suggestions that much of the risk could have been avoided and that the issue of compensation is being side-stepped.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader and the Minister of Agriculture should not stand between the Chair and the Speaker.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The editorial continues:

Whatever the law on the matter may be, a clear moral case exists for compensation for the miners who are dying and the families of those already dead from lung cancer, silicosis and fibrosis. No doubt it would be impossible to extract anything from the mine operators so long after the event. That leaves the matter squarely at the feet of the United States Government.

That is an incredible editorial, in my opinion; first, because I would question how much compensation we would be looking at for the unnecessary and inhuman deaths.

The editorial continues on the basis that future mining in Australia must be subject to the most stringent precautions. What the blazes has the Labor Government been saying for the past three years? Yet, this newspaper has condemned it every time we have opened our mouths. I find that the *Advertiser*, in some of these instances, is like an animal with two heads. I also find that the reply given by the Minister of Mines and Energy to the member for Mitchell on Thursday 11 October would have been laughable if it were not so downright serious.

During the recent election campaign great play was made by the Liberal Party on the creation of 10 000 jobs in mining alone, and I would say particularly in uranium mining. In a press statement in the *News* of 27 September, the Minister of Mines and Energy had the following to say, under the heading "Decision on Uranium Mining near":

A decision could be made early next year on the \$120 000 000 development of the Beverley uranium deposits in South Australia's Far North. The Mines and Energy Minister (Mr. Goldsworthy) said this today after a meeting with Mr. Bill Seward, Chairman of one of the participating companies. Mr. Goldsworthy said the mine would be in production within three years and would provide employment for about 300 people.

I would find it laughable, if it were not so serious, that 300 will be employed after three years. During that statement in the House the Minister made no mention of safety, health, or the conditions under which the miners would be working. On the same day, the Minister of Health attacked the statement made by the member for Elizabeth as regards Radium Hill, and promised a copy of the report

from the Health Commission on the aftermath of Radium Hill, thus giving me the impression that this was a piece of cake—we would get the report as easily as shelling peas.

Let us look at that question. Again I refer to a report in the *Advertiser* of 4 September under the heading "Two-year wait for results of U-study", yet we find, in reply to a question, that we would get a copy of the report as though it could be next week, whereas it will be a two-year wait. The report states:

The effects of uranium mining on workers at South Australia's Radium Hill are not expected to be known for two years.

Dr. P. D. Clark said yesterday it would be at least two years before there would be any statistically-significant results from a study by the South Australian Health Commission.

Dr. Clark is the Commission's health services co-ordinator for environmental and occupational health.

The study was looking at statistics to see if there was any link between cancer deaths and work at the mine.

An article in the *Advertiser* yesterday reported a witness to a United States Senate Committee in Grants, New Mexico, as saying there was an epidemic of lung cancer among former uranium miners.

The witness, Dr. L. Gottlieb, of the Public Health Service in Shiprock, New Mexico, said most victims were miners who had worked in the late 1940's and 1950's before there were any safety regulations.

Turning to the Minister's reply, I quote, in part:

The Government is seeking to give the public accurate information. It does not want to put anything over the public. The Government wants to give the public facts. The previous Government did not give the public facts. By the time the information had been through the political stream, the public did not get the facts.

The Minister continued to give all sorts of impressions, which confused even the member for Mitcham.

The world has not found a completely satisfactory set of safety precautions for the mining of uranium. Let us not kid ourselves. I hope that the Government does not think that it is kidding the Opposition, because it would be in for a rude shock. I believe that the Government's promise of the finding of 10 000 jobs in uranium mining, made during the election campaign, was a complete fallacy.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the honourable member for Semaphore, I draw attention to the fact that this will be his maiden speech, and I ask all honourable members to give him due courtesy.

Mr. PETERSON (Semaphore): I thank the member for Whyalla for clearing up a few points about which I was not too sure. In speaking on the Budget, I will make observations concerning some factors that seem to be anomalous to me. They affect the employment prospects of the whole work force. One of the proposed job-creating elements appears to be the development of Roxby Downs; yet, in terms of providing employment in the short term (the term of this Parliament), there can be only an insignificant effect. The Chairman of Western Mining Corporation stated recently that the feasibility study being carried out by that company will take at least another two years to complete. There could easily be a change of Government before any significant decision or course of action is decided on.

The proponents of developing Roxby Downs should refer to the Gallup Poll conducted by a local newspaper (and referred to by the previous speaker), wherein, of the people of Adelaide in the sample group, only 44 per cent supported the mining of uranium at that site; against that, the Australian opinion polls indicate that 56 per cent of

Australians were against uranium mining, with 10 per cent still confused. About 66 per cent of Australians are not sure about uranium yet. I suggest that, with those percentages, there is hardly an overwhelming mandate. It would seem to be far better to proceed with a maximum effort towards the Cooper Basin and Redcliff project.

Another aspect people lose sight of is the recent Three Mile Island crisis in the United States of America, or half-way around the world from us. If such an incident had happened at Torrens Island (and if we accept the use of atomic energy, the conversion of Torrens Island might not be far in the future), I wonder what the effect would have been on the thinking of people who support the use of nuclear energy. It is far too easy to be cool and calm when the incident occurs half-way around the world.

Looking further at the Budget and the proposed increases in employment, the Financial Statement accompanying the Budget states that the Government recognises the need to create long-term employment opportunities, especially for those seeking their first job.

It is fairly obvious from a statement made a little further on in the same document that that principle does not apply to the Public Service. It seems that, if a person is employed by the Government, he may even be at risk. The document states:

First, we propose to hold the Public Service to a no-growth constraint in 1979-80 and to seek actual reductions in numbers of people, wherever possible.

I repeat:

And to seek actual reductions in numbers of people, wherever possible.

The Speech continues:

We will review services, improve efficiency and redeploy staff, where appropriate.

Redeployment, I think, also includes the new term "secondment" that came out the other day in a statement. I cannot accept secondment in any form as being an answer to any problem. I believe that any intrusion by Government employees into areas of private employment at the expense of employment opportunities to the latter can only create dissension in the entire work force. It seems to me, once again, an action designed to reduce employment opportunities, not create them. The Governor's Speech continues:

Second, there will be a major thrust by the South Australian Health Commission to further rationalise services and reduce hospital running costs.

I suggest that wages are a significant part of the running costs of the hospitals, so it appears that jobs there are also at risk. I believe that this is causing concern in the hospitals at the moment. The Speech continues:

Third, the Public Buildings Department will be held to tight financial constraints in 1979-80. This is the first step in the longer-term plan to wind down, progressively, the activities of the Department, through a planned programme of natural wastage.

Again, if one is going to get rid of men there are certainly no employment possibilities there. The Speech continues:

Fourth, the Education Department and the Department of Further Education are both being held to tight financial allocations in 1979-80. The Government will be looking to a reallocation of resources, rather than to further increases in funds, to enable electoral commitments and new initiatives to be undertaken in both of these areas.

That would indicate that there are no new jobs and that there are one or two current needs that do not seem to be satisfied. There is a strong campaign going on at the moment, about which the slogan is "primary means first". I think that we will all hear a lot more about that programme before we see another Budget.

It is impossible to see where the 7 000 new jobs (and I repeat "new jobs") for youth advertised as a benefit of voting Liberal will come from when one looks at this Budget. Nor can we see where 10 000 new ("new" again) jobs in mining and associated industries will come from, as are promised in the Liberal campaign. Catering for that is not a possibility. The financial resources of the Budget do not cater for that either.

The total works programme has been reduced significantly for 1979-80. The Government openly states its concern at the effect those reductions will have on industry and employment, but it then blatantly states that part of the adverse effect may be offset by the involvement of the State Government Insurance Commission, the State Transport Authority, and the Electricity Trust of South Australia, combined with an improvement in the economy generally. That seems to be a little hypothetical. There does not seem to be anything definite there about making any improvements in the employment situation.

I cannot see how any pay-roll tax adjustment or concession will make up for the loss of public spending in the employment sphere. What is the point of employing workers when we are facing a diminishing market for goods? Not one aspect of the Budget has helped in expanding the market.

To me, the market, in general terms, means people with jobs to go to and money in their pockets. That situation will not develop as a result of this Budget. If a person has been unemployed and has received some small assistance from the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, this will not happen in the future. In place of that scheme there is now a grants scheme, which seems to me to be a two-bob-each-way situation; on the one hand, it is going to produce 7 000 jobs for youth, but if a person is still out of work he may be employed on a scheme funded out of a grant and with much the same end result as SURS, but on a reduced scale. Under the heading "Effective use of resources", the Governor's Speech continued:

My Government places great emphasis on efficient management and the effective use of resources.

I say that the Government is ignoring the greatest resource available; that is, the people of this State. They are adaptable and willing to work if given the chance. Their future and the future of the State depends on those people having a goal for which to aim. Looking further to the comment about revenue receipts there is a statement, as follows:

While the employment situation is still far from satisfactory, there have been some signs recently that economic activity is beginning to pick up. A sustained improvement would have a marked effect on employment and pay-roll tax receipts.

The statement does not exude confidence or give any indication of how that would come about. Under the heading "Public undertakings" there is an item that interests me. It states that the expected increase in receipts from the Department of Marine and Harbors is \$1 600 000. I also see an outlay of \$7 100 000 for berths and deepening. Port Adelaide and Outer Harbor, despite a continuing determined programme by officers of the Department of Marine and Harbors under a previous Government, has been treated poorly by shipping line operators and the tonnage handled through these ports has decreased significantly over the past few years. The facility that has been effected most by this policy of centralising cargo is the container terminal at No. 6 berth at Outer Harbor. The terminal has been in operation since March 1977, and has a proven capacity to handle any cellular container ship on the Australian service. Despite this, 76.6 per cent of Australia's total import and export containers

are transported by rail to and from Melbourne for the ship transfer.

In the past year, 19 000 containers were railed to Adelaide from Melbourne, but only 6 623 were landed ex-ship in Adelaide. On the export side, similar figures were experienced. There were 17 000 containers sent by rail to Melbourne and only 6 508 containers loaded at Port Adelaide. If incentives are required, surely there is one Government-owned facility well under-utilised. The benefits to the local transport operators and additional employment possibilities are obvious. The ability to land our imports and load our own produce would allow far greater control over this State's stevedoring requirements and would certainly remove the deficit in operating costs.

While on the subject of Marine and Harbors, I hope that the commercial aspects of its operation extend towards the extensive vacant industrial estate upon the LeFevre Peninsula and to the possibility of using Osborne bulk handling for RO-RO operations.

I am pleased to see that an amount of \$1 500 000 has been allocated for replacement of facilities at Largs Bay Primary School. That is an old school and can well do with that renovation. It is hoped that the State Transport Authority has allowed sufficient in its Budget for whatever work is required upon the Glanville-Semaphore line. The slight increase in the Budget allotment over the expenditure for last year is pleasing to see. When I look at the amount outlaid and see the very little done in my electorate by the Coast Protection Board, I assume that it must be our turn shortly, 1980 could be the year.

I see very little in the documents presented to invigorate the State's economy or create the employment potential claimed. The incentives offered are not substantial, as they will not create the markets necessary for on-going benefits for the State and the people. Overall, my reaction to the Budget is one of fear for the unemployed and apprehension for those who are employed.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the short time since the opening of this Parliament, I have congratulated the Speaker on his appointment and members opposite on their election. However, I forgot to congratulate you on your appointment as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees. I am sure you must have experienced some anxious moments at the special meeting of your Party before the opening day. I wish you well.

Today in the House the Premier spoke about publicity, received by the Leader of the Opposition. During the course of the elections and before the elections, I consider that the Premier had as much publicity as anyone in this State. I go further and say that the press has an important role in the running of Parliament. The freedom of the press is sometimes a long way from the mark, and at times one wonders about the ethics of the press. The press can either make or break a person, and I assure members that I have been through the mill with the press in another sphere before I became a member of Parliament. The press is very important to the Parliamentary situation. On 20 September, some worry was expressed by members of the press, especially the Secretary of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Journalists' Association, Mr. Swancott. An article in the *Advertiser* of that date states:

"Journalists want election rules for newspapers". The South Australian branch of the Australian Journalists'

Association will ask the Australian Press Council to formulate a code of conduct for newspapers covering elections. The Branch secretary, Mr. N. W. Swancott, said yesterday the branch would ask the A.J.A. Federal executive to draft a code for submission to the Press Council. He said the branch had received three complaints against the media over material published during the South Australian election campaign.

Two complaints related to material published by the *News* and one to a *Messenger Press* publication. The branch committee believed a code of conduct was necessary if the media were to retain credibility during election campaigns. It believed a code should include these points:

- Fact and comment should be clearly distinguishable.
- Readers are entitled to and should get all facts essential to an issue. Publishing conclusions without supporting facts should be considered unethical.
- Rumours, if published, should be identified as such.
- Readers should be given the source of a comment so a judgment of the weight of the comment could be made.
- When an election story advanced the interests of one side, the opposing side should be given reasonable space, promptly, to put its view.
- Published copy shown to be inaccurate should be adequately corrected as soon as possible.
- Anonymous letters to the editor should not be published during an election period.

I totally agree with the comments of Mr. Swancott. I assure members that some statements made in letters to the Editor and in other sections of newspapers were far from true. On occasion, as happened today, a person denied in writing to the paper that a letter published had been written by him at all. I have looked in up-to-date electoral rolls many times and found that people who have supposedly written letters to newspapers are not entered on the roll. Before the election, I asked a person in this place to take a survey of what had happened in the press from 23 August to 15 September 1979. The findings state:

In the following survey, I counted the number of letters supporting the Liberal Party and the A.L.P. and also measured the column centimetres devoted to each Party. In some cases, letters were difficult to categorise. For example, is a letter criticising a particular union anti-Labor? Is a letter criticising the Fraser Government pro-Labor? Generally, I included this type as being directly relevant to the election. However, the same overall result is obtained when this category of letter is excluded.

LETTERS SUPPORTING A.L.P.

	Number	Column Centimetres
<i>News</i>	28 (34 per cent)	17 (30 per cent)
<i>Advertiser</i>	36 (32 per cent)	448 (32 per cent)
Total	64	619
<i>News & Advertiser</i>	(33 per cent)	(32 per cent)

LETTERS SUPPORTING LIBERALS

	Number	Column Centimetres
<i>News</i>	54 (66 per cent)	391 (70 per cent)
<i>Advertiser</i>	76 (68 per cent)	952 (68 per cent)
Total	130	1 344
<i>News & Advertiser</i>	(67 per cent)	(69 per cent)

One can see that the journalists become worried about Parties receiving the same publicity. The survey further stated, relating to the *News* and *Advertiser*:

In the first three days of the campaign, letters supporting the A.L.P. amounted to 0 per cent of the total. In the first week of the campaign, letters supporting the A.L.P. amounted to 20 per cent of the total. In the second week of the campaign, letters supporting the A.L.P. amounted to 38 per cent of the total. In the third week of the campaign, letters supporting the A.L.P. amounted to 37 per cent of the total.

Thus, the letters supporting the A.L.P. tended to increase as the campaign went on. However, the maximum percentage achieved by the A.L.P. was 39 per cent in the *Advertiser* during the second week. Sometimes the statistics do not tell the whole story. For example, on 12 September the *News* printed seven pro-Liberal and seven pro-Labor letters. However, if the letter pages is examined, the two headlines that stand out are "Labor win not a safe bet" and "The folly of Corcoran".

Anyone can see the way in which the press informed the public in this period. The press has a big say in people's lives, whether during an election, in sport, or at other times. I am sure the figures I have quoted will give members an idea of what happened during the election. The survey continues:

Adding to the front page story, the major story under "State Election '79" and . . . the editorial in the *News* for the campaign gives a total of 52 items. Of these, 46 were anti-Labor or had a considerable anti-Labor content and only two were favourable to the A.L.P. In the *Advertiser*, there were no pro-A.L.P. editorials during the campaign and only two front page stories that could be regarded as friendly to the State A.L.P. However, this paper was prepared to criticise the Fraser Government and ran four stories critical of Canberra on the front page. There were also three editorials critical of Canberra. It could be argued that these anti-Fraser items were of some benefit to the State A.L.P. in the election campaign.

I refer now to press advertising. The survey states:

The cost of a full page advertisement in the *News* is about \$1 000 and in the *Advertiser* \$3 000. In the computation that follow individual advertisements have been added together to arrive at a total number of pages for the campaign. This total has thus been multiplied by either \$1 000 or \$3 000 to arrive at a final figure. This method only gives an approximate total and the final figure cannot be taken as accurate. However, the figures given can be regarded as minima as the method used tends to understate the amount spent. This occurs because four advertisements of a quarter of a page would cost more than one full page advertisement, as would three one-third page ads, etc. The proportional spending of one Party in relation to another can, however, be regarded as accurate. The table is as follows:

Advertising Supporting the Liberal Party		Total pages
<i>News</i>		31.7
<i>Advertiser</i>		13.9
		Spending
<i>News</i>		\$31 700
<i>Advertiser</i>		\$41 600
		<hr/>
		\$73 300

Of this amount Mr. Buick, of Kingscote, spent \$15 000, the employer group spent \$11 000, concerned small businessmen spent \$7 000, and miscellaneous Liberal supporters spent \$18 000.

Total "unofficial" advertising supporting Liberals: \$51 000.

**"Official" Party spending: \$22 000	
Advertising Supporting the Australian Labor Party	
	Total pages
News	10-7
Advertiser	9-1
	Spending
News	\$10 700
Advertiser	\$27 400
	\$38 100

Total "unofficial" advertising supporting A.L.P.: \$2 100.

**"Official" Party spending: \$36 000.

So, much money was spent outside the Liberal Party. In the case of the A.L.P., more money was paid by the Party. In regard to the number of advertisements it is found that:

(a) there were 75 advertisements favourable to the Liberal Party. Of these 54 (or 72 per cent) were placed by "unofficial" Liberal groups; 21 (or 28 per cent) were placed by the Liberal Party.

(b) there were 41 advertisements favourable to the Australian Labor Party. Of these six (or 15 per cent) were placed by "unofficial" A.L.P. groups and 35 (or 85 per cent) were placed by the A.L.P.

It is noticeable that until 6 September, when the employer groups entered the campaign, the A.L.P. had 12 supporting advertisements to the Liberal's seven. From six to 15 however the A.L.P. had only 29 supporting advertisements, to the Liberals' 68.

SUMMARY

1. The Liberal Party and groups supporting it spent twice as much on advertising in the *News* and *Advertiser* as the A.L.P. and supporting groups.
2. Unofficial groups favourable to the Liberals spent two and a half times more on advertising than the official Liberal Party.
3. These unofficial groups provided 72 per cent of all advertising favourable to the Liberal Party, while groups friendly to the A.L.P. provided only 15 per cent of that Party's advertising.
4. Official A.L.P. advertising amounted to \$36 000, and official Liberal advertising to \$22 000.
5. A.L.P. advertising was swamped after the employer group entered the campaign on 6 September.
6. About \$8 000 was spent on advertising critical of Peter Duncan.

A breakdown of all advertising day by day is available if more detail is required.

That shows some of the dirt and unfounded parts of some of the accusations that, I say, were getting close to being libellous and not correct. Mr. Buick, of Kingscote, really turned it on when he said:

Mr. Premier—Tell it the way it is! You're not really the Leader are you?

Then there is a photograph of the former Premier, Howard O'Neill, Don Ferguson, Kevin Hamilton, and Peter Duncan (with dark glasses, but that is the first occasion I have seen him with dark glasses) and George Apap. The advertisement states:

You're really dominated by the left-wing radicals at Trades Hall and former trade union officials in your Parliament. Isn't this really the power behind the South Australian Premier? Who will really control the way we live and work? Isn't the State being run from South Terrace instead of North Terrace? Remove the doubt! Protest! On this occasion vote Liberal .

People are entitled to vote as they like but I, as a member of this Parliament for some time, and knowing the members of the Caucus, can assure the House that since I

have been in this place I have never known the Caucus of this Party to have more members with a trade union affiliation than from the other fields of life.

Of the 47 candidates who stood at the recent election, only 12 were trade union people. I did not notice that Caucus was ever previously dominated by trade union people during the course of my years in this Parliament, which most honourable members opposite might say have been too long. Each and every member has the same vote. In the voting for positions in this House, as happened recently, every member has the opportunity to speak and to vote. I can assure members opposite and the writer of this advertisement that it is not true that otherwise is the case in the A.L.P. Caucus. Certain people who contested the election were defeated, but that is all in the game.

Mr. Mathwin: How is it that the member for Baudin, the member for Peake, and Jim Dunford, all have clipped left wings? They have their left wings in plaster.

Mr. LANGLEY: I doubt that the member in another place would like to have his left wing hurt. It is purely coincidental. I hope that the honourable member is never in a position to have his left wing broken. At the election our candidates included nine teachers, seven lawyers, six public servants, three lecturers or academics, two technical officers, a doctor, a farmer, a master builder, a fruitgrower, a housewife—

Mr. Mathwin: How do you get on with all those lawyers?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LANGLEY: They went through the right avenues and were pre-selected. I have no control over that situation. We also had one sportsman and one businessman. I do not know whether I was a sportsman or a businessman. The former Premier (Des Corcoran) was described as an Army officer. I do not know how the writer of this report can claim that the Labor Party is dominated by unionists and by the left wing. When I played football, I did not know whether I was half-forward on the left or the right, or half-back.

Such reports are written by people away from this place who decide which member is left wing, which is right wing and who is a communist. They make a decision and many times they have been wrong, especially about matters considered in Caucus and which way members vote. Government members would be surprised about how members vote in Caucus, where it is one vote one value. There is no need to worry about that. There are many more matters that I could raise. I have not referred to some of the headlines and the photographs of the former Premier, which were shocking. I refer to the way in which the press and sometimes members say that they wish Des Corcoran luck. I can assure the Government that everyone wishes Des Corcoran luck.

However, they never stopped saying that he would not last much longer, that he would not be in the House, and things like that. The honourable member said openly that he hoped to stay in Parliament for another eight years, just as the member for Elizabeth (Mr. Duncan) said that he never wanted to be Premier. We were told that a vote for Corcoran could well finish up a vote for Duncan.

The gentleman from Kingscote must be going along reasonably well. He could not say that he has been doing too badly since the Labor Government assumed office, as that man has had more than a dollar to spend this time. Indeed, not a bad sum of money (I think about \$15 000) was spent.

Mr. Mathwin: They all came in with it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg must cease interjecting.

Mr. LANGLEY: I refer now to what one reads in the

press and to what one does and does not believe. This is a perfect example of misrepresentation. Recently, on *Nationwide*, when Mr. Corcoran was asked who would be his possible successor, Mr. Duncan was one of his choices. The following was stated:

A serious recurrence of Mr. Corcoran's ill-health can force him to stand down. With Mr. Duncan as Premier and a majority in the Upper House, the left wing will see to it that we do not get another early leadership mandate vote.

If that is not surmising, what is? I am sure that more than one person would like to be a future Premier. Indeed, I am sure that one day someone from this side of the House (it could easily be three or four other people) will be Premier of this State. It is pure supposition to say that Peter Duncan would like to be Premier, when he has already said that he is not even interested in the position. However, those concerned do not take any notice of what is stated in the press, and other people are only too willing to print this type of rubbish, which is nowhere near the truth.

Mr. Mathwin: Didn't he try—

Mr. LANGLEY: I assure the honourable member that I take the word of the member for Elizabeth. I have not seen him throw in the hat previously and, as far as I am concerned, he has not done so now. Whatever he has said on this matter was not untrue, but most of the rubbish to which I have referred is.

Mr. Mathwin: You never know until the ball stops rolling, Gilbert.

Mr. LANGLEY: That is right. Members of the Liberal Party have been trying for years to win Unley, and this is the first time that it has not been a doubtful seat, although I must admit that it was not all that strong at the end. However, I assure members that it was not the worst majority that I have received. Indeed, my majority was only 43 votes once, and it has been under 800 votes previously. I have had some not bad candidates opposing me, either. I was going to say that members would have heard of Sir John McLeay, but he is not yet "Sir". However, I suppose it will not be long before that happens. Mr. McLeay had a bit of a go one day and got badly wounded. They have not been bad candidates at Unley.

Mr. Slater: What about Suzy Creamcheese?

Mr. LANGLEY: I am talking about the best candidates only. The gentleman who wrote the report to which I have referred is not even satisfied with that, because in his last paragraph he says:

Wake up South Australia. This is not a mandate vote for Corcoran: it is a vote for total left-wing union control.

In my opinion, it was a vote for the Labor Party. People who voted for me in Unley were voting for the Labor Party; I am sure that they were not voting for anyone else. I assure members that the hypocrisy concerning what is happening in relation to the members for Elizabeth and Hartley is hooey and that it is about time some of these people were brought to heel.

I referred earlier to Mr. Swancott, of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Journalists Association, a fair man for whom all members and I have a high regard. Some people in the press in South Australia did not want to do some of the things that they had to do. Otherwise, what Mr. Swancott has said would not have come to a head.

I refer now to a matter affecting women, who are part and parcel of life. This is from South Australian parents. I suppose that the author forgot about the menfolk. The real crunch of the election was whether the family would still have their jobs next week. The alternatives are set out and, if these can be carried out, honour must be given to

the Government, but I cannot see it happening within three years. If it does, well and good.

I have heard about the thousands of jobs and many more small businesses and I have received a dossier concerning shop assistants, which I will use later. If the Government creates more jobs, and not more laws, that will be wonderful. We might return to the era of Sir Thomas Playford, which, I suppose, was a wonderful era. We used to stay home for eight months, and we would sit for four months. There was no trouble about being able to attend the Melbourne Cup, because we would always be up by the end of October. I would be able to say to my colleagues that we would not be sitting very long. Perhaps executive Government will take over, as it did in the days of Sir Thomas Playford. I am not making disparaging remarks about him. He was a genuine Premier and man at all times.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: He was a very good chief.

Mr. LANGLEY: Whatever he may be, when I asked my first question in the House, I nearly fell under the table.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: He has not done badly. He is not short of a dollar. I do not know what Government members are thinking, but he must get one of the "jobs for the boys" soon. We cannot continue in this way. We will go broke, if we hold elections too frequently. There is no worry about that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that the honourable member for Unley does not need any assistance.

Mr. LANGLEY: The honourable member lives in that area, but I am sure that he did not write the script. I think that someone from the press department fixed it, because it is well done and well paid for. I have never known anyone in this State to win an election as the press has done in this one. Basically, the Murdoch press won it. I do not know that the *Advertiser* has ever been fifty-fifty. The Murdoch press said that it would tell the country how to vote. Mr. Murdoch told voters a few years ago how to get rid of another Labor Government. If you advertise yourself, you can sell yourself. I doubt whether some Government members door-knocked half of their districts when they won their plebiscites. Some were not elected for a certain time. I am sure that, if the press acts in the same manner next time, we will not have to worry about door-knocking. They appear to have put the Premier asleep for 10 days before the election, because he did not make any press statements.

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: The member for Glenelg can say what he likes. I hope that Parliament does sit for more than four months.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Budget papers. I accept the principle, to some degree, that a new Government cannot make drastic changes to the overall text of a Budget, but it can change its direction in philosophy and application. There is no doubt that that was the promise that the Liberal Party made before the election and no doubt that is a promise we will honour and are in the process of honouring. I will return to that later when I refer to the speech made by the member for Mitcham.

First, I wish to refer to the unemployment scheme. Several members of the Opposition have made the point that it has been a good scheme and that it is a pity that it has been changed and is no longer in existence under the present Government, except for those projects that were approved, which will continue. I never believed that it was a good scheme, and I have said that in this House

previously. I also said that in my own local newspaper even though I belonged to an organisation that gained some benefit from it, in the form of a clubroom.

My objection to the unemployment relief scheme and to making moneys available through that scheme was mainly that those moneys were supposedly to create work. I believe that was done in a semi-artificial way. We said money could be used only on community projects, mainly through local government or other similar community bodies, and that labour-intensive materials were to be used. Often those labour-intensive materials were the wrong materials for the completion of an economic contract, not the best materials for the project to ensure the service, quality, long life, and economy for the dollar spent.

If that money had been made available as a grant and if local government authorities or other bodies were permitted to call tenders for the project, those firms that successfully tendered for the work would have more work guaranteed and therefore less people would have been placed on the unemployment line. At the same time, more people would have been encouraged to move into the private sector to take jobs, resulting in more permanency than they would have had in a scheme arranged through local government and other bodies. Further, it would have created more community facilities for the same money.

The example I referred to earlier in my own community resulted in a project with an overall cost of about 40 to 50 per cent more than it should have been, and I stated that fact quite openly in my local newspaper. In other words, if the local council had been able to call tenders and use contractors to build that project, we would have ended up with a facility that was 40 to 50 per cent larger than it is. Now that community must face the obligation of attempting to build on to that building to achieve a desirable size for the community and the club involved. We set out to build stone retaining walls and we used stone materials, which our great-grandfathers had used, because it was labour-intensive. However, by doing that we squandered money. We could have used other materials, resulting in a larger building. Some members would say that we would not create as many jobs, but I say that we would, because we would be using more materials, thus creating more job opportunities back down the line to the manufacturer of those materials, whether it be in the cartage of ready-mixed concrete, in the quarrying, mining and preparation of that concrete, or in regard to the timber or other manufactured goods.

The unemployment scheme was an artificial way of trying to create jobs. In the long term, it could not work. Many of the buildings built under that scheme were not of good quality. The Deputy Opposition Leader said today that that workmanship was good. In some cases it was, but in many it was not and it was uneconomical. In many cases the work was bad and the work effort was not good because the people did not have the skills to create a good result in quantity of bricks laid, and so on. In some cases the bricklayers were laying no more than 200 bricks a day. At the age of 70, Winston Churchill took up the challenge with the unions in England and laid 800 bricks in one day without practice, and he did it with first-class workmanship to prove his point.

Therefore, in that sense, the unemployment scheme was not very good. The Government has now said that it will allow the completion of those projects that have been approved and are on their way under this scheme. There is still an opportunity for grants to be made through local government, the Health Commission, the Community Welfare Department, and the Recreation and Sport Department.

The Government does have the opportunity to create jobs by making grants available so that the private sector can tender for work projects, and I believe that that is the proper approach. My answer to the Labor Party on the State Unemployment Relief Scheme being taken out of existence in the near future is that, as far as I am concerned, I am satisfied that that is the proper move.

I would like also to refer briefly to the remarks made by the member for Mitcham. I believe his comments were unfair and that he was not prepared to give credit where credit was due. He said that the Government had made some promises before the election and that it had not honoured any of them. I believe he is wrong, because of the many moves that the Government has made, and I will refer to some of them. The member for Mitcham did not point out that the Policy Division of the Premier's Department had been abolished, as has the Industrial Democracy Unit in the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment Department. Those are two moves that were made immediately to bring about economies.

The Leader of the Opposition said we had stated that succession duty was not a good tax. I believe the member for Salisbury also referred to succession duties, as well as gift duty. We agree that it is a bad tax, but it is not easy to come into Government and make such a measure retrospective. The Government never promised that: it promised that it would abolish that tax, and that will be done. Legislation is on the way so that that can be done. It will be abolished as from 1 January. If the Labor Party wishes, it can support the Government in getting rid of this bad tax (and it is a bad tax, there is no doubt about that).

The Government also said it would abolish land tax on residential properties. We admit that there are some difficulties in doing that, not because we do not wish to implement that legislation, but because of the data and detail that has to be collated about individual properties beforehand.

The Government did what I believe was an honourable thing. It promised that as from 1 July next year the tax on residential homes will be abolished. In the meantime, it gave a guarantee that nobody would pay any more land tax this year than he paid last year. At least the Government has guaranteed that there will not be an increase in taxation, so the Government has honoured that promise as much as it can, bearing in mind the data that has to be collected. The Government said that it would provide payroll tax incentives for employers to employ more people, particularly young people, and we are honouring that promise, with legislation in the process of being introduced. But the member for Mitcham chose to ignore that matter also. The Government promised that it would abolish stamp duty for persons buying their first home up to a value of \$30 000, and that related particularly to young people to give them the opportunity to buy a home. That is already operating; we have honoured that promise, but was there a word of recognition about that from the member for Mitcham? Not one! He chose to ignore that also.

He said that the Government had not set out to decrease some of the areas of Ministerial appointments and Ministerial staff. However, when the Liberal Party came into power, its predecessor, the Labor Government, employed 13 press secretaries, and there are now only eight. The Liberal Government has done away with five appointments already. I do not know the limit, but at least these appointments have been reduced by five, which is a considerable amount. Figures contained in replies to Questions on Notice will show that there has been a decrease in Ministerial staff since this Government came into power. It must not be forgotten that the Government

has been in power for only a few weeks. What a lot of achievements have been made in that short time! They are certainly not insignificant. People should realise this, especially if they are going to be critical in other areas.

The member for Mitcham raised the matter of electoral offices, and I am glad that he took this up in writing with the Government. I wrote to the previous Government on two occasions and had a conversation with several Ministers about having a junior work in electoral offices. I still believe that there is a need in at least some offices for a junior, particularly in offices in the fringe metropolitan districts, not because there now happens to be more Liberals in those fringe seats (and I congratulate them on their appointment and on the magnificent work they did during the elections). I said at the time that some of those districts (including those then held by certain Labor members) had a bigger work load than some inner metropolitan and country districts. The Government could approve that a junior of, say, 16 to 17 years of age, with some typing and shorthand experience, could be made available; that person would gain some experience and perhaps receive the guarantee of a job for a maximum of 12 months.

If, through their own initiative, ability and improvement while working in that office they were offered a job in the community, they could be allowed to move on to that job, and another junior could come in, again receiving no more than 12 months work. Even if the junior did not gain employment afterwards, work experience would be gained in an interesting area. The cost would not be great and would not affect the Government's Budget very much. If the member for Mitcham adopts that argument, I support him, because I have been supporting this suggestion for a long time.

However, I would take the member for Mitcham to task when he talks of getting extra staff because the burden in his office is greater. We must be honest; the member for Mitcham spends a lot of time in court and in his legal practice. If the person working in the honourable member's electoral office (called, I think, an assistant) is overburdened, part of the reason is that the member for Mitcham is appearing in court or otherwise engaged in his legal practice, receiving high fees. The member for Mitcham should at least come clean on that point: the reason the lass in his office has to carry a bigger work load is that he is not there much of the time. Indeed, he is not in this Parliament much of the time, as the member for Whyalla said earlier.

If all honourable members chose to have another job and if, when Parliament was sitting, it did not matter if members were not in the House when a debate not concerning them was taking place, or they did not want to ask a question on a particular day, Parliament possibly would not operate because there would not even be a quorum. Surely one of the major responsibilities of an elected member is to attend Parliament, speak, vote and take an interest in what is happening. Some people wonder why some members are not present in this Chamber, but at least in every room there is an amplifier so that members can listen to what is happening here.

However, the member for Mitcham grandstands on this subject when his own credibility should be taken to task. He is someone of benefit to the press. He sits in the middle and can take a poke at this Party and a poke at that Party to gain publicity. It is not to the advantage of the press to point out how he regularly manipulates the system and has done so for many years to his benefit, including his financial benefit, but to the detriment of Parliament and the political system. I hope the member for Mitcham sees the error of his ways and realizes that he is being unfair

and unjust to many dedicated people, even though we may not all be as dedicated as each other. He himself is exploiting the situation.

The member for Unley made a brief remark about the Playford Government sitting for only about four months of the year. That is not a bad practice if members had more time to spend in their electorates and if we can achieve as much success as Sir Thomas Playford achieved, for instance, great expansion in industrial development and manufacturing industry occurred in that period, as well as the extension of pipelines and the reticulation of power throughout most of the State, the construction of most of our reservoirs and the founding of the satellite city of Elizabeth. We can contrast those achievements with those of the past Government, which wanted to sit and pass many laws and regulations until people were over-regulated and thought that there was no benefit in attempting to survive in private enterprise. There was no incentive for them to stay in this State, because of those laws.

Which is the best form of Government? One that leaves the opportunities for individuals to succeed through their own initiatives, or one that regulates and controls every move people make so that they cannot succeed, often, in their own small businesses, and become frustrated with the law and over-regulation? The member for Eyre said that a constituent in his area had often in their own small businesses, had to answer to about 20 Government departments and take out various licences in order to run a small business. People in small businesses cannot be bothered with that amount of regulation, involving more book work than the actual work of attending to customers or clientele. I hope that the Labor Party has learnt its lesson and can see that society does not wish to be over-regulated. I hope that the present Government sets out to at least get rid of the bad laws and regulations and does not bring in a lot of new laws or amend existing laws except where absolutely necessary. The community does not need that; it wants an opportunity to settle down and look forward to progress and success in the future.

In relation to the private sector, some members opposite suggest that money earned without effort—in other words, interest or returns on money invested—is not money earned honestly. They reflect upon many of their own very keen supporters in saying that. Even Frank Walsh, a former Premier and a very loyal Labor man, said in 1963 that home ownership was a cornerstone of democracy. He was encouraging people to acquire a home. If we say that a person who acquires a home is not entitled to the inflationary trend in the value of that home, we are denying him his real purchasing power. That is true of most people who invest money.

If one invests money today one is lucky to get more than 12 per cent without taking a risk. Even at that interest rate, one could be taking a risk. However, that return is not much above the inflationary trend. If one is going to take a risk, why invest money in something that does not much more than occurs with the inflationary trend? It is the only way to retain one's purchasing power. If one had \$10 000 in 1970 and had not obtained the benefit of inflationary trend, by today, one would have lost 50 per cent of one's purchasing power.

Surely that right should be retained by an elderly person who has retired and has put money away for retirement. Surely the elderly person should be entitled to retain the purchasing power he had at the time he retired. If he spends some of the overall capital, he will lose some of the purchasing power; but at least he should be able to retain something a little better than the inflation rate. So, the Labor Party is attacking many of its own supporters. Of

course, there will be rich people in the community—millionaires. Personally, I would prefer to live in a community surrounded by millionaires, because I would be more likely to share in their wealth than I would if I were surrounded by people poorer than I was. That is true regardless of what community one may live in.

I hope that the Labor Party sees that there is no benefit in a State like South Australia, with 1 400 000 people, encouraging people to leave South Australia and invest somewhere else; that is, taking their capital out of South Australia. There is no benefit in doing that, because that will bring about a depressed situation in this State. I hope that the Liberal Party will continue with its true philosophy of encouraging the private sector and of having a public sector only where it is necessary to give proper service to the people, so that we end up with an economy of which we can be proud. I hope the Liberal Government can develop this State in such a way that people will wish to come here, invest here, and create job opportunities here. If they do not do this, our young people will have to look at the prospect of going to other States. I am sure that the Liberal Party can achieve the other goal of giving job opportunities to young people in South Australia. This will not occur overnight; it will not be achieved in 12 months. If we follow the Liberal Party philosophy in the long term, for two or three years, the goals will be achieved. I have faith in the Budget that is before us and in the philosophy of my Party.

Bills read a second time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

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

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): Shortly we are to proceed to a detailed examination of the Bills on a line-by-line basis. In the course of examining this matter I felt it necessary to refer to precedents. As the House is well aware, this is the first occasion on which I have stood here as Leader of the Opposition to take part in such a debate. I found it useful to examine precedents for remarks that are traditionally made at this stage. In the course of my research I examined the corresponding debates of a little more than 12 months ago. I wish to refer to the remarks made by the then Leader of the Opposition, who now occupies the position of Premier. He said (*Hansard*, 26 September 1978):

We are about to play out what has effectively become a meaningless and scandalously irresponsible charade.

He complained that the process of examining Government expenditure elicited little information and was for the Liberal Party members then in Opposition, a tedious business. That is how the then Leader of the Opposition viewed what was to be done. It was based on his analysis of the importance of the debate, the procedure, and the information available to conduct it.

For a start, I would say that those statements themselves are somewhat irresponsible, and certainly ignore the vital role that can be played by members of the House in the course of detailed examination of the Estimates. The Budget is the cornerstone of the Government's policies. Any promises made either before or during an election will, if they are to be fulfilled, find expression in that Budget. In those detailed lines, in those Estimates, are all the policy proposals of the Government, whether arising from election promises or from policies developed in the course of Government. They are all reduced to dollars and cents but, by questioning and examination, members of the House can more fully understand the Government's

programme and judge its effectiveness. Therefore, to call that a meaningless and scandalously irresponsible charade does demean the approach that the then Leader of the Opposition was taking to the debate and the role of this House.

Now the former Leader of the Opposition is in Government, he will need to do more than complain about the structure of financial debates in this Parliament. He will learn that promises made in respect of them and his proposals in relation to them are something that must be put into effect, or he will be judged by them. Let me be fair to the former Leader of the Opposition. As well as the criticism that he made, he outlined some alternative approaches, and they are interesting approaches, ones that were not only outlined in the speech on the Budget in 1978 but which have been repeated subsequently, only a month or so ago, in the course of the election campaign.

Among these promises, and particularly relevant to the process that we are coming to today, namely the examination of the Estimates in Committee, was a system of Budget and Estimates committees, which would examine specific areas of the Budget. They were to be associated with the extension of the time allocated to consider the Budget and the Estimates. The former Leader of the Opposition also proposed that the Public Works Committee was to have extra powers and functions, and that the Public Accounts Committee should be reconstituted "under the chairmanship perhaps of the Auditor-General, but certainly an independent person". He suggested that it should be provided with additional clerical and research support.

The important point is that these proposals, which were made specifically and in some detail 12 months ago by the then Leader of the Opposition, were repeated in detail again in the Premier's election policy speech. I intend to quote the exact words from the Premier's policy speech, delivered on television by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. David Tonkin, M.P., 7.30 p.m. Tuesday 28 August 1979. This is a document that Opposition members will be referring to frequently in the course of the next three years, the life of this Parliament. In relation to these specific points, this is what the then Leader of the Opposition stated:

A Liberal Government will introduce cost-benefit procedures in Government departments and statutory authorities . . . extend the powers of the Auditor-General and Public Accounts Committee . . . establish Budget and Estimates committees to scrutinise the Budget.

One or two other points are then made, but I have quoted the three that are relevant to this debate. The House is no longer just debating the point that the Opposition made in the course of those procedures, but is debating firm election promises that should be fulfilled or, if they are not to be fulfilled, should be explained fully to the Parliament and the people of South Australia, with the reasons given as to why it is impossible or why they are being cast aside.

What has happened with those promises? First, the Government has not been with us for long, so some could argue that there has not been sufficient time to implement the promises. At first glance, that seems to be a reasonable thing to say, but surely the changes that have been outlined by the Premier, which are mere machinery changes, not necessarily requiring legislation to give effect at least in part to their provisions, could have been put into effect. Certainly, because they were raised and detailed about 12 months ago, I would have thought that there would have been ample time for the then Opposition to prepare them in firm administrative detail so that they could be introduced soon after an election.

After all, the Liberal Party has had time to introduce a

Budget, to recast a Budget that it now claims as its own, so why could it not recast the procedures under which it was to be considered?

Let us get down to the specifics of those promises. Where are the Budget and Estimates committees? Where are they mentioned in the Premier's Budget statement? They are certainly in the policy statement and in the annals of this House on previous occasions. However, they are no longer mentioned in the documents that are currently before us; nor have they been mentioned during the course of this debate. Must we sit here longer and wait until we hear? I do not think that is likely.

Apparently, the Premier and his deputy, the Leader of the House, are anxious that the House rise as quickly as possible. Every day (and, I suspect, every Question Time) increases the embarrassment that the Deputy Premier brings to his Cabinet colleagues. So, it is not surprising that he would be rather anxious for the House to rise at the earliest possible opportunity.

There, we have two aspects of those promises. The system of Budget and Estimates committees not only has not been introduced but also has not even been referred to. They have been buried, and the extension of time allocated to consideration of the Budget and Estimates has been completely ignored. We are to rise, it is said, within a couple of weeks and perhaps there may be one or two weeks extra grace on top of that, but certainly not the sort of time for the detailed consideration that the Government has promised.

The Premier referred in his statement to the programme by the Treasury and Public Service Board to review and improve the budget and financial systems of departments. There is nothing new in this. Indeed, it is part of a process which was initiated by the former Labor Government and which was well advanced. It is not a sudden result of the present Government's taking office.

Incidentally, in this context it is worth referring to the Auditor-General's Report, which has received such unwarranted criticism. The fact that the report does not need in many respects to go into great details is clearly because the process of financial reorganisation, of improving and streamlining budgets and of the organisation of departmental accounts were sufficiently advanced for it to need no further comment from the Auditor-General. An examination of each of the points raised and the Auditor-General's report on progress made in meeting those points made by departments bears this out.

That process was well advanced under the previous Administration. The very fine financial record and the surplus with which we ended the financial year are clear indications of how successful that process was. So, for the Premier to claim that as some special programme that he is about to initiate is quite wrong. It was already well advanced.

Let us now look at the Public Accounts Committee, which is indeed an important committee that was the subject of considerable promises by the then Opposition at the time of the election and previously. We were to have an independent Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, possibly even the Auditor-General. But who do we have instead? We have the member for Hanson, not very well known as an independent and certainly nowhere near resembling the Auditor-General.

One must ask the question (which has been referred to on other occasions) whether the member for Hanson has seen, by taking this position, that he has somehow moved himself on to the cross benches and that he no longer needs to take the Party Whip. On the other hand, has this promise simply been over thrown because something had to be fixed up for the member for Hanson following his

disappointment over failing to reach Cabinet office? That may be so.

However, the fact remains that the former Opposition promised that when it was in Government the Public Accounts Committee would have an independent Chairman. It had an opportunity to appoint such a Chairman, but it failed to take that opportunity. Secondly, it said that the Public Accounts Committee would have more resources, and more clerical and research assistance. When one examines the Budget, one finds no mention at all of those resources. Indeed, we discover that one major new resource was made available to the committee. I refer to the provision of a car and driver for the Chairman, no doubt to enable him to tour more adequately around the suburbs on the protracted investigations that, as some sort of mobile watchdog, he would see himself making. They are the resources that the committee is getting and, in terms of the effectiveness of the Public Accounts Committee, one could see that as being sheer nonsense. It is simply a perk and an assistance to compensate for the member for Hanson's disappointment and to possibly buy his silence and co-operation during the course of the present Parliament. Who knows? He can speak for himself on the matter.

Let me turn now to the Auditor-General, who was mentioned, as I have already said, as being possibly the person who should chair the Public Accounts Committee. That has been quietly dropped. The Liberals, in Opposition, have always made much of the role of the Auditor-General as an officer of the Parliament and, indeed, that independent office, which is secured by Statute, and which requires that the reports be delivered not to the Government of the day, but to the Speaker of the House of Assembly and to the President of another place, is an important one. It does have statutory independence and a requirement for public independence from the Government to protect the probity of the important audit of Government accounts.

We would fully agree with the remarks made by the previous Opposition about the role of the Auditor-General, and would support them while in Opposition. But, in office, this Government forgets his independent statutory role. The disgraceful attack made on that officer and his report by the member for Hanson is doubly disgraceful in view of his important function as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. It was a matter of considerable disappointment that the Premier was not, on the occasion the attack was made, prepared to make an unequivocal statement in support of the statutory independence of the Auditor-General. If he had been in Opposition, he would have been extremely quick to speak on that subject, but he chose not to do so. However, I acknowledge that the member for Hanson was today prepared to publicly place on record that the remarks he made were intemperate and should not have been made, and for that we must respect him. Indeed, that respect is somewhat tempered by the fact that he felt inclined in the first instance to make such an unscrupulous and scurrilous attack on an independent officer.

Regarding the Auditor-General, it was said that more finance and resources would be made available to him in order to assist him in the discharge of his office. I ask all members to examine the Budget. There is no increased allocation for the Auditor-General's Department beyond the minimal amount for inflation. So much for the Government's promises in that area.

Let us turn now to the Public Works Standing Committee, which was to be given extra duties and responsibilities and additional powers. What has happened under the present Government? There was

absolutely no mention in His Excellency's Speech that the committee was to be amended in some way to increase those responsibilities, powers or duties. Certainly an examination of the Budget documents indicates no increased financial allocation. Indeed, something has happened to the committee: it has been thrown out of its offices in Parliament House and transported at short notice to the station building over the road, simply because Liberal members of the Legislative Council, particularly the defeated candidate for the position of President, want an office for themselves in Parliament House. That is how that committee has been dealt with under a Government that said it would increase its role and responsibilities. In Government, it has been treated with considerable contempt; that is the sort of upgrading a Parliamentary committee could well do without.

All this adds up to two features beginning to emerge with this Government. At this stage, we must still give it the benefit of the doubt. As a new Government, unfamiliar with what is required, and with the major problems of public administration, one can expect mistakes to be made in the early stage. The administrative incompetence so far demonstrated is beginning to fall into a somewhat disturbing pattern. The Government has already admitted its inability to translate even its more highly publicised promises into action—promises at the base and cornerstone of its programme presented to the people of South Australia. The Budget speech states that it will not be possible to abolish land tax this year because of administrative difficulties.

The administrative details of the much-vaunted youth employment scheme still remain a mystery. On that matter, the Premier has promised legislation to amend the Pay-roll Tax Act. That is necessary to make the appropriate rebates and remissions, and we acknowledge that and look forward to seeing the legislation. The introduction of legislation is not necessary before the actual administrative details of the scheme are announced, and before employers in the community are told what they can expect in the form of rebates and how they can take advantage of them, pending the legislation.

It must be remembered that this is not a scheme that is to operate some time in the future. Before the election, the Premier said that it would operate from 1 October and on that very day he made a grandstanding speech to a group of businessmen and was given a huge ovation when he announced with a great flourish that the scheme was on its way and would operate from that very day. Three weeks later those details are not available, and the Premier has accused the Opposition of carping when we raise the point. The fact is, that employers in the community who are meant to take advantage of this scheme do not know what it is about because the Government is not able to tell them. What sort of incompetence is that?

The administrative details might be uncertain, but what is certain is that the amount of money allocated to that scheme is nowhere near the sums touted during the election. During the election the Premier portrayed the scheme as being fully costed and thoroughly planned, yet the Budget has provided less than half the \$6 800 000 cost mentioned during the election. What has happened to the \$3 000 000 that was meant to be made available for this scheme? Is the delay in introducing the administrative details simply in order to ensure that no-one can take advantage of the scheme and thus save money that has not been allocated?

Those costings are quite clearly established. For the benefit of Government members that may not understand how these figures are determined, I will briefly go through

them. The first element of the scheme, which excludes from a firm's annual pay-roll figures the wages and salaries of all employees aged less than 20 years who are engaged after 30 September and whose employment represents a net addition in employment, is costed at \$2 800 000. The second element introduces a special exemption of \$12 000 for every firm whose total employment is increased by the engagement of one full-time employee aged less than 20 years, and the revenue loss there is \$6 300 000. When going through the various costing figures we realise they are determined on a full year and, for the nine months operation from 1 October to 30 June, it works out to three-quarters of that—\$6 800 000. Therefore, that is the true cost for 1979-80 according to the promises made by the Liberal Party.

Another figure that should be taken into account and which is deducted in the Liberal costing document is the amount of money saved under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. That money was not set off against the specific pay-roll tax scheme, but has been absorbed into general revenue and should therefore be excluded when looking at the cost. Therefore, a figure of about \$3 000 000 at most is available from revenue to provide the pay-roll tax incentives for youth employment in this financial year—half of what was promised in the election. It is an extremely hollow promise indeed.

I now turn to an extremely grave matter that is concerning the community. I have referred previously in this House to the incongruous and in many cases quite absurd arrangements of portfolios that appear to have no rationale, other than to make Cabinet resemble an agricultural and horticultural society. It now appears that the Government has turned its gaze to the professional Public Service, with the result that the public Service Association has been moved to protest and seek reassurances about the careers and fate of many of its members. A distinction should be made here. Ministerial staff, who are specifically appointed to work with Ministers in the development of policy, to assist with inquiries and so on, are clearly in a different category from those who are employed under the Public Service Act by the Public Service Board selection procedures in full-time career positions in the Public Service. Unfortunately, the Government does not appear to be able to make that distinction. In the case of the former category, it is indeed appropriate under a new Administration that officers in those roles under the previous government should be shifted to non-sensitive and non-policy areas. That procedure is quite proper; we have adopted it in Government and will adopt it when we return to Government.

There is a clear distinction between those officers and the permanent, professional public servants who are employed as part of the normal administrative departmental strength of particular departments. It was certainly to be expected that the Policy Division of the Premier's Department would be the first to feel retribution for professionally and competently carrying out its duties under a former Government. I am not talking about the Ministerial staff: I am talking about the professionally appointed Policy Division.

When in Opposition, the Liberal Party displayed, with this group, an almost paranoid obsession that often took the form of personal attacks on individuals, despite the proprietary of their appointments. In June last year there was an attack on the Assistant Director of the division. Even the editorial writers of the *Advertiser* felt obliged to remind the Liberals that "one of the basic props of our system of Government is that the Public Service is apolitical, serving elected masters of different outlooks

with equal competence and loyalty".

It seems that under the Tonkin Government a large number do not even get a chance to demonstrate their professionalism and commitment to an apolitical service. It is not a case of their being asked whether they can do the job, or of their being given tasks to perform and of the Government's assessing whether they can carry them out competently and loyally. They are not even given the chance. They are moved on and forced to go to other departments. Future promotion and work in their field of expertise is denied them.

There has been a quite shameful shifting around of employees from department to department by the Public Service Board and then officers being told that a new instruction has come that an area is too sensitive, that it is a core department (or some other excuse is given) and that they must find work elsewhere, so they go on to the suspension list. Over ensuing days we will be examining in some detail what is happening within the Public Service that is beginning to cause grave concern among those who feel that a professional Public Service under the Westminster system is something to be conserved.

As I said earlier, in the case of Ministerial staff, those shifts, those changes, are not to be disputed. It is important (and we have always said this despite the objections from the other side of the House) that there be Ministerial staff. It is important that they are there, in part to preserve the neutrality of the Public Service. Where political advice is sought or particularly sensitive policy areas must be assessed, it is far better to have the personal Ministerial staff of a Minister involved than to force that particular task on to the Public Service.

It is a recognised principle of modern public administration that the neutrality of the Public Service, under the Westminster system, can be secured properly only under that particular arrangement. Yet, as I have said, it has been criticised. However, that does not stop the new Premier and his Ministers moving quickly to appoint persons to Ministerial office. In fact, they have gone even further than we ever dreamed of going, and introduced one of those political appointees, a person who came from outside, a former member of this Parliament, a failed candidate, as a senior adviser to the Government. He actually sits in at Cabinet meetings at the right hand of the Premier. It is the first time in the State's constitutional history that a person other than a Cabinet Minister has been allowed to be privy to the deliberations of Cabinet. It is an amazing scene. I can imagine the outcry that would have occurred if we had introduced such a system. We separated and maintained the independence of the Public Service. In 1977 the present Premier said, in relation to about 30 appointments to a Public Service of over 16 000 members, in a statement to the *Advertiser*:

It would mean that any person seeking employment in the Premier's Department would have to prove that he or she was politically aligned to the Premier. That would be the beginning of the end for an independent and politically neutral Public Service.

I certainly agree. The present Government has made political persuasion a criterion for appointment to Public Service positions. If damage is being done to the system of public administration, the blame will rest fairly and squarely at the feet of the present Administration.

In the Supply debate, I pointed out that one of the indicators as to the style and priorities of a Government is the way in which it organises itself administratively. I pointed out that this Government was organising itself on the basis of expediency, of trying to fit functions around individuals rather than looking at the intrinsic values of those functions and how best they could be organised for

the effective pursuance of public policy.

That certainly affected Public Service morale. The dismantling of departments, and the shuffling around of departments into incongruous associations like transport, recreation and sport, and health and tourism (we have been given many examples), clearly lower the morale of public servants involved in those changes. I think that far more serious is this latest attempt, the evidence of which is slowly gathering. I refer to the way in which a political test is being applied to many persons, not at the higher policy levels but down through the line to people like stenographers and office assistants. That is a sweeping claim, but it will be followed up and justified during the next few days as answers to questions are put before the House, and as the Public Service Association takes up the case on behalf of its members.

I think that a political test is being applied in all sorts of circumstances to a number of career public servants in a quite unforgivable way. The effect of that on the morale, independence and integrity of the Public Service is to be feared. Efficient, competent public administration cannot be expected in circumstances where the Government of the day is attempting to place people it considers to be hostile, or to have a philosophy unsympathetic to its views, in areas where they can have absolutely no effect. Think of the morale of an expert in a field like ethnic affairs, transport, industrial affairs, or general policy, who is placed in the E.&W.S. Department, in an outlying office in the suburbs, or wherever the Government may choose to place him.

That system is quite wrong and, while, at this stage, there is not sufficient evidence to make a firm accusation or to assess the damage being done, unfortunately the evidence is building up, and I believe that a detailed examination must take place soon in this House and in public forums. I warn the Government that its attitudes and policies are under close surveillance. The Opposition will be examining what the Government is doing and demanding that it perform, not just in terms of public probability but also in relation to its promises as well.

Mr. WRIGHT (Adelaide): I wish to speak about the effects of technological change, because I believe that Australia is facing a turning point in its economic history. Anyone who had the opportunity earlier this year to see the film *The Chips are Down* must surely realise the tremendous impact that technological change will have in this country and the effect it will have on labour displacing in the employment situation in Australia.

The Government of the day, when I was a Minister, made preparations to examine this matter within the Public Service area. It was decided to set up a technological department within the Department of Labour and Industry to examine and monitor the implementation of technological change in this State. I believe that this is a national problem that should be handled on that basis. My investigations in countries like Sweden, U.S.A., Germany and most other sophisticated countries showed that these countries were suffering from the effects of technological change.

With the silicone chip being reduced to its present size, all sorts of things are opening up in technological change areas. Many people in Australia have said that, provided the manufacturing industries are maintained and are able to ensure that markets are available, the economic climate in Australia should be safe. My research proves that the manufacturing industry has never really been the backbone of the economic structure in this country. The manufacturing industry peaked between 1947 and 1965.

At that stage, it catered for about 27.6 p.c. of the actual work force. In 1976, this figure decreased to 21 per cent. If one takes the percentage of that situation, there was a decrease over a 12-year period of 21.38 per cent of the work force.

I am not talking about the technological change areas or markets that affected the situation at that stage. Let us look at what the situation may be with the introduction of technological change into those areas. The only increase I can find in the work force in Australia over the years from 1970 to 1979 has been in the women market area. The adult and juvenile male areas have all decreased, but there has been an increase in the area of women from 31 per cent of the total labour market to 37 per cent. We are looking at some drastic changes. We need to ask ourselves whether the new technology will create more jobs than it eliminates.

Neither I nor the Opposition want to appear or be known as Luddites, but we must ask whether employers would be introducing technology if it was going to create more jobs? The simple answer to that is, "No", but some jobs would be created in some areas, mostly service areas. Surely the situation is that in the circumstances, the employers would not be setting out to establish and pay for more jobs when they were introducing the technological changes into these areas at a low cost and therefore doing away with the working class in those areas along with worker's compensation, long service leave and other payments. The positive answer to that question is simply that they will not create more jobs.

We have people in the community at the moment, public servants, journalists and the like (I shall call them technological determinists), who say that technological change will create further employment and will place us in a position to produce our articles much more cheaply than

we are producing them at the moment. In those circumstances we will find markets elsewhere for our goods and create more employment.

I have looked at several interesting studies, the most important and up-to-date being one done by a Dr. D. P. Vincent and a Professor Peter Dixon. Reviewing this IMPACT Project's "SNAPSHOT" model, Pat McGuinness of the *National Times* wrote an article suggesting that the authors of that document were saying that the innovation of technological change clearly indicated that new jobs would be found. He states that the model provides evidence that an "Innovative Economy" which adopts the new technology will provide more jobs than a "Luddite Economy" which rejects change (where that option is really open). The authors deny this, and their table 4.1 provides stark evidence to the contrary. The figures related are important to my argument. They say that in the professional white collar area the requirements in 1971-72 would be 173 people employed, and in 1991 there would be only 137 required in the same occupation. In the skilled white collar area the 1971-72 requirement was 670 and for 1991 it is 496. That is a startling figure when we sometimes consider into what areas technological change can enter. Those who saw the film *When the Chips are Down*, saw the entry into all sorts of occupations—medicine, law, farming and so on.

So, no-one is barred in connection with this innovation. I was particularly interested in the skilled blue-collar metal and electrical areas. In 1971-72, the requirement would have been 570 persons to do the same job as opposed to 353 persons in 1991—almost a decrease of 40 p.c. in those areas. Even if we look at the semi-skilled and unskilled white-collar areas we find the figures required are 1 412 and 1 039. I seek leave to have the relevant table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE

Occupation	Labour Requirements	Labour Requirements	Ratio 1990-91 1971-72
	(thousands of persons) 1971-72 Techniques	(thousands of persons) 1990-91 Techniques	
1. Professional White Collar	173	137	0.79
2. Skilled White Collar	670	496	0.74
3. Semi and Unskilled White Collar	1 412	1 039	0.74
4. Skilled Blue Collar (metal and electrical)	570	353	0.62
5. Skilled Blue Collar (building)	268	159	0.59
6. Skilled Blue Collar (other)	135	92	0.68
7. Semi and Unskilled Blue Collar	1 678	1 092	0.65
8. Rural Workers	252	138	0.55
9. Defence Workers	85	75	0.88
Total	5 243	3 581	0.68

Mr. WRIGHT: I know that the Government has plans (I am not sure whether it has implemented them) to try to understand this problem. I shall be watching closely what the Government does in this connection, because it is of the utmost concern to all Australians. Already there is proof throughout the white-collar areas of a dramatic loss of jobs in this area. I am not sure exactly what the Government's intentions are, but it is important to me and to the Labor Party that the present Government views this matter with the utmost concern and that it brings into effect some controls in these areas.

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

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): Last week the member for Brighton said that tourism would become the world's largest industry in the 1980's. He cited some countries where tourism was the major industry; in particular, he said that last year more than 38 000 000 people visited Italy. That seems a large number, but I will not question it. I agree with the general thrust of the honourable member's remarks and with his concern that little has been

done or is being done to capture a part of this market for Australia, particularly South Australia. Australia enjoys less than 3 per cent of the world's tourist trade, and only a minimal increase in that figure would ensure a boom in the tourist industry in this country. For the first half of 1979 there was an increase of 28 per cent in tourists visiting Australia, compared with the corresponding period of the previous year. However, a very insignificant number of those visitors came to South Australia.

Any attempt to discuss Australian tourism without a close examination of the airline industry, particularly as it affects South Australia, is ludicrous. The cost of domestic air fares, parallel scheduling of aircraft and the location of international airports are all vital ingredients in the tourist industry.

The point of entry or exit for overseas visitors to Australia is mostly confined to Sydney and Melbourne, with 82 per cent of overseas visitors arriving at or departing from those cities. If South Australia is to capture any of the tourist trade, it must ensure that extensive promotional campaigns are conducted in every State by the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau and by the tourist industry generally.

By setting out to capture the international market, the tourist industry will be forced to provide higher quality facilities which, in turn, will encourage more Australians to spend more of their holidays in Australia. Australians are fortunate in having more holidays than have people in most other parts of the world, although there are some limits to the capacity of Australians to travel overseas, and technological change will ensure that leisure time in Australia will increase. Consequently, as we improve facilities, Australians will be attracted to spend much of their leisure time in Australia.

Many Australians travel overseas rather than within Australia because of a general fascination for different lifestyles and cultures which appeal to travellers. I refer to the more exotic and exciting environment that people mostly look for in their travel experience. The vast number of Australians who have travelled overseas have returned and compared facilities here with what they have been offered overseas. Through their experiences they have become a little more critical and perhaps more selective in the type of accommodation and the style of holiday they desire.

South Australia has some well known and prominent tourist resorts. However, we need to sell more than just our scenery. True, the Flinders Range, the Barossa Valley, the South Coast, Kangaroo Island, Port Lincoln, and other places, some of historical interest, are all attractive, but not everyone is looking for a tranquil holiday. At times holidays should be associated with more excitement, more activity and more nightlife, and it is not good enough for South Australia to rely on scenery alone. There must be things to do as well as things to see. Perhaps the classic example of this situation is the Queensland Gold Coast which, besides its beaches, surf and climate, has other attractions. The Gold Coast attracts young people, and it has an exciting image to those young people and also perhaps to some of us who think we are still young.

Mr. Keneally: What about Russell Hinze?

Mr. SLATER: I do not know whether he is a tourist attraction. He is one of those persons that I referred to who travel overseas fairly often, usually at taxpayers' expense. South Australia has the potential to increase its slice of the tourist industry by promoting not only its natural tourist attractions but also the prospect of an exciting holiday associated with those natural attractions and by providing more things to do, as well as see, thereby

attracting both interstate and overseas tourists of the younger generation. Governments need to provide the appropriate incentives to encourage entrepreneurs to undertake ventures, developing accommodation and entertainment facilities, and making South Australia an attractive destination.

I am disappointed, however, that there is only a minimal increase in the allocation for the Department of Tourism. Its allocation has increased by only \$200 000, from \$2 400 000 that was spent last year to \$2 600 000, for this year. If we are to accept what the member for Brighton said earlier, Governments need to spend much more in this regard.

The tourist industry is indeed important and will in future undoubtedly become one of Australia's money spinners. We in South Australia need to promote the opportunity for people from other States and overseas to come to South Australia and to get a slice of the action in the tourist industry. I am disappointed that a greater sum has not been allocated in the Budget to tourism in order to enable us to attract more tourists to South Australia.

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): Quite a deal has been said about the ethics and the truth of advertising, as well as about the Murdoch press and its attitude to the Australian Labor Party during the recent election campaign. I want to refer not to the Murdoch press but to advertisements that were taken out by individuals in the *Messenger* press. I am prompted by a statement made by Mr. K. L. Milne, an Australian Democrat who is now a member of another place and who said at the declaration of the poll that he was sorry that the election campaign had been marred by some very doubtful advertising. He said that there was no need for the Liberals to hit the Australian Democrats so hard with expensive advertisements, some of which were patently untrue and misleading to the people.

I remind members that not only the Australian Democrats but also the A.L.P. suffered, and suffered greatly, as a result of the efforts of certain people who are supposedly leading members of the community. One of these people is the Mayor of Port Adelaide, a person who holds himself out as a leader of the community and who goes back to 1939, when he was in Burma.

Mr. Slater: Whose side was he on?

Mr. WHITTEN: That is doubtful. His initials, namely, "R.M.", are the same as those of another person, namely, Sir Robert Menzies, who was in the same sort of business in 1939. I refer to the scrap-dealing business; and all honourable members know what happened to the scrap that we sent to Japan. The fellow about whom I am speaking was in Burma, having been sent there as the Mobil Oil Company's representative. When the evacuation of Burma occurred, this man took up an honorary commission as Squadron Leader in the Royal Air Force, so that his salary would be similar to that which he was receiving from Mobil Oil. I refer to some of the things that this man put in the press. An advertisement headed "Vital message to Semaphore electorate: block radical socialism" in the Wednesday 12 September issue of the *Messenger* stated:

Every family made sacrifices of some kind from 1914 to 1918 and from 1939 to 1945. Don't let these courageous people down.

He goes on to say, "Put Apap fourth". He is there implying, not only to me but also to the people of Semaphore and Port Adelaide, that Mr. Apap was a security risk and was not fit to be in this Parliament. In fact, the advertisement states:

Stop the rapid growth of extreme left-wing socialism in our Parliament before it is too late.

The man he was talking about was on Malta.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Who said that?

Mr. WHITTEN: I am talking about Squadron Leader H. C. R. Marten and I will give the biographical details directly.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: He couldn't lead a good horse to water.

Mr. WHITTEN: I do not care what the Minister of sticks and dirt—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no such Minister.

Mr. WHITTEN: I apologise. He inferred that George Apap, the A.L.P. candidate for Semaphore, was not a fit and proper person to represent the people of Port Adelaide and that he was a security risk. I blame not only the Mayor of Port Adelaide but the whole pattern of advertising in the local press at a time when it was too late to hit back. Because of a similar pattern, the Liberal Party's suggestion was "Vote Apap 4". The Independent put Apap third. The Liberals knew what they were doing. They had people handing out cards for the independent member for Semaphore. If the Liberals had polled the votes they should have polled, they would have come second, and the preferences for the independent member for Semaphore would have elected the A.L.P. candidate. I say the Liberals ran dead.

Since the election, there have been many concerned residents in Port Adelaide, 250 of whom placed their name to a letter addressed to the Mayor of Port Adelaide, Mr. Marten, Mrs. Marten, aldermen and councillors of the Port Adelaide Council, which states:

We, the undersigned, wish to protest most strongly and emphatically at the Mayor and Mayoress's advertisement which appeared in the *Messenger* on Wednesday, 12 September, 1979. We are shocked and appalled that two people who have been well-respected and esteemed by members in our community, should resort to fear tactics and rhetoric aimed at people's emotions, as vehicles to further the cause of their own political bias.

It is indeed true that members of our families made sacrifices and some gave their lives not only in World Wars I and II, but also in Korea and Vietnam. But they fought and died so that the people of Australia could have the democratic right to choose which political Party they wish to support—whether it be Labor, Liberal, Democrat, Independent or any of the other Parties. The people's choice of candidate is their own privilege and we feel we certainly do not need or want Mr. and Mrs. Marten to influence us as to which order we should direct preferences to one particular candidate.

(May we also remind you that the endorsed Labor candidate, Mr. George Apap's father, made the supreme sacrifice during World War II, that Malta, the country of Mr. Apap's birth, was given the exceptional award of the George Cross after World War II, and that the Maltese people are respected throughout the world for their bravery and loyalty to the Allied nations, of which Australia was part.)

We deplore the fact that Mr. Marten has used part of the "Ode to the Fallen", his membership of various ex-servicemen's associations, his office as Mayor and the implication that Mr. Apap wishes to usurp "our wonderful heritage of a free country", in his political message to the Semaphore electorate.

We feel a serious impropriety has been committed by the Mayor and therefore ask that he and his wife make a public apology to Mr. George Apap. Failing this, we feel Mr. Marten should resign his office as Mayor of Port Adelaide, as he can no longer hide behind the facade of political anonymity or neutrality.

The letter was signed by 250 people. The advertisement

was signed Squadron Leader H. C. R. Marten, who was a penguin who never got off the ground and who could never fly, except a kite made by someone else, because he would not be capable of making that, either.

He signed himself Squadron Leader H. C. R. Marten, honorary member of the Naval Association of Australia, member of the Returned Servicemen's League, member of the Airforce Association (South Australian Division), member of the Burma Star Association, and member of the Legacy Club of Adelaide; "At the going down of the sun and in the morning we will remember them." It is hypocritical and disgusting that a Mayor of a city, a city that I belong to, would put such a disgraceful thing in the press and put it there at a time when it is too late to be answered. I do not blame the Messenger Press in any way, because it exists through its advertisements, from which it obtains a profit for its shareholders. It is dog eat dog in this capitalist society and only those who return a profit to their shareholders are successful.

I am disgusted that the leading citizen of Port Adelaide should sign himself in such a way. In fact, he was a penguin who never flew, he took a job in Burma. I have his biographical details with me and I only wish I had the time to read them. Members would be as disgusted as I am at the things that have been done by this H. C. R. Marten, the Mayor of Port Adelaide. As I have said, I am disgusted and I am sure that the people of South Australia are as disgusted as the people of Port Adelaide.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I wish to take this opportunity to address some comments that come within the sphere of the Minister of Transport. I am referring to the proposed Salisbury over-pass which has been proposed for many years and which, we understand, will possibly be built some time in the mid-1980's. Serious implications could result from the construction of this over-pass for the residents of Salisbury. I want to look at those implications and, in so doing, I want to look at the broader implications of heavy density traffic through residential areas. That particular type of problem affects a number of major thoroughfares through the Salisbury electorate, and would also affect many other thoroughfares through the electorates of my colleagues in this House.

The Salisbury over-pass, if constructed, will connect Salisbury Highway with Gawler Street and allow for an increased flow of through traffic through the city of Salisbury going to points north such as Elizabeth, Munno Para, Gawler, and so on. My personal contention is that the Salisbury over-pass should not be built. Instead, there should be an upgrading of the Main North Road and the Port Wakefield Road adjoining Angle Vale Road to allow for the increase in traffic that is expected in the 1980's. If it is built, the Salisbury over-pass will only add to the serious problems already being faced by residents along the Salisbury Highway.

Those problems occur in two major areas: first, an impairment to the amenity of the locality and, secondly, the noise hazard that is posed. Regarding the impairment to the amenity, if the over-pass is built it will increase the isolation of those residents east of the highway in the Salisbury Downs and Parafield Gardens areas from the rest of the city of Salisbury. They are relatively small pockets of population bounded by the railway line and the Salisbury Highway which, by themselves, are unable to sustain adequate community facilities and must rely on the larger populations on the western side of the highway to provide those facilities. To raise the level of the Salisbury Highway to increase its arterial capacity will only make it more difficult for the residents on the eastern side of that highway to partake of those community facilities. Already

a number of injuries have taken place, including some fatalities of pedestrians who have attempted to cross that highway. If the traffic volume is to be increased that problem can only be exacerbated in the years to come.

The other problem is the noise hazard. Two years ago my predecessor, Mr. Reg Groth, went overseas and studied the question of traffic noise, amongst other types of noise. He looked at the existing problem overseas and at the way overseas countries were attempting to solve that problem. I believe he came forward with many reasonable and proper suggestions that we should have been looking at in this State, and I certainly hope that the Department of Transport will make an effort to look at it in the years to come.

To summarise some of the problems caused by noise hazard, it is often presumed that it is merely the volume of traffic that causes the noise. In fact, for a long time the contention has been that it is the type of traffic that seriously affects the noise that residents hear. What is relevant is not merely the number of cars that may use a highway, but how many trucks might use that highway.

English studies have found that one heavy truck produces as much noise as 10 cars. United States studies show that one truck with a faulty muffler will produce as much noise as 90 to 100 cars. In other words, we are looking at the problem of heavy traffic that tends to use some of these residential roads. Perhaps that is the main thrust of where some form of traffic control should take place.

Another aspect of the problem is that truck noise is of a different tonal quality from car noise. Studies have found that residents can tolerate fairly high levels of car noise on a highway but find it difficult to tolerate a very much smaller amount of truck noise. I know from contact with people in the District of Salisbury who live not only on but also near the Salisbury highway that trucks are a particularly distressing part of traffic noise. Their fear is that if an over-pass is built truck traffic must increase to service points north, and that this will aggravate the problem even more.

Studies done overseas, and in this country, particularly in Queensland and New South Wales, have found that noise is not merely a disturbance or irritation but can have quite serious effects on health, productivity and activity levels of people in general. It has found that sleep can be seriously disturbed. It is not necessary for people to be woken by the traffic noise to be disturbed; they can sleep through it, but still suffer serious impairment of the quality of their sleep and the quality of rest that they should be achieving. The implications of this are that there are some responsibilities for noise abatement along major traffic thoroughfares in our cities. What I am supporting is some means of control of noise on the Salisbury Highway, but I am generalising to say that all traffic highways that pass through predominantly residential areas should become the focus of attention.

It seems to me that we can analyse four areas of responsibility that should be looked at for noise abatement with regard to traffic. First, the householder has some responsibility by means of insulating his house to block out noise from traffic. Also, he can accept the fact that a certain amount of noise will come from arterial roads that one would not get on a suburban road. They seem to be the two main areas of householder responsibility. There seem to be responsibilities also devolving on the road user, such as the responsibility for considerate driving. Tests show that good drivers who drive with caution and care can drive with less noise to surrounding residents than those who drive carelessly and without consideration for others. Likewise, the road user has the responsibility of

maintaining a vehicle in a roadworthy condition so that it is not sporting a faulty muffler and creating unnecessary noise.

I also suggest that there may be some responsibility on the road user, because of the various imposts and taxes he pays on petrol, sales tax on vehicles and so on, to see that some of that money goes towards helping subsidise noise-abatement measures. The manufacturers of vehicles have responsibilities. This is enshrined in various standards, which are set down by Governments at various levels, to control noise emitted by their vehicles. I believe that this country is somewhat lax in the way in which it has imposed these controls on Australian vehicle manufacturers, but that certainly is not the case in the United States and Europe.

Lastly, the Government has the responsibility for effecting some of these noise abatement techniques. This could be done through a variety of means—through the creation of noise barriers, through subsidising individual initiatives to block out noise, and through road zoning in the sense of limiting certain roads to certain types of use. We have not seen much of that in this country. One of the few examples I can think of where the Government has taken a positive initiative towards enacting its own responsibilities, would be in the Munno Para district, where the South Australian Housing Trust has created earth mounds to act as noise barriers to protect residents on the other side.

Earlier experiments by the Housing Trust in Elizabeth and other areas, by planting trees for noise barriers, proved not so effective. Experience overseas tends to suggest that new types of noise barriers may be suitable for residents along highways. The barriers need not be large earth mounds. The Danes are now designing and selling noise barriers. This project is now at the commercial stage. The barriers are only about 8 inches thick, stand about 5 ft. high, and can be placed along particularly noisy sections of highways. One does not particularly want to have large barriers along highways; but these are not unaesthetic. They are not visually unpleasant and they can improve the quality of life for those who live near highways and cannot sell their homes because of traffic noise.

That possibility should be examined. I hope the Department of Transport is giving attention to my suggestion. In some European countries, certain major arterial roads are accepted for one type of traffic at one time of the day, and not at other times. Heavy vehicular traffic is accepted during the day and early evening but not during night hours, such as between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m. It would be possible for the Department of Transport to draw up a grid of roads throughout the Adelaide metropolitan area, restricting, between say, 11 p.m. and 6 a.m., heavy traffic from the majority of arterial roads that have a heavy residential component.

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

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): Regarding contributions of members opposite this evening, I was surprised at the venom displayed by the member for Price when he was talking about the first citizen of Port Adelaide. I was also surprised that he should launch such a torrid attack on a person who, from what I could gather from the documents from which the honourable member quoted, was merely exercising his democratic right. I find it peculiar that people that have professed to believe in open Government, and have made all the right noises in relation to allowing people to exercise a democratic right, should object so strongly when groups or individuals decide they should make their point of view known. I can see nothing wrong with that. It would appear that the Labor Party is

great when it is out in front, but when it gets a bit of a quilting, it takes it badly. Members opposite cannot accept that the people of South Australia, and in particular the people of Semaphore, did not—

Mr. Whitten: How low can you get?

Mr. GUNN: Is the honourable member saying that I am low?

Mr. Whitten: No, I refer to the leading citizen.

Mr. GUNN: The Labor Party cannot accept that groups of people in South Australia did not want a Labor Government any longer, or that one of the safest A.L.P. seats was lost. I know it is a hard pill to swallow. Members on this side have had to swallow their pride in the past. That is not always pleasant, but it is a political reality that one must accept. It might not be as easy a second time to right a wrong. Members opposite should accept that, in a democracy, people have a right to make their own choice. They did that and elected the member for Semaphore, with a considerable majority.

The Labor Party has a lesson to learn, namely, that it should be more careful when selecting candidates. It is fair to say, from comments made, that Mr. Apap is not the most popular or appealing person, although I have never met the gentleman. He may have qualities that have not been recognised by me, but I think it fair to say that he was not the best candidate.

Mr. Whitten: You don't know who the candidates were.

Mr. GUNN: I am trying to offer the Labor Party some advice in the best spirit. I was reflecting on what has taken place.

Members on this side of the House were interested in what had taken place during the electoral battle at Semaphore. One would have thought that this Government had been in power for about 15 years because we have had the Leader and his colleagues opposite laying forth what they should have done. I can assure them that in good time, in season, those matters that were announced will systematically be put into operation. I should have thought that even members opposite would have wanted to see the Budget and Supply Bills passed so we could go on and fund the public service. Do they not want the Budget and the Loan Estimates passed? I should have thought that they would regard that as a very important part of the Parliamentary process.

Mr. Payne: You could have brought in an interim Supply Bill.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member knows that the Budget and the Loan Estimates had to be passed. He obviously does not approve of Budgets, he wants us to go on in a willy-nilly fashion. A few weeks ago I received a letter from a constituent living at Leigh Creek. The letter states:

I would like to submit to you an official complaint in regard to the electricity supply at Beltana.

My wife and I jointly own the Old Overland Telegraph Repeater Station at Beltana and we have applied for electricity to be connected. We are now informed that out of nine applicants there are three of us that have to dig trenches to house the electricity cable. Why?

If there had not been Overland Telegraph poles right through the township, I could well understand their argument. But seeing there was, up till eight or nine years ago, why can't E.T.S.A. put in new poles to carry the power cables? E.T.S.A. did suggest this; they even said they'd paint them to correspond with the surroundings, but the Department of Environment said no.

Why also is there a border between one end of town and the other? The eastern side of Beltana is allowed to have stobie poles and overhead transformers, but the western side, from the water reserve, has to be underground. Why the

difference? Are they trying to split the town in two?

Apart from it being an inconvenience to us to have to make this extra time to get trenches dug, it will cost my wife and I alone \$500—as long as the trench diggers don't strike rock, otherwise the price goes up accordingly for having to blast. Then, on top of that, we have to get enough sand to cover the bottom of the trench and with petrol the price as it is today, you would tack another \$500 on to the price, which would also include wear and tear on the vehicles.

Why also is it costing my wife and I just as much to have our power connected, as it is for those who have overhead power, when we have to dig our own trenches?

Will you please find out why we are being persecuted like this, and let us know, as we are completely bewildered?

So am I completely bewildered. I have never heard so much nonsense all my life. I took the matter up with the Minister of Mines and Energy and received a reply, part of which states:

Applications for electricity supply have been received during the last two or three years from existing residents and several owners of historic and other buildings. Because of the special nature of the town and because the responsibility for developmental control rests with the State Planning Authority, which is administered by the Department of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs, the matter of electricity supply was referred to this department and to the Department of Environment. Both of these organisations have examined the problems associated with supplying electricity without interfering with the historic nature of the town.

What nonsense! I think that my constituent has been treated as badly as anyone else since I entered this House. If people go to the town and look for themselves, they cannot help but be amazed. I am amazed that those bodies mentioned would have the audacity to inflict such unnecessary costs upon my constituent.

The nonsense in the Flinders Ranges has got out of control. I call on the Minister responsible to take up this matter immediately with the responsible authorities and to issue them with firm ultimatums, so that my constituents are no longer discriminated against. I explained some time ago that we had a gentleman from the Department for the Environment suggesting that we have power poles painted green in the winter time, and suggesting that we would have to paint them every six months, particularly if there was a drought in the Hawker area. That is the sort of nonsense that people are putting forward. For my constituents who have been delayed during this time, the cost is rapidly increasing. I want to know whether those departments that are denying those people the right to have power will meet the extra cost. If not, will those officers who are denying my constituents the right to have power ask the Electricity Trust to disconnect the power supply of the officers during the delay? It is only fair that, if they are going to deny the people the right to have electricity, they should suffer the same consequences. I believe that every person in South Australia is entitled to be treated fairly and squarely. I believe that my constituents in both these cases have not been so treated. I am aware of the problems that the Electricity Trust, particularly at Beltana and those areas, has faced with the environmentalists and other people who are not very realistic. I have one or two other matters to talk about, but unfortunately time does not permit. I wanted to talk about daylight saving.

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

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): The member for Mitcham mentioned tonight an advertisement his Party had put out

at the recent State election concerning "Tweedle Des" and "Tweedle Dave". I could talk at length tonight concerning "Premier huff" and "Deputy Premier puff". I will have plenty to say about that later. Tonight I will deal with the Budget, specifically the health area. This House has been told that there will be a major thrust to rationalise services and to reduce running costs in hospitals, but we have been assured that these cuts will not affect or undermine the high standard of patient care. In effect, what is being said by the Government is that the reductions will take place in ancillary operations. Funds to the Health Commission have been cut by \$3 340 000 on the 1978-79 allocation.

Judging from the reports in the newspapers by the boards of management in the major hospitals and by their administrators, medical services will suffer; nursing staff will be retrenched; and, judging by the magnitude of these cuts, the staff retrenchments will be on a massive scale. Obviously, patients will suffer. There will be a cut of \$3 250 000 to the Royal Adelaide hospital; a cut of just under \$1 000 000 to the Modbury Hospital; and a cut of \$642 000 to the Children's Hospital. A number of major hospitals have indicated short-falls, yet the Budget figures have yet to be formally determined. The Minister's prescription to these worried people in charge who are given the responsibility of carrying out the hatchet jobs on behalf of the Liberal Government is akin to a general practitioner prescribing valium to a harassed housewife. In effect, what the Minister is saying is, "Everything will be okay. Look at it as a challenge and, if all else fails and you make a botch of it, call us and we'll bail you out, and you'll take the blame."

I have mentioned previously the situation concerning my own local hospital, the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Without going into any detail with regard to the cuts it faces in the current Budget, I will say that in 1978, when the Lyell McEwin Hospital was facing cuts in its budget (cuts which, I might add, were in no way as Draconian as in this year's Budget) the hospital called a meeting of the local members of Parliament—the member for Playford, the previous member for Salisbury, the member for Elizabeth, and I were present. The hospital stated that, if those budget cuts had to take effect, it would have to curtail its casualty department, which at that time was providing a 24-hour service.

The casualty departments of not only Lyell McEwin but also other hospitals act as a back-up service when general practitioners fail. It is well known that general practitioners are no longer interested in providing a family service after hours. Also, the cost of visits to a general practitioner is out of reach of many people, especially for people in my district and other areas in the northern metropolitan area. The figures show the real picture. In 1978, 58 902 people attended casualty at Lyell McEwin, and in 1979 the number had increased to 62 593 and, judging by what will take effect after the new Federal health services come into operation at the end of October, the number of people attending casualty at that hospital will further increase.

However, if that hospital does not get additional finance, the many people who have to attend casualty at that hospital, in lieu of visiting a general practitioner, could be denied treatment. I refer to the attitude of the new Minister of Health to her portfolio. True, to give her her due, she has had plenty to say in the press on that matter since she has been appointed. In the series of articles on the new Ministers, the *Advertiser* states:

"Reports on waste should be made public," she said, "There is strong emphasis in Liberal health policy on what I prefer to call good health rather than preventive medicine—a negative title." . . .

"Most ill health suffered in the community today is self-inflicted and we've got to change people's attitude to develop a sense of individual responsibility so they are moderate and sensible in their living habits." Mrs. Admanson said.

On 23 September the *Sunday Mail* published an article on the new Minister and, apart from a few things that she said about plastic flowers, fresh flowers and the like, the report stated:

She believes the Ministry has been overly concerned with the curing of ill health, and intends to concentrate on the more positive side of creating an environment of good health. "Most diseases are preventable," she said. "I would like to see people think of good health as a natural state to be in."

The new Minister is a great believer in natural things. She believes in fresh food, good diet, exercise and fresh air.

We have now got with one stroke of the pen, with one Ministerial decision (and that responsibility also falls on the Government) a Minister who intends to leave those poor unfortunate sick members of our society by the wayside and concentrate on preventive medicine. Forget those queues in casualty departments in local hospitals, forget those migrants who not only do not understand how to get medical treatment but also cannot afford it, anyway! The Minister suggests that we should eat more fresh fruit, turn off air-conditioners (that is, if you have one), take a brisk walk and "She'll be right". I suggest that the Minister takes time out, as should all Government members, to see how an ever-increasing number of people in South Australia receive their health care. The Minister and her colleagues will receive a shock.

This highlights a major difference between members on this side of the House and Government members, who do not seem to realise that most people in South Australia have to go through public hospitals and their general practitioner. They do not enjoy specialist treatment, and they cannot enjoy private hospitals, because the cost is way beyond them. Perhaps the new Minister will take time out, if she has time, and visit some of the casualty departments, as I have, in the late hours of the evening and see how people wait for three or four hours to receive treatment.

How could the Minister cut \$3 250 000 off the South Australian Health Commission's budget, which will only make the situation worse? Yet the Minister tells us that if we eat more fresh fruit and take a brisk walk everything will be all right. How does the Minister intend to deal with those people who, in the light of the \$3 250 000 reduction in health funds, will be faced with little or no hope of adequate medical care?

The Minister has said literally nothing on this matter until now, but how does she intend to deal with those people who are at present going into community health centres? These people are mainly migrants and, as members will recall, I referred to the Hindmarsh Community Centre recently. These people will find in the next few months that the pitiful service that they are now getting could be cut off. Undoubtedly, the Minister will have little to say on that point.

It is about time that the boards of management of this State's public hospitals got together, became political, and told the Minister and this Government that they are prepared to work with the South Australian Health Commission but not for it. In this respect, I should like to comment on the statement made by the Chairman of the Adelaide Children's Hospital, who, in the Minister's presence, said that the board was prepared to work with the South Australian Health Commission but not for it—in other words, in partnership with and not as a servant to the commission.

That is the whole thrust of this Liberal Government's

policy regarding health. Hospitals will become servants of the Government, and they will have no autonomy, which was one of the great things that the former Labor Government gave this State's hospitals.

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

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): Earlier this evening, my Leader eloquently canvassed certain areas that he was sufficiently charitable to describe as involving incompetent administration by the new Government that is now occupying the Treasury benches. It is no coincidence that I, too, intended to canvass an area that received considerable publicity during the recent election campaign. I refer to the question whether the Liberal Opposition (as it then was) made to the people of South Australia a promise about land tax on which it has already welched. That question can stand further examination in this House, so I will examine it in some detail.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: No-one has welched on anything.

Mr. PAYNE: The position is exactly as follows: At 7.30 p.m. on Tuesday 28 August 1979 Mr. Tonkin delivered the Liberal Party's policy speech via the television channels in this State. So far, there is no quarrel from members opposite. I now quote directly from a relevant portion of that speech, as follows:

We will abolish succession and gift duties from 1 January 1980. People and their savings will no longer be driven from this State by fear of taxation.

That was promise No. 1. He continued:

We will abolish land tax on the principal place of residence.

There are no qualifications to that. On the first promise, a specific date was given. Mr. Tonkin continued by referring to high land tax.

Mr. Olsen: Can't you do better than that?

Mr. PAYNE: If the honourable member will be a little patient, he will learn something which he has not perceived but which his Leader had in mind all the time during the election campaign. No doubt the honourable member was not privy to the inner councils but, if he listens, he will find that a different connotation can be put on these matters. Mr. Tonkin continued:

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

That was promise No. 2. Mr. Tonkin continued:

We will exempt from stamp duty the first \$30 000 involved in the purchase of a first home.

That was promise No. 3. Further, in the supplementary policies issued by the Liberal Party, the following appears:

A Liberal Government will abolish land tax on the principal place of residence.

Then, there is a full stop, and no qualification. But, what has happened since? Succession and gift duties are to be abolished, as promised, on 1 January 1980. That date has been honoured.

The abolition of stamp duty on the first \$30 000 involved in the purchase of a first home has been arranged to apply from 1 November 1979. I would be the first to say that that is a reasonable date on which to implement it because, from inquiries I have made from the departments concerned, it means that settlements occurring on transfers on or after that date will gain the rebate, and most transfers normally would have been under way for about four or five weeks. The member for Hanson would no doubt agree with me that that is a reasonable proposition. That takes care of two of the promises.

I have already referred to the third promise. The answer

given to date is that this is what has been served up to those people foolish enough to believe Liberal Party promises after the experience they have already had in these matters, namely, because of administrative difficulties, it will not be possible to abolish land tax on the principal place of residence until the beginning of the next financial year. A considerable amount of preparatory work and other problems will make it difficult for the Liberal incoming Government to relinquish the \$5 000 000 it had promised to return to the people in the form of land tax remission. What sort of dissimulation is this? If these difficulties exist now, they existed when the promise was made, and should have been made clear during the election. It is not as though this were a new plank brought forward by the Liberal Party. On the contrary, it is something it has harped about for years. You, Mr. Speaker, would have heard that on more than one occasion. When speaking to the Budget, in 1976, the Leader of the Opposition (now the Premier) in *Hansard* of 14 September, at page 1907, said:

The Liberal Party will undertake at the appropriate time to announce a land tax policy which, as in the case of succession duty rates, will bring positive relief to all sections of the community who pay land tax.

That could be taken as a policy put forward as a promise during the recent election, whereas nearly two years ago it was announced in the House that something would be done in that area. Now, we are told that, because of administrative difficulties, it will not be possible.

The difficulties they refer to are so hard to find that a 10-minute perusal of the Act would disclose them. Yet, in three years, they did not have enough perspicacity, apparently, to do something about it. I suggest there was never a real intention to do anything. It was a vote-getter, and the chance of hanging on to \$5 000 000 for another year. Only one inference could be placed on it, if one is charitable; no homework had been done by the Premier. If that is the sort of ability and confidence he intends to display in the future, God help the people of South Australia. I made my own inquiries on this topic from the department concerned.

The member for Hanson might be surprised to know that I take the view that citizens of this State have every right to approach the Public Service, which exists to serve them. Whether a member of Parliament or not, it does not seem to me to be necessary to make other than a normal inquiry. Can Government members advocate any other course of action? My inquiries were such that the administrative work would have to be done by the department concerned for the measure to come into force in the next financial year. If the Government was, and is, dinkum about this promise, let it consider a proposition which would allow it to keep that promise this year. Land taxpayers are due to pay land tax on receipt of their assessment. The assessment notices normally do not go out before the end of October and, on my information a day or so ago, they had not been sent out.

I refer honourable members to the relevant sections of the Act. Part VI, section 56 (2) states:

Land tax shall be due and payable thirty days after the service of a particular notice showing the amount payable. Where is the problem? If the Government is fair dinkum about that promise all they have to do is hang on to the assessment notices and not send them out until they have had time to do the administrative work and then only bill those persons who are to pay land tax under the provisions they promised the people of South Australia at the election. They could get those assessments out in the last quarter of this financial year, because it is going to be a remission on the principal place of residence.

Mr. Gunn: How do you know which one is which?

Mr. PAYNE: I discussed that with the officers of the department and that is the work that they have to do anyway, so that is ready for next year. I am simply pointing out that all they have to do is get it ready one month earlier before the end of the financial year and they could still collect that money. If there is any doubt in the honourable member's mind section 57 states:

The Commissioner may, if sufficient reason is shown, postpone for such period as he thinks proper the day upon which any land will become due and payable.

So there is a challenge for honourable members opposite. If they are dinkum, let them examine that simple administrative procedure.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): I rise to continue my earlier comments about the poor and needy, and to refer to some aspects of the Federal Budget. "Fight inflation first" remains the catch-cry of the Fraser Government, even though it admits that inflation will continue over the next 12 months. The Federal Budget is again directed at making the low income earner with children, the pensioner with children in rented accommodation, the unemployed, and the sick, bear more than their fair share of the Government's economic incompetence.

I have had a constituent who is temporarily unable to work because of sickness, who called on me yesterday. He is not eligible for sickness benefits because his wife is working and earning \$80 a week. He is to enter hospital shortly to have an operation on his ear and could be unable to work for a long period. After paying his rent he is left with about \$40 to support his family and pay his medical bills. However, because other income, in this case earned by his wife, exceeds \$6 a week, he does not qualify for any benefit and as a consequence his application for sickness benefits has been rejected. What can anyone purchase today with \$6? That is a completely ridiculous amount on which to apply a means test. This will certainly place a big strain upon this family and it will take them a long time to recover.

Hundreds of families are in similar situations. The estimate for pensions, benefits and social welfare programmes in the Federal Budget is \$7.8 billion an increase of about 9.5 per cent on the \$7.1 billion spent last year. This will not even cover the Federal Treasurer's estimate of an inflation rate of over 10 per cent and a big increase in unemployment.

Let me give a brief analysis of some welfare and social security aspects of the 1979-80 Federal Budget. The Budget raises the basic income test for pensioner health benefit card entitlement, which has not been altered since 1973. That will now rise from \$33 to \$40 for a single pensioner and from \$57.50 to \$68 for a married couple.

The new limits are effective from 1 November. However, if these income limits had been indexed to inflation they would now stand at \$62.10 and \$108.15 respectively. An estimated additional 25 000 pensioners, plus 5 000 dependants, will qualify for pensioner health benefit cards.

From 1 November, those receiving the supporting parent benefit and their dependants will also become eligible for the pensioner and health benefit cards. An estimated 56 000 supporting parent beneficiaries, plus 96 000 dependants, will qualify.

The Government has finally decided to restore twice yearly indexation to most pensioners and beneficiaries next May. It does not include, however, income lost in the last year when the May 1979 pension rise was cancelled and, as a result, each single pensioner lost \$60 and each pensioner couple lost \$100. When one considers that the

general population can no longer claim the 40 per cent benefit for medical services costing less than \$20, the increase in the cost of "free" prescriptions from 1 September, removal of many drugs and medicines under the "free" prescriptions list, higher health costs and insurance rates and the increase in doctor's fees on 1 November, it is a severe blow, especially to social security beneficiaries, for example the unemployed, the sick, and also the low-income earners.

These higher charges will mean a pay-out for the average family of an extra \$4 a week. It will wipe out the tax cut on 1 December for most families. Families already will be paying a lot more before they get the illusory tax cut. The fact should also be emphasised that the few concessions announced in the Federal Budget for pensioners and supporting parents do not become effective until 1 November, which is two months after the higher health costs come into operation.

For people liable for the funeral cost of an age or invalid pensioner a benefit of up to \$20 is payable. A higher benefit of up to \$40 is payable to an age, invalid or widowed pensioner or supporting parent beneficiary liable for the funeral cost of a spouse, child or another such pensioner. For these benefits "pensioner" means a person who satisfies, or had satisfied, the Commonwealth Government pensioner fringe benefits means test. I point out that funeral costs today are very expensive. It was reported in the *Advertiser* on 19 October that cremation fees have also risen. The article states:

Increased cremation fees have been approved by the Executive Council. The cost of weekday cremations at the Enfield General Cemetery and the Centennial Park Cemetery have been increased from \$85 to \$100. An extra charge of \$75 will apply for cremations on a Saturday and an extra charge of \$112.50 on Sundays and public holidays.

The Federal Government's own policies have set off a renewed surge of inflation and, as a consequence, there will be more unemployment. In the past three years the Government under-estimated the amount to be spent on unemployment benefits by \$441 000 000. That is another classic example of "rubbery" budget figures. Family allowances remain unchanged, hurting the low-income earner and pensioners most of all. The failure to compensate this group for inflation, added to the drop in real wages since 1976, has thrown a heavy burden on families, particularly mothers.

The \$7.50 paid to pensioners and beneficiaries for each child under 16 years has not been increased since 1975. If this payment had kept pace with inflation, it would now be \$12 a week.

The total Aboriginal housing spending is \$9 000 000, or 23.8 per cent less in real terms than under the Labor Government in 1975-76. Likewise, spending on Aboriginal health programmes is 1.5 per cent down on last year and 15.3 per cent down on the last Labor Budget. In every detail, a Federal Budget is an unemployment Budget and a high tax Budget. Low-income earners will suffer increases in their tax liability well above the average and, as prices are expected to rise by more than 10 per cent, living standards will continue to decline. The Federal Budget is ruthlessly consistent in its neglect of women. Perhaps the most damaging cut-back is the \$50 000 000 reduction in the appropriation for the NEAT scheme. Of all the Government's retraining schemes, NEAT has been the most accessible to women needing job skills. Women suffer a higher unemployment rate and are concentrated in those areas of unskilled employment where jobs are disappearing fastest. Women have been badly affected by the Government's refusal to increase or index family allowances for the past three years. By the new year,

inflation will have risen 48 per cent since Fraser came into office. The failure to increase—

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

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): First, I want to acknowledge an element of truth in some of the pre-election propaganda of the Liberal Party; secondly, I wish to express my astonishment at the seemingly miraculous powers of the new Premier, and, thirdly, I will speculate on the political patronage emanating from the new Government. Before the election, a lot was heard from the Liberal Party about the migration of people from South Australia to Queensland. I do not want to talk about those people who allegedly moved so that they could evade succession duties, although I wonder about the morality of people who take advantage of the education system in South Australia, enjoy a good political and economic climate here for themselves and their children and, when they are called to contribute back to society some of the rewards they obtained from it, go off to Queensland so that when they die they will evade succession duties.

The Liberal Party was correct. If it wants some proof regarding the move from South Australia to Queensland, that proof is on the front page of today's *News*, which states that South Australia's most wanted criminal has turned up in Queensland. I must admit that that course seems fairly reasonable for any criminal to take because Queensland is the State, as we know, where innocent people are apprehended by the police and crooks can look forward to a long and successful career in politics. The gentleman in question might have thought that, with any luck at all, he could finish up in Queensland as the Minister of Local Government. Members can imagine that he might have been somewhat chuffed by the action of the Queensland police; no wonder he wanted to throw gelignite at them. Like all people who have migrated to Queensland from South Australia, he now realises that he has been conned.

The main point of my contribution concerns the astonishing powers of the new Premier. When the Premier opened the Colonnades (a \$25 000 000 building, constructed seemingly in a week), that feat was without parallel, and that, as good as the Premier might be, he could not match that. It did not take long for us to see that he could. In an article in the *Advertiser* of 16 October, written by political reporter Greg Kelton, we see that the Premier has some critical things to say about the Frozen Food Factory at Dudley Park. He described it as a white elephant and said that it was a disaster. He also said that the future of the factory was in doubt and that it could be sold to private enterprise. The Premier said that the Government would sustain enormous losses on the operation. He is quoted as saying, in part:

The production, marketing and financial functions lack proper direction and co-ordination. . . . Before production can be substantially increased, and efficiency improved, it will be necessary to review the management structure of the factory.

The Premier thought that he had done a good day's work. He continued the propaganda we had heard before the election that the frozen food factory was a State disaster and he added a few comments to the secret report, as we are led to believe, when it was made public. Being pleased with the day's work, he would have been surprised to see the comments added to the bottom of the report in the *Advertiser* that the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. John Bannon, hoped that the factory would not be sold and said that the public money involved would be best safeguarded by persisting with arrangements made with the previous

Government, which were already starting to show results.

Quite obviously this made the Premier think again, because he knew that the Leader was not a person to make statements the he could not substantiate, unlike the Premier and some of his Ministerial colleagues. He thought that he should have some sort of reinvestigation of his stand the previous day. Of course, he did and this is where the miracle occurred. Within 24 hours he was able, by a stroke of the wand, to turn an inefficient organisation that would cost millions of dollars and run the risk of being sold to private enterprise into a very effective arm of the Government's services. On the following day, 17 October, an article said, "Food factory better: Tonkin." In one day he had turned this white elephant, this factory that was losing countless millions of dollars, into a winner. The report stated:

The operating efficiency and quality of food from the Frozen Food Factory had improved "substantially," the Premier Mr. Tonkin said yesterday.

Overnight, this was a remarkable performance by our Premier. The report continued:

Mr. Tonkin said he was concerned that Press reports suggested the factory was still making substantial losses and being managed ineffectively.

It was the Premier himself who said that. He was concerned that the press had printed his remarks. I suspect that, if he was not able to have the benefit of the Leader's good advice, he might have fallen into the trap of selling this useful service off to private enterprise. The report also stated:

Mr. Tonkin said senior management at the factory had been changed and strengthened.

The new Premier had waved his wand again. The article further stated:

A general manager and a marketing manager, with considerable practical experience with a large interstate frozen food service, had been appointed in April.

The word "April" took a bit of the shine off, because I thought he had seconded these people overnight from the Eastern States and they had arrived in the morning, slightly out of breath and puzzled, ready to take over the frozen food factory that was now a success. This is one example of what we are getting from the Government. It concerns me that the *Advertiser* can write such a critical article about the frozen food factory and the next day write such a glowing report about the same factory and not comment at all. We need some investigative journalism in this State. That may get to the bottom of some of these statements that we are getting from the Government.

I also wish to speak about the political patronage that is still to emanate from this Government. I would like to start a little competition entitled, "Guess who will be the new knight in the New Year Honours List". I can assure everyone that the list will not include a Sir Bruce Eastick or a Sir Arthur Whyte on it any more than that there will be a Sir Don Dunstan or Sir Robin Millhouse. However, I suspect that we will see a Sir Ren DeGaris. The Government could not give him a car, as there is none left, unless it increases the size of the fleet. The only thing left is a knighthood. I suspect he would accept that. I can imagine the discussion, "Bad luck about the President's job and the car, but how would you like to be Sir Ren?" That would bring a pleased expression. I think services in politics would be a reason and I would expect Sir John Rundle to also receive one for services to politics. One may also expect a "Thank You" Sir Nigel Buick, baron of Kangaroo Island, for services to politics and advertising far beyond the call of duty. I am also interested to see what happens to the Minister who now carries the title of Chief

Secretary. I do not expect that his service in the Ministry will be long and he will be told, "Look, Allan, a knighthood would be the sort of recognition for you and if you do not get it on this year's honours list, there are still a couple of opportunities to come."

The House knows of the history of Liberal Governments in this country in rewarding their political supporters with knighthoods. I do not know of too many, Federal Presidents of the Liberal Party or the Country Party who have not received knighthoods for services in one way or another. I will be looking very closely at what this Government does with regard to the knighthoods that they will undoubtedly lavish on their supporters at the end of this year. I think this political patronage has surely gone far enough. I do not believe that those members in the House here tonight could really face the electorate of South Australia if all those defeated candidates within their own Parties whom they need to buy off for future loyalty will be bought off with a knighthood. Shame on the Party if they do do it! Somehow or another I feel that they will take no notice of me, and those knighthoods will be given out as feared.

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

Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park): I would like to refer to statements made by the Liberal Party during the election campaign in respect of job opportunities and the promises of more employment. I refer to tonight's *News* in which mention was made that the Minister of Transport will be having talks in Canberra on the standardisation of the Adelaide-Crystal Brook railway line. The article states:

Australian National Railways has proposed a reduction of one service a week on the lines from Tailem Bend to Pinnaroo, Barmera, Waikerie and Loxton.

The rail transfer agreement which provided for South Australia country rail services to be taken over by the Commonwealth stipulates that any cuts in services must be agreed to by the South Australian Transport Minister.

If agreement cannot be reached, the matter must be referred to arbitration.

An article in the *Pirie Recorder* dated 12 December 1978 states:

There could be 250 railway jobs lost in Port Pirie through the standardisation of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook line.

It is expected work on the link will begin next July and take about three years to complete. Mayor of Port Pirie, Mr. W. G. Jones, told Monday night's City Council meeting that unfortunately when completed the standardisation could mean a loss of 250 railway jobs to the city with the removal of the bogie exchange depot plus the marshalling and train examining sections. "The standardisation will mean that freight trains will bypass Port Pirie", he said.

Mr. Jones said, that the council could only hope that with the almost certain go-ahead for the Redcliff petro-chemical project, spin off industries would be located at Port Pirie and thus provide employment for people affected by rail standardisation.

Later, the article states:

Dr. Williams was most concerned that the 10 trains result in an annual loss of \$340 000 to Australian National Railways.

However, a spokesman for Australian National Railways said the information was correct and although the finance had not been made available for the project by the Federal Government this financial year, it was expected next year.

He said the 250 jobs lost would not be retrenchments. They would be transferred to other areas in the State.

"Standardisation in itself will create jobs in other areas, and many of the transfer would be involved with this work",

he said.

However, on 5 November a report by Greg Kelton in the *Advertiser* stated:

The South Australian Government should seek a High Court injunction to stop the Federal Government closing some country rail services, it was stated yesterday. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Wright, said a Federal Government move to close some services to Port Pirie should be contested by the South Australian Government. He said the previous Government had known about the move for about two months.

"At that time we notified the Federal Minister for Transport, Mr. Nixon, that the South Australian Government was opposed to the closure of services to Port Pirie," Mr. Wright said. "The Railway Transfer Agreement provides for the consent of the S.A. Minister of Transport before any effectively demanded service can be withdrawn. The agreement also allows, in the event of any disagreement between the State and Federal Governments, for the matter to be referred to arbitration."

"We believed that the Port Pirie services were effectively demanded and were preparing to take the case to arbitration to support our view. This was the decision prior to the State election. It now appears that the new State Government has bowed to pressure from the Federal Government and has deserted the needs of the residents of Port Pirie and other country areas. If this is not the case, then Mr. Nixon has ordered the withdrawal of services without the consent of the S.A. Government. If that is the real position, then Mr. Wilson (the S.A. Minister of Transport) and his Government must demonstrate their concern by taking the matter to the High Court."

I would be interested to hear from the Minister whether he has made representations to the Federal Minister (Mr. Nixon) and agreed to the reduction in those services on the Port Pirie line. A letter of 28 September was received by the Australian Railways Union stating that services would be curtailed and that a State Transport Authority State Liner bus service had been approved and licensed to operate in Port Pirie, calling in at Crystal Brook, Redhill and Snowtown. What of the other localities that were linked to the passenger railway service? No mention was made about that. A report in the *News* of Wednesday 3 October 1979 indicates that the Port Pirie council became so concerned when council members first heard of the closure a month previously that they set up an inquiry committee, whose Chairman was Alderman Wes Thomas. The article states:

It would be a serious inconvenience, especially to old people and students. Our old people cannot travel by bus because they need the extra room and comfort of a train. It will also inconvenience students attending tertiary education in Adelaide. The overriding opinions, the committee found, was that the service would be upgraded and it would not run at a loss.

One of the most serious factors is the loss of 250 jobs in Port Pirie. That will affect not only the business houses but also those people, particularly railway men, who will be required to transfer to various localities throughout the State. Although it may be claimed that those jobs are not lost, great inconvenience will be caused to those railwaymen required to transfer. What guarantees has the Minister sought from the Federal Government in respect of remuneration or compensation for those railway employees who own their own homes in Port Pirie and who may be required to sell them when railway standardisation eventuates there?

Mr. Wilson: You do approve of the standardisation?

Mr. HAMILTON: I do not oppose standardisation as such, but I am seeking compensation or some indication

from the State Government about this matter. Are railway officials aware of when standardisation will be completed? At that time there will be a flood of homes on the market.

One could safely say that, if the 250 job losses or transfers from Port Pirie were halved, about 125 houses would be on the market. People would be well aware that the employees must sell their houses because they were being transferred, and in those circumstances it would certainly be a buyer's market. This would result in a considerable loss to those employees who must sell their houses in order to transfer to other localities.

If this Government was really concerned about the people at Port Pirie, it would be seeking compensation for them when they transferred to Adelaide or to some other locality, where they would have to buy an equivalent house. What detrimental effects would it have on a family, when a railway employee must sell his house or, because of an inadequate sale price, decide to stay in Port Pirie?

Mr. O'NEILL (Floreys): I intended during the time that is available to me to comment on statements made earlier by the member for Mitcham. However, he disappeared so rapidly after he made his speech that I do not intend to go into those matters. Although I would not agree with many of the things that the member for Hanson says, I certainly think that he had a point when he raised in the House recently matters that the member for Mitcham successfully turned to his advantage in the press the next day.

I have learnt one thing today (and I say this with no disrespect to this House): I have a better idea of the meaning of the old adage that every circus has its clown. It is a shame that members laugh so much at the member for Mitcham, because he appears to me to treat this House with some contempt. However, I will continue to deal with the industrial matters that I raised earlier this afternoon.

While we have been sitting in the House this afternoon a drama was, unfortunately for the working people of Australia, being enacted in Brisbane. The Premier of that State, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, was guillotining through the Queensland Parliament the Emergency Services Bill on the pretext that it was necessary because the unions were getting out of control and that the people of Queensland could be guaranteed services only if the Government had these emergency powers.

This is an old story, but it is not true. I believe it derives from the relatively new conservative line. After 25 years of kicking the communist can, they are off on a new tack, namely, "Bash the unions". Mr. Heath tried this in the United Kingdom some years ago and paid the penalty. Mrs. Thatcher, with the assistance of one Eggleton, used it to gain government, and I daresay that in the not too distant future she will meet her nemesis as a result. The present Prime Minister of Australia is developing a similar scenario, and we could still see an election in December if the funeral director can be buried for long enough. I see that they have deferred the case until next February, so that may be an indication of what they are trying to do.

Mr. Gunn: While talking to us about Queensland, what about telling us about Senator Georges and what has happened to him?

Mr. O'NEILL: He is a poor old chap who deserves some sympathy, but I think that the Queensland branch is handling that matter reasonably well.

Mr. Kenally: How about Senator Sheil?

Mr. O'NEILL: Yes, what about him! What we have is a major problem which is not the fault of the trade unions. A member referred earlier today to the problems confronting the Western world. Those problems relate to the idiosyncrasies of the system and to the fact that no-one can control it. The people with the biggest hands, the

biggest money grabbers, cause fluctuations from time to time, and the ordinary people who do the work are the sufferers. Regarding the bogey of the trade union movement and of the industrial strife it causes, certain statistics are available in the library on the causes of industrial disputes in Australia. The causes were proportioned as follows: wages 23.5 per cent; hours of work 2.7 per cent; matters relating to leave, pension, compensation provisions, etc., 1.8 per cent; managerial policy 39 per cent; physical working conditions 19.9 per cent; trade unionism 8.9 per cent.

The actions of the trade unions in Australia during the 12 months covered by these statistics were responsible for 8.9 per cent of the disputes, whereas managerial policy, on the other hand, was responsible for 39 per cent, thus raising an interesting question about who causes the disputes. I know, as I said earlier (and I could document cases in respect of it), when managements have gone out to provoke industrial disputes for their own ends and means. Managerial policy covers matters such as the following:

... computation of wages, hours, leave, etc. in individual cases; docking pay, docking leave credits, fines, etc.; disciplinary matters including dismissals, suspension, victimisation; principles of promotion and filling positions, transfers, roster complaints, retrenchment policy; employment of particular persons and personal disagreements; production limitations or quotas; etc.

Management, whether prepared to admit it or not, causes more industrial strife than does the trade union movement. The movement is not about creating time off work because, regardless of what the Government thinks, trade union officials cannot con workers out on to the grass. If so inclined, an official might get them out once, but I think that it shows contempt for the intelligence of South Australian workers if the Government believes that union members can be conned by trade union officials. Most Government members do not know anything about the internal workings of the trade union movement. As they know a good deal about management, they probably know a good deal about the real causes of industrial disputes. They are more aligned with the people who cause most industrial disputes, namely, management, which caused 39 per cent in that one year compared to 8.9 per cent caused by the trade unions.

The situation, because of this managerial attitude, this overbearing and high-handed attitude, accompanied by the assumption of the holy right to hire and fire, with which they will countenance no tampering, will lead to confrontation.

[Midnight]

Mr. O'NEILL: We are very close to that situation in this country now, in Western Australia and in Queensland, and it would appear from the latest news that the combined trade union movement of Australia will have to take action to assist the people in Queensland to deal with Mr. Petersen, who has gone right off this planet. He has become absolutely paranoid in his efforts to—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call to the honourable member's attention that it is disrespectful to refer to members of another Legislature in a derogatory sense.

Mr. O'NEILL: I thank you for the advice, Mr. Speaker. I do not mean to be derogatory to the man; I just believe the policies adopted by his Government are an insult to the working people of Queensland and they are aimed at shackling them to the big business corporations that own Queensland. Those corporations include Utah and other corporations in which the Premier has admitted that he

does have shareholdings, which is subsequent to his denial on national television when he said that he did not. When challenged about his shareholdings he proved to be untruthful in his response; he then said that the people of Queensland admired a leader who had shown business acumen that had led him to the acquisition of such a large number of shares. Nevertheless, that man will probably go down in Australia's history as one of those responsible for one of the biggest industrial upheavals this country has seen. He may beat the Premier of Western Australia in that race by a short half head.

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

Mr. TRAINER (Ascot Park): I would like to express my disappointment at what I have seen so far of the Government's performance, particularly the performance of the people in the front row, who constitute the single-Storey Cabinet. One member in particular, the Deputy Premier, although he is not here at this moment, seems to get rattled awfully quickly. I have heard him two or three times so far condemn the Government. He is not quite sure which side of the House he is on.

He comes in here like a classroom teacher who has not prepared his lessons well and tries to bluff and bluster his way through. He regularly contradicts himself, and it is very hard to work out just exactly what his Government's policy is, particularly with respect to uranium. I am sure I have heard him come out with some statement to the effect that no uranium mining will take place until it is safe. I am not quite sure whether that is a statement from the Deputy Premier that amounts to a bipartisan uranium policy, because it sounds awfully like our A.L.P. policy on uranium, which is to ban it until a majority of Party members is convinced that it is safe. If the Party policy ever changes, it will be because we have been convinced on the facts, and on the facts alone, and not because we have been persuaded or pressured by press barons or mining magnates. I would like to think we could say the same about the twists and turns of policy on the other side of the House.

This afternoon, the Minister showed a clear inability to answer simple questions, when I asked a question in relation to the vitrification processes for handling waste material. I asked whether the waste disposal techniques at the Marcoule plant, in France, can commercially vitrify waste from the mainstream of light water reactors or only wastes from the older gas-cooled reactors, of a type that are being phased out. This question was not replied to, other than by some vague statement about vitrification and synroc techniques, which had nothing to do with the question whatsoever.

I tried to make sure that the question was phrased clearly, and I offered to repeat it for his benefit because of the confusion in the Deputy Premier's mind as a result of an earlier question from the member for Stuart. On that occasion it had been necessary for the member for Stuart to very carefully, slowly and precisely spell out his question again for the benefit of the Deputy Premier, who would not or could not answer. I am amazed that a man in such an important position cannot answer simple questions. I wonder whether the job is too much for him already, and whether we are heading for a Cabinet reshuffle only a couple of weeks after the election. There may be a few smiles coming from behind the front bench from people who perhaps believe they will move into one of the vacancies if it opens up.

When I opened the *News* earlier today, I thought that this Cabinet reshuffle must have taken place already because

on page 46 of this afternoon's *News* there is a press statement that was made by the member for Norwood, Mr. Webster, in which he referred to various things connected with a Kensington home unit and then, the report states:

Mr. Webster said the former Community Welfare Minister, Mr. Burdett, had questioned . . . These Cabinet reshuffles must take place so quickly that they are on and off before we know about them!

Who would be the likely lads to fill this vacancy if the Deputy Premier manages to commit suicide, falls under a bus, or just suffocates from having his foot in his mouth?

It could not possibly be the member for Hanson, although that would release a car for use by somebody else. Unfortunately, he has an even worse case of foot and mouth disease. He was responsible for a disgraceful attack on the Auditor-General, one for which he had to apologise. I admit that he did so with some sort of grace, but it is obvious that the Premier would not have him in Cabinet; he has too much to say for himself.

When it comes to presenting an argument he is as weak as is the Deputy Premier, and he is even more transparent, I have noticed, in the short time I have been here, that the weaker the argument of the member for Hanson the louder he raises his voice; one knows that if he shouts, he has nothing to say at all.

It cannot be the member for Glenelg, who seems to recycle his old speeches regarding trade unions, socialism, and McNally.

Mr. Mathwin: You wouldn't know.

Mr. TRAINER: I sat in the gallery before entering this House and I am sure that I have heard some of the same speeches that I have heard from the honourable member since I came into this House. He says that the Labor Party was trying to socialise the whole of South Australia. He never makes clear what he means by "socialise". "Socialise" is a word that is thrown around with no attempt to explain its meaning—it is just used to scare people. If I were a Liberal member of Parliament I would be ashamed of being here because I would have got here by scaring the wits out of little old ladies, with the sort of advertisements that appeared in the press, which tried to terrify them with reports of reds under the bed and trade unions marching from Trades Hall. On the other hand, if I was the sort of person who could be ashamed of myself for any reason, then I would not be on that side of the House.

These likely lads who might move up in a Cabinet reshuffle could not include the member for Fisher; he is already in the Premier's bad books, despite the hard work he has done. I could say some nice things about the member for Fisher. It is a pity he is not here to hear them, because I am sure he would beam from ear to ear. Remarks he has made indicate that he has some sort of awareness of the problems of technological change, which is more than I can say for some members on the other side of the House. He has shown no indication that he understood that the comments we have made with respect of technological change do not concern technological change per se but its untrammelled introduction. Technological change cannot be resisted; it is something that just cannot be held off. It is coming whether we want it or not. We must ensure that its introduction is accompanied by an approach that makes sure that its social and economic implications are given full consideration.

The likely lads I have mentioned before could not include the member for Eyre, because he has already got something as a consolidation prize for not being in the Ministry. On the other hand, there are all the new members on that side of the House. I concede that there

are more of them than there are on this side. It would not be the member for Mawson, because what he said recently was the most unrivalled collection of platitudes, clichés and repetitions that I have heard for ages. I was amazed when he started his talk about the Colonnades, but I particularly became perturbed when he was referring to the gaiety of the crowd. I thought with all this talk about gaiety and gay people he may have been saying something about the inclinations of people in his area, but, as he went on further, I was satisfied that his reference to the gay behaviour was just another platitude.

It would not be the member for Henley Beach, who got into a bit of strife the other night by demanding that the member for Florey table documents, as though they were some sort of secret document that was hard to get hold of, although the member for Florey had got them from the library just around the corner from this Chamber.

Apart from waving an A.T.E.A. card and firing a couple of Dorothy Dixers at Ministers, the honourable member's only contribution so far has been to criticise new members on this side of the House for doing their homework before making speeches. Recently, the honourable member stated:

The speeches made by new members on this side of the House will not be nicely typed up on printed paper for us to read to the House.

I am not sure what is meant by the reference to "printed paper". The member further stated:

Those speeches will be made off the cuff.

After hearing the honourable member's speech, I think it would be better if he did his homework.

We have not heard much from other new members opposite. What will they do between now and their inevitable retirement at the next election?

There are a couple of exceptions to that. The member for Rocky River had some sobering things to say. The only thing that has not impressed me so far is his column in the *News* (which he probably got from the Parliamentary handbook) in which he described the opening of Parliament the other day.

The member for Mallee attracted the attention of this House with the comment about his tender olfactory organs. He referred to odours emanating from the air-conditioning near the entrance to the car park and how he could tell what was on the luncheon menu as he came from his car. It is obvious that he is not a true son of the soil or he could take stronger odours than those.

The honourable member also talked about some leafletting, related to a matter raised by the member for Peake. The honourable member referred to the suburb in which he lived. This reference confused me because I was pretty sure that the member for Mallee would live in his district. If he does, something strange is going on. Perhaps the metropolitan boundaries have been changed. Or perhaps the honourable member is really a city slicker. People in the Mallee District may query the fact that their member does not live in his area.

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

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): For a considerable number of years, rehabilitation and compensation has been a social question affecting the working-class environment. I am sorry that the Minister of Industrial Affairs is not in the House, because some days ago he produced a report that the previous Labor Government introduced—a report of the committee on rehabilitation and compensation of persons injured at work. The part of the report that I have actually read I have found to be inconclusive. The definition of rehabilitation in the report

is the restoration of the handicapped to the fullest physical, mental, social, vocational and economic usefulness of which they are capable.

The report goes on to deal with the medical aspects of rehabilitation, and the vocational and social aspects. I find it extremely difficult to work out in my mind exactly what the report endeavours to prove. From my experience (and I have had experience over 20 years in industrial injuries), I have found that it is difficult to lay down stringent rules regarding rehabilitation. The basic concept of industrial accidents, when they occur, revolves around what I believe to be proper and immediate safety precautions in industry, taken at all times, despite the question of production. I want to say, in all fairness, that the employer with whom I had so much contact, B.H.P., is probably one of the most safety-minded employers that could be found almost anywhere. However, sometimes, when it came to the question of production, there was some hesitancy about safety precautions.

The second point I make is that proper and immediate first-aid medical treatment should be involved. Thirdly, the workers' finance should remain unaltered in respect of earning power, and fourthly, there should be ready and quick assessment of the loss of facilities. I do not know why this question has not come out in the report because, despite the improvement to the Workmen's Compensation Act by previous Labor Governments, I find that there are still areas whereby a quick assessment has not been made. The fifth point I make is that where possible a return to work in some capacity (and this is important) should be made as soon as possible.

I have no real quarrel with what I have laid down in these concepts. I believe quite seriously that most employers have no quarrels with them. I found that when the Labor Government brought in the new concept of workers' compensation, employers generally opposed the concept of having to pay workers' compensation and, on a return to work by the employee, having to be responsible for all injuries or aggravation of those injuries. I do not want to be disrespectful, and I will not read all the correspondence forwarded to me by the B.H.P. Company Limited on an occasion when I had approached it in writing to endeavour to get a past employee of that company re-employed, particularly on a rehabilitation programme. In part the management of B.H.P. states:

I certainly share your concern, particularly as our company is constantly seeking to employ people, and I recall our discussions of some time ago on aspects of the South Australian Workmen's Compensation Act which, in fact, tended to work against members of the work force.

I agree that that aspect is true. The letter then quotes the gentleman's name and continues:

You will no doubt be interested to know that of 181 applicants for our apprentice intake this year, 37 already had noise induced hearing loss, potentially equivalent to a compensation pay-out of between \$20 000 and \$30 000. Of further interest is the fact, that, during 1977, 165 applicants for work at the Whyalla steelworks were denied employment due to some medical disability.

I made a submission to this committee that I still believe strongly that this submission goes a long way to solve that problem. However, in its report I can find no area in which the committee had dealt with this question. My submission states:

You will no doubt recall my verbal conversation with you and also my discussions in Parliament on the question of my suggestions in relation to some alterations obviously required today in the field of workmen's compensation.

There would be no doubt in my mind that you, together

with others, would be very aware of the gigantic current unemployment figures. Figures, I might quickly add, that have reached currently in Whyalla, to something like double the overall national figure.

I point out that within this figure there is, in my opinion, a very large proportion of unemployed people and redundant people, particularly in Whyalla, who, because of some past or present medical history on works injuries or common injuries, have no real chance of future employment. In other words, even if the economical situation improves, particularly for Whyalla, there is an ever increasing and somewhat present massive number of unemployed who are literally unemployable because of their medical history.

At that time I put up a suggestion of a new clause within the Act. In my correspondence I said that I was not a lawyer and I do not necessarily confess that it was worded in the correct manner; nevertheless, it could have been worded in the correct manner. I suggested that, where it can be proved medically that a potential employee has a percentage loss of limb, function of body or incurable ailment, that that person be subject to his own doctor, with the proviso of employer medical opinion, to ascertain a medical percentage loss to such limb, function of body or incurable ailment".

The point that I am making is that, if that was done and a percentage was given, I believe the potentially unemployable people that they are now talking about could be utilised in the workforce. In my opinion that would be a step forward in comparison with what is under discussion as far as rehabilitation is concerned in the workforce.

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth): It gives me some pleasure to rise and speak in this debate this morning, particularly in light of the fact that I have had the opportunity over the past few days of listening to the contributions, such as they were, of the new members on the Government side of the House. It was certainly with some pleasure that I read and heard those contributions. It was not the sort of pleasure that honourable members opposite are no doubt assuming that I had, but pleasure in the sure knowledge that the whole bunch of them (possibly with the exception of the member for Rocky River) are a bundle of "oncours" and that his House will be graced with their immortal words for a short period of three years. How extraordinary it is to observe the House in light of the changes that have taken place with the Liberals being elected to office. They always, of course, try to claim that they are the Party that represents all the people in the community. However, most of the people in the community are not fooled; they know that the Liberals represent the narrow sectional interests of capital in this House. One can reflect on how surprising it was to see that manifested so adequately tonight by the Minister in charge of the House, the Minister of Environment, sitting there hour after hour massaging himself with a cheque book.

One could hardly imagine a better indication of the thinking of honourable members opposite. On a more serious note, I suppose the saddest thing is the way that honourable members opposite have entered the Budget debate which, after all, comes up only once a year; none of them found anything of any world shattering importance, or for that matter of any real importance to the overwhelming majority of South Australians, to contribute to the debate. It is hardly for a lack of issues or a lack of great events challenging the people of this State or the people of Australia, or for that matter the people of the world; that is hardly the cause of their not doing so; I believe it is just a question of their own innate parochialism that will not enable them to look any wider

or farther to see what the issues are that are challenging the people of this State and to come to grips with them and deal with them. It may well be that they do not want to deal with those issues because of the fact that now that the Liberals are in Government federally and in South Australia it will be more difficult for them from now on to try and heap the blame onto the Labour Party. They will not find that nearly so easy as they have in the past. It is interesting to reflect for a moment on some of the figures that have been made available on the status of distribution of wealth in this country.

I have figures that clearly indicate just what has been happening in Australia since 1975. Since 1974-75 the Australian economy, in terms of gross domestic product, has grown from \$96 481 000 000 to \$109 709 000 000 at current prices, an increase of \$13 227 000 000, or 13.7 per cent. Australia is wealthier than it has ever been before. The national cake is now bigger than it has ever been before.

In 1975-76 each employee produced, at current prices, an average of \$18 511, and by 1978-79 this had increased to \$20 108. Therefore, productivity per worker increased by 8.6 per cent. Of course, wage-earners in Australia have not received the extra wealth in wage increases during that period. One might well ask who has received the wealth.

Since 1974-75 real wages per employee after tax have fallen by 7 per cent a year, whilst household/business incomes after tax have increased by 4.8 per cent per year. Honourable members might well reflect on whether we are getting enough back from the Federal Government on the income tax that we pay as wage-earners. Since 1974-75, Budget manipulations by the Fraser Government have meant that workers have paid \$35 529 000 000 in tax, yet have received welfare cash benefits of only \$30 812 000 000.

Therefore, the working people of Australia have been robbed of \$4 717 000 000. What about inflation during that period? Since 1975-76 prices have increased by 39.4 per cent. What has happened to jobs during that period? That is the most sorry tale of all. Since August 1975 the number who cannot find work has increased from 231 000 to 383 600 in July 1979, and they are only the visible figures produced by the Commonwealth Statistician.

What has this meant to a family on an average income? For the average wage-earner with one dependant spouse and two dependent children the situation is as follows: since 1975-76 the average wage, excluding managers and professionals, has risen from \$135 to \$185, an increase of \$50. But what has happened to that \$50? To buy the same amount of goods and services as in 1975-76 now costs \$50.81 a week. Health costs have increased by \$11 a week, and direct pay-as-you-earn income tax has increased by \$7.92 a week. The productivity increase that I have mentioned a few moments ago of 8.6 per cent, which has not been passed on to wage-earners, amounts to \$15.91 a week.

So, although the increase was an average of \$50 a week, workers lost an average of \$85.64. That is, to be on an equal footing with the position that wage-earners were on in Australia before the Fraser Government was elected, they would need an increase of \$35.64 a week. That is, in graphic terms, exactly what has happened under the Fraser Government.

Wage-earners and the poor of this country have suffered badly, but I suppose that no-one has suffered more greatly in Australia, especially under the Fraser Government, than have Aboriginal people. It is a sad indication of the politics of the Liberal Party that, to my knowledge, not one Liberal Party member, in speaking in this debate, has referred to the problems confronted by the Aboriginal

community in South Australia.

In case anyone has doubts regarding the extraordinary poverty in which Aborigines live at present, I will quote some figures. Although these are Northern Territory figures, I was told by people in the Health Department that the figures were consistent with South Australia's. In 1978, there were 48.1 Aboriginal infant deaths for each 1 000 live births, compared to a rate of 9.7 deaths among each 1 000 non-Aboriginal infants in the Northern Territory.

Having put these figures in *Hansard*, I feel like calling for a moment's silence in the House because there can be no greater condemnation of the inequality that exists in our community than that which is expressed in the figures to which I have referred. In future debates, I will say more about Aborigines. It is certainly time that every member of this House concerned himself or herself about this issue and started to pay attention to the real root of poverty in this country, that is, in the Aboriginal community.

One could continue to refer to the problems being experienced by Aborigines. However, one does not hear very often about the problems of aged Aborigines. This is because few Aboriginal people live to a so-called ripe old age.

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

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I should like to raise two matters, relating to the State Unemployment Relief Scheme and to pensioners, both of which matters are part and parcel of Unley District. Each and every member of this House must feel for the plight of the young people in this State. There is no doubt that when the State Unemployment Relief Scheme was in force many councils and people all over the State benefited from it.

One of the great things about the scheme was the labour content. I do not know of any member who did not receive some benefit from the scheme, which has now been scrapped by the Government. This successful scheme helped a lot of people, especially sporting bodies, in relation to the work done on painting and erections. I refer, for instance, to the work done at Unley Oval or at any other sporting ground in this State. One can see the terracing that has been done at Unley, which work has been of great value. This applies also to the Woodville and, I think, Alberton Ovals, work on which has got people employed and has been of great benefit to the community.

I refer also to the wonderful recreation centre at Goodwood Oval, as well as to that alongside the school at Black Forest. Work on these projects was done by persons who were not skilled tradesmen and who could not be apprenticed because there was no movement in the work force for those employing apprentices, who could go on to become tradesmen. The limited number of apprenticed tradesmen will be a great loss to this State.

Although these people have no possible hope, they are willing to work, as indeed are most young people. However, there are no jobs for them. This was, therefore, an opportunity for unskilled persons to get a job. In some cases, these people took hold of the opportunity to obtain employment. The ratio of those involved was not that hot, and indeed not everyone got a job. However, the scheme did much for the community in many areas of this State. Even small tennis clubs, for instance, were able to have their places painted.

It is awkward for sporting bodies to charge sufficient fees to enable them to pay for such work to be done. For instance, a decent cricket bat now costs \$140, although I am not sure about the price of tennis racquets. With club

members paying only \$40 a year, one can imagine the upkeep of places had they not been helped by the State Unemployment Relief Scheme.

It saved the Federal Government in more ways than one. After the Government introduced the SURS scheme, people immediately became wage-earners, and the Federal Government collected income tax from them. Many times, the Federal Government has been asked by the State Government to return the tax, but it will not do that, after saving so much money through taxing people who were on the dole but who had gone into the work force.

Only recently, the Federal Government tried to take the dole away from the young unemployed, but it did not last long. However, I am sure that it soon will not happen to people in this State. I know a few people who do not work, and who have never worked. However, many people, if given the incentive, will work. I will allow the Government time in which to show whether its new scheme will be anywhere near as good as the SURS scheme introduced by a Labor Government. The Prime Minister works angles in the press. Many people were shocked when he announced that he would reintroduce television licences. There was such a hue and cry about it that it was not many days before the announcement was withdrawn. There was also the plan to introduce half-yearly, instead of yearly, pension reviews. It must be getting close to an election when we hear about these changes of plan. During my experience in the House, it has been only the Labor Government that has helped pensioners. Possibly the new Government will withdraw any existing fringe benefits or concessions pensioners are now receiving. Land tax will be abolished before long, but the Government has not had sufficient time yet to implement that measure. As it was an election promise, I hope that it will be honoured. We will wait and see.

My Government was able to help pensioners with bus fares, rates and taxes, water and sewerage rates by allowing as much as a 50 per cent remission, later even a 60 per cent remission, thus benefitting them considerably. Medical and hospital expenses can be considerable, even though some pensioners belong to some type of health scheme. These are matters on which I hope the Government in no way cuts back. It is difficult enough for pensioners to carry on, but it will be made even more difficult for them if the Government cuts back. Many older people never had much opportunity during the hard times, but they should be looked after and recognised for bringing South Australia to what it is today. The lifestyle of the young of those days did not compare with that of the young nowadays. With washing machines and other modern amenities, people nowadays receive all the benefits they possibly can, and I hope that the Government will not interfere in these fringe benefits for pensioners.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I want to speak briefly this evening about some misunderstandings that have occurred in relation to a statement that I made during a previous grievance debate about the balance sheets of unions. The member for Peake certainly misunderstood my intention, and I thank him for the rule book he gave me today, enabling me to look at matters in relation to his union. I referred to State unions and the fact that, according to the law, they have to submit their balance sheets but that nobody else, unless a member of the union, is allowed to see them unless application is made to the Commissioner.

The member for Florey, who has the honour of being the Labor member against whom the biggest swing was recorded in the last election, took me to task, and brought

forward balance sheets from a Federal union, but not from a State union. He produced these balance sheets with great gusto, and stated that he could get this information from the library, and so on. He also said that I could have obtained the same information. I realise that that information is available, but, as I said, I was referring to State unions. The member for Florey spoke about people who remind him of other people. In my younger days I saw some horror films which I could say (but I will not), remind me of the member for Florey. I would not say that because I would be regarded as making a personal attack on him. He stated that these people were fascists. Let me remind him that the fascists are from his side of the camp. They are the national socialists and they are all in the same camp. They have the national socialist Party, the Nazi Party, and other fascist groups under their wing.

I spent some time fighting such people, so I would not be a follower of the national socialists. Likewise, I would not follow any of the socialist splinter groups, of which there are many, whether they support the Chinese, the Russians, or the Yugoslavs. There are many facets of socialism and national socialism is one of them.

The member for Florey also said that this person reminded him of a man with hate all over his face. When he entered this House, the honourable member refused to shake hands with any member from this side who went over to congratulate him on his election. He was the only member opposite who refused the hands of members on this side of the House in friendship and congratulations. For such a man to talk about hatred is surprising and hypocritical.

I refer the honourable member to section 129 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, which states:

The secretary or director of every registered association shall, within one month after the completion of the yearly audit of the accounts of the association, deliver to the Registrar—

(a) a duly audited balance-sheet of the assets and liabilities of the association made up to the date of the closing of the accounts;

and

(b) a duly audited statement of the receipts and payments, or income and expenditure of the association during the year in respect of which such audit was made,

Clause 130 states:

130. (1) The Registrar, or any officer of the Court or the Commission shall not, except by direction of the President, divulge to any person, other than an officer of a registered association—

(a) the name of any member of that association;

or

(b) the financial position of that association.

Penalty: Fifty dollars.

There it is, in black and white, in the Act. I suggest that, when the member for Florey has a little time (and I know he is going to have his time taken up trying to get over the 13½ per cent swing against him in that blue ribbon seat of Florey), he might look at sections 129 and 130. If he does, he will find that, under the Act, if a person wants to see the balance sheets of a union he must go to the Industrial Court and get permission from the President to peruse (not take or have a copy of) the balance sheet. Let the honourable member come in here flourishing as many balance sheets as he likes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member does not need any encouragement.

Mr. MATHWIN: Let the honourable member flourish as many balance sheets as he likes from the Federal sphere. We have a Federal Government that looks after

the trade union movement, and protects it. We have a Federal Government that allows people to see union balance sheets, but we had a previous State Government that would not allow any member to look at those balance sheets, under threat of a \$50 penalty. That is the situation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg has the floor.

Mr. MATHWIN: Let that be a lesson to the member for Florey, the muscle man of the A.L.P., who came in here and said he was not in a union, although he read out the balance sheet. Let me also remind him that that was a Federal union. Next time the honourable member forages in the Library, let him forage for a State union balance sheet, and let him produce it and talk about it. Let me remind the honourable member that there is a difference between State and Federal unions, and, with his experience in the union movement, he should know that. Certainly, with his experience in the Labor Party, he should be well aware that there is a difference between Federal and State unions.

Dr. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I move:

That the debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Abbott, L. Arnold, Bannon, Max Brown, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (23)—Messrs. P. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olson, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Webster, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Plunkett. No—Mr. Allison.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

Dr. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I wish to comment about transport services in my district although, in a grievance debate of 10 minutes, one can only scratch the surface of this problem. I have some suggestions for the Minister of Transport, and I am glad to see that he is in the House. The Minister may find the suggestions of some use. He may be a little bemused as to why I put question 52 on notice. It states, in part:

What is the current minimum safe "lead time" between successive trains on that section of the Adelaide-Noarlunga Centre railway line between Woodlands Park and Goodwood?

It is clear to me that one of the major problems with which this new Government will have to grapple is the problem of transport links between the older metropolitan area and the Noarlunga region. This is a matter with which the former Government was grappling, I believe successfully, but obviously any fruits that come from those investigations will, in the first instance, be announced and at least partially implemented by the present Government. I think it is important that the viewpoint of local people be taken into account in whatever may be done.

It seems that one of the problems that exists is the difficulty in finding suitable alternative routes between the Noarlunga region and the old metropolitan area simply because of the topography that exists between the two, including particularly the Eden fault scarp. That is crossed by the Main South Road at Tapleys Hill and also by the Noarlunga Centre railway line along the coast, but duplicating these facilities in any way will be a very expensive proposition indeed. It could, of course, be done. Land has been set aside as a transport corridor from

the Darlington area through Christie Downs along to broadacre areas to the south where all sort of options are open to the Government. That could be developed in some way or other. It is important to realise that even with the levelling off of population development in the south, nonetheless some population increases will continue. A survey that was made by the City of Noarlunga with assistance of the SURS scheme three years ago would suggest, by some extrapolation of population, that, by 1981, the population of the south would be in excess of 60 000 people. One does not know what impact continuing increases in fuel prices will have. The Federal Government hopes that it will force more people off the road; that is the intention of the pricing policy in part, not totally.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Who said that?

Dr. HOPGOOD: That is clearly part of the intention. There are two reasons for the pricing policy: one is to provide greater incentive for exploration, and the other is to get some movement away from the very extensive use of fuel in private motor cars. Part of this answer must be in terms of public transport. It could be in terms of conventional bus services but that must, in the short term, use the existing road that is available, or it could be in terms of better use of the present railway facilities. The point I make to the Government is that, if it wants to provide a service and save money, the best way of doing it is to use the existing services to the greatest possible level.

Regarding the Noarlunga Centre railway line, the problem is that we already have in effect three services being forced into the one double track between Woodlands Park and where the Noarlunga Centre line meets the Hills line at Goodwood. That already creates problems in programming for the S.T.A. One has the Noarlunga service, the Brighton service and the service from the Tonsley spur. I am told that it is practically impossible to get any more trains running on that line at present in peak hours because of the lead time problem from Woodlands Park, where the Tonsley Park service enters. It is most unlikely that the Government would be prepared to acquire additional land to provide a third track through the area because there would be political objections to this happening and it would be a costly procedure. Is it possible to get, by some other means, additional train services on that line? Of course it is possible because, in answer to my question, the Minister said that the present lead time was three minutes. He went on to say in reply to my question:

It may be possible to reduce this time to 1½ minutes by using considerably more sophisticated equipment. No such equipment is on order and is unlikely to be acquired in the near future due to the considerable expense involved.

One accepts that view point. However I would urge that this line of inquiry be followed through because it seems that, with a continual build-up of patronage of railway services, this would be one possible option available to the Minister.

Earlier I mentioned the survey undertaken by the City of Noarlunga in 1976. That is not particularly useful to us in terms of rail patronage because of service had not really got going at the time. Table 78 of the survey, which looked at modes travel to work, showed that 88 per cent of people in the area either drove to work as their principal mode or were passengers in somebody else's vehicle.

At that time only 2 per cent were using the train. I am aware that the Minister will be reporting to the House shortly on the Noarlunga transport study, and no doubt that report will have rather more up-to-date figures. I am well aware that there has been a dramatic increase in patronage on the line. It is extremely well used, and it seems to me to be one of the answers for the future. I am

disappointed that the Minister, in answer to other questions that I put on notice, is not prepared at this stage actually to commit the Government to the eventual extension of the Noarlunga Centre service south to Aldinga and also to the reopening of the line from Hallett Cove to Morphett Vale. I am aware of the fact that he has not ruled these out, and that he said he would look at their feasibility; but I would point out that the Government of which I was a part did commit itself to re-establishing these services. The very best construction one can put on this is that the Government is equivocating on the matter. No doubt I will get an answer to my question on whether some existing services on the Noarlunga Centre line are to be cut.

I missed the press release upon which my fellow commuters are making a judgment that in fact this is going to happen. I will be disappointed if it does happen and I will be interested to know what the services are, whether there will be, for example, a 5.20 service from Noarlunga Centre to Adelaide. I believe that quite a few people use that very early service. I do not know how many people use the express which leaves Adelaide at 4.42 a.m. and gets to Noarlunga Centre at 5.13. It is fairly critical which services are to be cut out. I would point out that I have used the mid-day service and the train is pretty well patronised at that time of day. I doubt whether there are many services on that line that are not extremely well patronised. These are possibilities for the future, and the Government will have problems in determining what the future will be for commuters to the older metropolitan area. There are some non-transport solutions to this problem on which I will expand later. I would urge on the Minister that there be a thorough examination of more sophisticated signalling which will squeeze more trains on to the line, and I am sure he will not be disappointed at the resulting patronage.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I want to refer to some problems which are obvious in the criminal justice system. The first of these is the rights of the victim in cases of criminal offences. The fact is that no Government, whether Liberal or Labor, has ever faced up to the reality of the fact that we give very little assistance to the victim of crime, as compared with the amount of time, money and effort we are prepared to put into the rehabilitation of the offender. It has been said in respect of my own Party that we instituted the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act and gradually uplifted the levels of payment. That of course is not really good enough. What I see as being a basic minimum demand for any victim of a violent offence is no less than what an injured worker would receive in the work place. After all, the chances of becoming a victim of a criminal offence are really similar to the chances of a lottery in most cases. We should be looking forward, first, to the proper financial compensation of victims of offences and secondly, to the proper rehabilitation in social terms of that victim.

I strongly support what was said by Mr. Whitrod, the former Commissioner of Police in Queensland and in other states of the Commonwealth, in his article in the *Advertiser* the other morning. There is another fundamental matter that causes great disturbance in the community; that is the increase in crimes of violence. In fact, crimes of violence have markedly increased throughout Australia and, indeed, throughout the whole western world over the past 20 years.

The problem is that no-one knows the cause of all this, the reason being that there has never been any proper or thorough research. If we want to find an answer we must be prepared to extend ourselves financially. One of the

things that has been suggested as a cause, especially for the violent offender, is lack of education.

It is noticeable that, if one looks at prison populations, one finds that well over 50 per cent (as high as 60 per cent or 70 per cent) of inmates are virtually illiterate, and the balance may have an education equivalent or barely equivalent to having finished primary school. In turn, that is linked to causes like poverty, disease, disturbances in the home from which that person came—

Mr. Mathwin: Truancy, too, is a factor.

Mr. McRAE: Truancy, incest, sexual molestation and all these things are factors. I do not believe that we will move far in trying to sort out this problem unless we are willing to give it the priority it demands. To do that we must be prepared to expend money. I hope in the Address in Reply debate to elaborate on these points to a much greater extent and point to some of the initial research that is being done.

I now turn to one matter that causes grave disturbance in the community, that is, the apparent disparity in sentencing. In many circles, people in the community blame this on the courts. I would like to give members four examples and ask them to reflect on whether they blame the situation on the courts or whether we ourselves should be taking stock of our own situation. I have here cases of four persons for whom I acted in the past three years. Case No. 1, involves a 40-year-old female charged with manslaughter; no previous convictions; not truthful to police; eventual plea guilty, maximum penalty available, life; actual penalty, three years suspended, with onerous bond.

Case No. 2, arson, 50-year-old male; minor previous convictions; unintelligent; almost destroyed family home; truthful, maximum penalty, life; actual, three years suspended, with onerous bond. Case No. 3, 18-year-old male; addicted to marijuana; basically a good person, however offence pre-mediated; maximum, life; actual three years suspended, with onerous bond. Case No. 4, driving under the influence; 45 year old male journalist; no troubles prior to 40 years of age; positive good record; addicted to alcohol; doctor said stress; kept job but only through pressure from union; minimum, 1 month; actual 1 month.

It is an extraordinary situation where Parliament seems to place a higher priority on the punishment of case No. 4, the drunken driver, than in the cases of manslaughter, arson or armed robbery. I am not saying that the first three cases are typical; of course, they are not, and far from it but, because they were not typical, the point is that the judges in each case felt that society would be better protected and the offenders better helped by the threat of imprisonment as an inducement to positive behaviour, and with the assistance of the bond process.

I suggest to members that case No. 4 is not typical, either, because it involved a man who was highly intelligent and who had a network of friends with brains, influence and money who were prepared to help him and did help him. That is not the usual situation that one finds.

The contrasting example is a man who has a problem with alcohol or drugs who has very few friends, little money, no influence and no particular intelligence. Therefore, this man, the normal case, gets two months in prison. He loses his job. His wife and family have every reason to hate him, and he has every reason to hate himself and the officials who are doing this to him.

He is not helped by being imprisoned with a miscellaneous group of rapists, bashers and child molesters. There is no-one in a position to offer rehabilitation because the period is just too short. Probably the wife and family are being supported by the

welfare system, and almost certainly after release he will be on unemployment benefits for some time. If he relied on his licence that period would become even more extended. But most important of all, after all this he still has his problem, namely, addiction to alcohol or drugs.

The fundamental problem is that no-one (and we can ask the Health Commission or doctors) knows why he has this problem. There are four or five possibilities why the man concerned has the problem, all related to stress, depression, or similar states, but again those people learned in these matters can only shrug their shoulders and say, "Well, we really do not know what causes these forms of addiction."

So, my point is that there are all sorts of problems in the criminal justice system. There are no easy answers to these problems, and the only way we can tackle them is by being prepared to pay for research.

I should like to squeeze in a final point as a positive contribution to the debate. Regarding case No. 4, the drinking driver, surely this Parliament could work out a system whereby the man's licence would be removed for an indeterminate period or, if he had to go to prison, it would be a different sort of prison. Instead, going to prison for one month or two months in one stretch, thereby losing his job, his self esteem and perhaps his family, and suffering all the things that go with it, could not the person involved serve 15 lots of weekends, or shorter periods of imprisonment? Surely, to enable this to occur, we could have a different sort of prison. It would not be terribly expensive for this sort of person, who is not normally or typically a violent person and who is, once he is in a state of sobriety, easy to deal with. We could have an Army barracks situation. It could be built near the Army barracks, if one likes, and we could try to solve the problem in that way.

I hope later in the session to develop these points in greater detail. They are worthy of the consideration of every Parliamentarian.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I compliment the member for Playford for what was the only reasonable contribution that we have heard all day from Opposition members. It is a pity that it is so late in the evening and that for about three minutes of the honourable member's speech there was no-one on the Opposition front bench. That was an insult to their own colleague. We have heard the performance of Opposition members in that regard in the past.

I make two brief comments, one of which relates to the severe attack made by the member for Price on his worship the Mayor of Port Adelaide. The attack was fairly severe and unwarranted, because the people in Semaphore made a clear decision. I refer to a circular from the Waterside Workers Federation, which issued the following note to its members on Thursday 13 September, just before the election.

Mr. Abbott: Are you a member?

Mr. BECKER: No, although I have some good contacts down there and I have some friends who are waterside workers.

Mr. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: That is about what I would expect from the member for Napier. The circular states:

Members are reminded that, in response to an appeal from the South Australian branch of the A.L.P. for funds towards the cost of the State election campaign, the branch executive decided that a \$5 voluntary levy be struck and that every endeavour should be made to collect same over a five-week period (now four weeks).

At the bottom, under the heading "George Apap", the circular states:

George Apap, the endorsed Labor candidate for Semaphore, must be wondering what happened to our non-political Mayor of Port Adelaide, who burst forth via an advertisement in the *Messenger* press advocating that the endorsed A.L.P. candidate be placed last on the ballot paper. Roy Marten may be non-political, but he is obviously anti-A.L.P.

Another issue of concern to A.L.P. voters at Semaphore is, "Why is it that the so-called Independent Labor candidate is giving his second preference to the Australian Democrats?" Surely a man who claims to support A.L.P. policy would desire his second preference votes to go to the endorsed Labor candidate.

Here comes the crunch:

Labor voters in Semaphore will realise that all these moves are designed to bring down the Labor Government and will act accordingly.

Certainly, they did so in Semaphore. They brought down the Labor Party candidate and the Labor Government. In other words, they rolled Apap, and so they should.

Mr. Mathwin: Brother George.

Mr. BECKER: Yes. Looking at the final figures for Semaphore, the A.L.P. polled 5 778, the Liberal Party 4 500, the Independent Labor candidate 5 106, and the Democrats 715. When we exclude the Democrat vote, the A.L.P. had 5 829, the Liberals 4 779, and the Independent Labor candidate 5 491. The Liberals were then excluded, and the A.L.P. finished up with 6 077, and the Independent Labor candidate with 10 022, or a great majority of 3 945.

I do not care what anyone says. It is about time the Labor Party in this State grew up and stopped complaining about the mistakes that led to its defeat on 15 September, and realised that the Liberal Party put up the best alternative and that the people voted happily for the Liberal Party. In Semaphore, the people decided that they would not have a bar of the endorsed A.L.P. candidate and voted for the Independent Labor candidate. In districts in which there are unknown candidates, the donkey vote is always handy. George Apap got it and, when we look at the distribution of preferences (and we shall bear in mind that 5 215 were distributed), the donkey vote was worth only 299. Without the donkey vote, he would have been well and truly rolled. Full credit to the Independent Labor candidate for Semaphore and his campaign helpers who gave him such a resounding victory. I hope that he will be here for many years to come, because it proves the weakness in the so-called united Labor Party campaign and the statements made during the election that that Party was united. So much for the card vote in Semaphore, where the people have proved that they can certainly think and are capable of voting for the best person to look after their interests. That has already been demonstrated by the performance in the House of the member for Semaphore.

Let us look at some of the complaints that have been made by the Opposition, and bear in mind the statistical information provided by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, M.L.C., information that has been well accepted. The largest swing against the Labor Party in the 15 September election was in Newland, namely, 15.9 per cent. We welcome the new member to the House, and undoubtedly he will be here for many years to come. He has already proved his worth. The next largest swing was in Florey, namely, 13.3 per cent. Credit must be given to Mrs. Bell for conducting an effective and active campaign in the district. She is a keen

and conscientious person, who deserves full credit for standing in the Florey District. Information of interest is shown in the Ascot Park District, where the swing against the Labor Party was 10.8 per cent.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: That's a marginal seat.

Mr. BECKER: Yes, of 1.7 per cent. No doubt that is one seat we will wrest away at the next State election.

The swing in Baudin was 10 per cent. It is interesting to note that in the electorate of Brighton the swing was 12.8 per cent, and we welcome the member for Brighton, who will be here for quite some time. It is also interesting to note that in the electorate of Coles we were able to gain a swing of 10.8 per cent, proving the effectiveness and the hard work of our lone female member in this House, who I know after the next election will be joined by other female members. In the electorate of Elizabeth the swing was 11.8 per cent. In the electorate of Henley Beach the swing was 10.3 per cent, and we welcome the member for Henley Beach who proved what hard work, determination and honest representation will bring. The swing in the electorate of Mawson was 9.5 per cent, which was also a strong effort. The real surprise of the election was the electorate of Norwood, because on the 1977 figures there was a swing of 10.3 per cent, and no doubt the talent of the new member will prove at long last that the people of that electorate were right.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: What about the member for Davenport? He had a bit of a fight!

Mr. BECKER: The member for Davenport had an 80.6 per cent vote and he has certainly proved his worth over the years. The member for Playford certainly has something to worry about, because his is a marginal seat and with 55.1 per cent of the vote he suffered an 11.5 per cent swing. In the electorate of Price there was an 8.9 per cent swing. The great effort was in the electorate of Todd where we obtained 11.1 per cent, and that member is proving that hard work, determination and sincere consideration for the people in that electorate will keep him with us for many years to come.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: With the concurrence of honourable members I intend to deal with the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) in total first, followed by the Public Purposes Loan Bill.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Schedule.

Legislative Council, \$226 000.

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): In the vote to the Clerk of the Legislative Council, I notice the amount proposed is \$31 063, an increase from the previous year. What is the percentage calculation involved, and is that a standard calculation that will be applied to salary and wages throughout the next financial year?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): That amount is due to the national wage increases during the year. The proposed salary is that as at 30 June 1979. I do not have percentages for the Leader of the Opposition, but I suggest that he could work them out very easily.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 1.25 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 24 October at 2 p.m.