

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 30 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. 3, 4, 15, 29, 30, 32, 33, 39, 41, 42, 44 to 47, 49, 50, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60, 68, 69, 71, 74, 76 to 78, 82, 83, 86, 88, 92, 105, 110, 119, 125, 131, 136, 142, 143, 146, 153, 155, 156, 159, 161, 162, 165, 169, 170, 172, 175, 176, 178, 179, 181 to 183, 198, 200, 201, 203, 204, 209, 211, 214, 218, 220, 221, 224, 233, 244, 252, 261, 263, 266 and 268.

PUBLIC DEBT

3. The Hon. B. C. EASTICK (on notice):

1. By what amount did the South Australian public debt increase or decrease in 1978-79 and how does the percentage alteration vary from that of the preceding five financial periods?

2. What is the estimated increase or decrease for 1979-80 and what, if any, positive steps are being taken by the Government to effect economies in this area?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows: The public debt increased by \$96 387 252 in 1978-79. The following table sets out movements in the public debt for the last six financial years:

	Balance of public debt at 30 June \$	Increase/ Decrease \$	Percentage Increase/ Decrease
1974 . . .	1 481 336 694	66 208 002	4.68
1975* . .	1 425 332 761		-56 003 933
1976* . .	1 394 701 639	-30 631 122	-2.15
1977 . . .	1 495 736 967	101 035 328	7.24
1978 . . .	1 605 833 769	110 096 802	7.36
1979 . . .	1 702 221 021	96 387 252	6.00

*Public debt taken over by Commonwealth:

1975—Pursuant to the Amending Financial Agreement Act (\$130 000 000).

1976—Pursuant to the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Act (\$124 000 000).

It is estimated that the Public Debt will increase by almost five per cent in 1979-80.

Government control over the capital works programme includes Cabinet screening of all proposals and the exercise of conventional cost and budget controls.

MEAT

4. The Hon. B. C. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What has been Samcor's monthly production of meat meal since 1 January 1978 to the present, and what has been the price per tonne throughout this period?

2. Is meat meal still exported interstate or overseas and, if so, how much, to which destinations and at what export price?

3. If no export is currently permitted, when is it expected that exports will resume and at what price?

4. Are there any plans for ensuring home supplies prior to export and, if so, what are the relevant details?

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

Month	Production of meat meal by Samcor in tonnes	Local Price per tonne (Bulk) \$
January 1978	721	190
February	870	190
March	733	190
April	373	195
May	733	195
June	369	195
July	323	195
August	298	190
September	366	190
October	670	185
November	639	185
December	600	185
January 1979	576	187
February	616	198
March	575	215
April	339	255
May	363	260
June	320	300
July	494	330
August	537	380
September	676	300
October (to date)	200	260

2. No. In the case of export, not since May 1978, and interstate not since January 1978.

3. Exports are now permitted on a shipment by shipment basis under the supervision of the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry.

Samcor does not envisage the need to export meat and bone meal in the foreseeable future. This will depend on the support of the local farming community for ruling market rates and production levels.

4. The local market will continue to receive Samcor's support in preference to export. During recent local shortages Samcor arranged purchases of meat and bone meal from interstate to supplement production and to ensure adequate supplies for the South Australian market.

LIGHT INDUSTRY

15. Mr. PAYNE (on notice):

1. Has the Government received submissions for a rezoning of the Aberfoyle Park-Happy Valley area to provide land for light industry and, if so, what is the Government's attitude to these submissions?

2. What objections, if any, have been received to the proposals?

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

1. The draft supplementary development plan for the Meadows district including the Aberfoyle Park-Happy Valley area will be placed on public exhibition on 18 October 1979. It is understood that Meadows council rezoning proposals for the same area will be placed on public exhibition in the near future.

The supplementary development plan and the rezoning proposals make allowance for the provision of service industry within the proposed district centre on South Australian Land Commission land. An area of approximately 8 hectares could be available within the district centre for sensitively developed light industry or service industry purposes. Such development would be subject to Meadows council planning approval.

2. No objections to these proposals have been received to date.

BOAT LAUNCHING FACILITY

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

1. Are plans in hand for an all-weather boat launching facility in the area south of Hallett Cove?

2. Where and when might such a facility be built?

3. What provision would have to be made for access to the site?

4. What is the estimated cost of such a facility and the likely breakdown of costs as between Local Government, the Coast Protection Board and other instrumentalities?

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

1. The Noarlunga council has produced plans for an all-weather boat launching facility south of Hallett Cove. However, Government consideration of the plans has been deferred pending the council obtaining a suitable site.

2. Vide No. 1.

3. This would depend on the site chosen.

4. The estimated cost of the project as submitted by the Noarlunga council is between \$800 000 and \$1 000 000.

COROMANDEL VALLEY DAM

30. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Does the Government intend to proceed with the acquisition of the land on which the so-called Coromandel Valley dam is situated?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes.

MUSGRAVE RANGES SCHOOLS

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

1. How many Aboriginal children are enrolled at schools in the Musgrave Ranges?

2. What is the average daily attendance of these children at those schools?

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

1. There are currently six schools in the North-West Aboriginal reserves area. Only two of these, Amata and Ernabella, are actually situated in the Musgrave Ranges. However, details of all six schools are supplied to give an overall view of enrolments and attendance statistics for the North-West area. Pre-school children are not included.

Amata 85

Ernabella 109

Fregon 64

Indulkana 83

Mimili 44

Pipalyatjara 38

2. The average daily attendance of children at these schools is as follows:

per cent

Amata 70 (82)

Ernabella 88 (81)

Fregon 53 (83)

Indulkana 70 (84)

Mimili 27 (61)

Pipalyatjara 34 (90)

SCHOOL DENTAL SERVICE

33. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Does the Government intend to continue to expand the School Dental Service and, if so, what expansion can be anticipated in the next twelve months?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: Subject to the availability of funds and physical resources, it is intended that the school dental service will be extended to cover all primary schoolchildren in 1980.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF TEACHERS

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

1. Is the Government aware that a breakaway union from the South Australian Institute of Teachers is currently in the process of being formed?

2. Has the Minister had any discussions with any representatives of this group and, if not, does he intend to have such discussions?

3. What, generally, is the attitude of the Government toward this group?

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

1. Yes.

2. (a) by correspondence.

(b) not at this stage, as the South Australian Institute of Teachers is recognised as the official body.

3. See No. 2.

METROPOLITAN COUNTY BOARD

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

1. Is the Government aware that some concern exists in the community over the future of the Metropolitan County Board?

2. What local government bodies have—

(a) disaffiliated from the Board; and

(b) affiliated with the Board in the last twelve months?

3. Is the Government prepared to commit itself to the continued existence of the Board at its present staffing level irrespective of local government affiliations?

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

1. Yes.

2. (a) None.

(b) None.

3. The functions of the Central Board of Health, county boards and local boards of health have been under study by the Advisory Committee on Boards of Health, set up to advise on future relationships between the S.A. Health Commission and boards of health. No decision will be taken in regard to the continued existence of the Metropolitan County Board or of the extent of its functions until the report of the advisory committee has been received.

STRAYING ANIMALS

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

Will the Government amend the law to allow the driver of a motor vehicle which collides with a straying animal to make a claim for damages against the owner of the animal of the land on which the animal was supposed to be located?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The problem of civil liability for straying animals is currently being considered by the Law Reform Committee of South Australia. The committee has been awaiting the outcome of a decision of the High Court of Australia in a case involving liability of straying stock; that decision has only recently been handed down. The Government will make a decision on whether to legislate on the matter when it receives the report of the Law Reform Committee.

HALLETT COVE SUBDIVISION

44. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Is there currently before the Government a plan for the subdivision of any of that area of land on the western side of the Noarlunga Centre railway line between Hallett Cove and Hallett Cove Beach railway stations and, if so—

- (i) when is the development likely to proceed;
- (ii) will any part of the subdivision about the site of scientific interest; and
- (iii) will the subdivision provide a link between the two currently disconnected portions of the Cove Road

and, if not, what other plans are in hand to link Hallett Cove Estate with Hallett Cove Beach?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes. There are two current subdivision applications contained in S.P.O. dockets 6099/78 and 6100/78. These applications were lodged with the Deputy Director of Planning on 16 October 1978, and given letter form A (tentative approval) on 4 July 1979 after approval by the City of Marion and consultation with the Department for the Environment and other Government departments and authorities concerned.

- (i) It is a matter for the subdivider as to when the development is likely to proceed. It is understood he is waiting on approval by the City of Marion to engineering plans before commencing any site works. However, prior to the issue of the letter form's A the subdivider was very keen to make a start on portion of the subdivision south of Waterfall Creek.
- (ii) Both of these subdivisions about the site of scientific interest.
- (iii) Yes. These two subdivisions make provision for the linking of the two currently disconnected portions of Cove Road.

"EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES NEWSLETTER"

45. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Will the Government continue to publish the "Equal Opportunities Newsletter" and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes.

SALISBURY EDUCATION CENTRE

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

1. On what basis does the Commonwealth fund the Salisbury Education Centre?

2. Does the Government believe that the Centre should be maintained at its present staffing level irrespective of the level of Commonwealth support?

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

1. The Commonwealth funds the Salisbury Education Centre under the State Grants (Schools Assistance) Act No. 133 of 1976, through the Schools Commission.

2. The situation will be reviewed if and when such a change occurs.

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE RECORDS

47. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Is the Minister of Education seeking a Crown Law opinion on whether school attendance records should be made available to persons seeking children claimed to be missing and, if so, will such opinion be made available to the House and if it will not be made available, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: While I am not certain if Dr. Hopgood's reference to "school attendance records" is in relation to records of students' attendance or enrolments, I have assumed that it is the latter in view of the reference to persons seeking missing children. The Crown Solicitor has recently advised that the department is under no legal obligation to disclose information concerning children. However, he has qualified that advice by saying that discretion should be exercised according to the facts of the case, particularly where the person seeking the information is in possession of a court order for custody. Previous advice from the Crown Solicitor has been to the effect that the department should co-operate wherever possible when it can be seen that to do so would be in the best interest of the child concerned.

QUARRY REHABILITATION FUND

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

1. How much money is currently held in the Quarry Rehabilitation Fund?

2. What have been the receipts and expenditures of the fund for each of the past two financial years and what are the anticipated figures for the current financial year?

3. Does the Government plan to change the system in any way?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows:

1. The balance held in the Extractive Areas Rehabilitation Fund at the Treasury as at 15 October 1979 was \$491 667 (credit), of which \$334 000 was committed to current projects.

2. Receipts and payments of the fund for each of the past two financial years were:

	Receipts	Payments
	\$	\$
1977-78..	447 495	519 491
1978-79..	454 871	400 625

The anticipated receipts and payments for the current financial year are:

	\$
Receipts	690 000
Payments	934 000

3. It is not intended to change the system in respect to the fund's operations.

MARION HIGH SCHOOL

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

1. What damage occurred at Marion High School as a result of the recent fires?

2. What will be the cost of replacing or repairing the damaged rooms and materials?

3. Were police informed of the first fire before the second fire occurred?

4. Will additional security measures be undertaken at that school?

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

1. On Saturday 6 October 1979, fire destroyed an office and store room and damaged toilets and change rooms, all of which were located in a single solid building. On Sunday 7 October 1979, fire destroyed a quad timber building used as a drama centre.

2. The total estimated cost of the damage was \$100 000. The timber building will not, however, be replaced. Action has been taken to reinstate the solid change room building and to convert an existing triple timber building for drama. Cost estimates for the repairs and conversions

are from \$50 000 to \$60 000.

3. Police from the Darlington C.I.B. were in attendance while the first fire was in progress and filed a report at 10.45 p.m. on Saturday 6 October 1979.

4. The school has been short listed for the provision of a security patrol service. This service was implemented immediately after the fire.

JUNIOR PRIMARY SCHOOLS

54. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Which junior primary schools will be disestablished at the end of the current school year?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Three junior primary schools will be disestablished, those at Mitchell Park, Le Fevre Peninsula and Taperoo. Detailed discussions have been held with school councils and the position is accepted.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF EDUCATION

55. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Who comprise the selection panel charged with making a recommendation for the appointment of a new Deputy Director-General of Education?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The selection panel charged with making a recommendation for the appointment of a new Deputy Director-General of Education vice Harris comprised the following: a Public Service Commissioner, the Women's Adviser to the Education Department, and the Director-General of Education.

LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

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

1. How many cases of legionnaire's disease have been reported in South Australia?

2. How many deaths have occurred in this State as a result of the disease?

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

1. Three.

2. One.

SCHOOL ENROLMENTS

58. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): What are the anticipated enrolments at:

(a) Government primary schools; and

(b) Government secondary schools, for February 1980?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: In February 1980 the enrolments in South Australian Government schools are expected to be 139 300 primary students and 80 000 secondary students, excluding students in special schools which are not usually included in February returns. There are currently about 1 660 students in special schools.

PORT NOARLUNGA

60. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Will the Government, through the Coast Protection Board, honour the commitments of its predecessor regarding the redesign of the Port Noarlunga foreshore and the making of a contribution to the new club-house for the Port Noarlunga Surf Life-saving Club?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes. The Government has

approved a subsidy of \$127 500 from coast protection funds to the City of Noarlunga towards various components of the council's foreshore improvement project.

NOARLUNGA SERVICES FORUM

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

1. Is the Government aware that the Noarlunga Community Services Forum has written to the State Director, Commonwealth Department of Education, emphasising the need for an education programme for unemployed youth in the Noarlunga area?

2. Has a similar approach been made to or by the State Government and what assistance, if any, is the State prepared to give?

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

1. Yes, the Government is aware that the Noarlunga Community Services Forum has written to the State Director, Commonwealth Department of Education, emphasising the need for education programmes for unemployed youth in the Noarlunga area. The funds for the education programme for unemployed youth which is offered by the Department of Further Education originate from the Commonwealth Government. Funds available fall short of those needed and have to be allocated according to a priority list determined on the basis of the number of students eligible to attend the courses. The Noarlunga-Hackham area, on the information provided by the Commonwealth Employment Service, is not given a high priority.

2. As far as I am aware, no similar approach has been made to State Government. The State Government, in conjunction with the State Director Commonwealth Department of Education, has approached the Commonwealth Government requesting additional funding for the education programmes for unemployed youth in South Australia. The Department of Further Education, through its normal range of offerings, provides a wide variety of courses which assist unemployed youth in finding employment.

SCHOOL CLASS SIZES

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

What would be the cost to the State in a single year of—

(a) providing 10 per cent non-contact time for teachers in all primary schools;

(b) reducing all class sizes in primary schools to a maximum of 25 pupils; and

(c) reducing all class sizes in high schools to a maximum of 20 pupils,

(all other variables being held constant in each case)?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is not possible to provide this information at short notice. Considerable research will be required to answer parts (b) and (c) accurately because of the current policy of not giving schools specific instructions on how staff is to be utilised, rather allowing Principals to deploy staff according to the specific needs of the school within the staffing target.

BOOK-STUDENT RATIO

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

1. What is the book student ratio recommended by the Technical and Further Education Council for further education institutions?

2. What is this figure for South Australian colleges of further education?

3. What plans, if any, has the Government in hand to improve these ratios?

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

1. The Technical and Further Education Council has adopted the following figures for bookstock in TAFE colleges as interim goals to be reached by 1981:

(a) not less than 10 000 volumes for a college with an individual student enrolment of less than 2 000;

(b) not less than 25 000 volumes for a college with a student population (individual enrolment) of between 2 000 and 5 000;

(c) not less than 50 000 volumes for a college with a student population (individual enrolment) of between 5 000 and 10 000;

(d) not less than 5 000 books for every additional 1 000 individual enrolments;

(e) the above figure should include a basic collection of reference books of not less than 1 000 volumes in each library;

(f) in colleges with fewer than 1 000 student enrolments and without staffed libraries an interim figure of 5 books per student.

In effect a figure of five books per student applies in each group.

2. Total library holdings in South Australian colleges of further education were just over 200 000 volumes at the end of 1978. The individual student enrolment figure for the year was 123 264, providing a book to student ratio of approximately 1.65:1.

3. The improvement of its library resources remains a high priority of the Department of Further Education. Despite financial constraints it is planned to achieve a ratio of 2:1 during 1980.

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

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

1. How many people are presently employed with the Division of Co-ordination and Policy of the Department for the Environment?

2. What are the responsibilities of the division in relation to the promotion of inter-departmental liaison with respect to the environmental aspects of planning?

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

1. Nineteen.

2. The division has been closely involved with the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs in the development of planning policies for such areas as the Mount Lofty Range and in reviewing proposed planning policies.

FERAL CATS

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

1. Has the National Parks and Wildlife Division of the Department for the Environment, or any other Government body, any plans—

(a) to control the destructive and predatory activities of feral cats in natural bushland areas; or

(b) to eradicate the feral cat from these areas, and, if not, why not, and, if so, what measures does the National Parks and Wildlife Division propose to use?

2. Will the Government treat this problem as a matter of urgency?

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

1. (a) No.

(b) No. There is at present no acceptable effective method available for controlling feral cats in natural bushland and no suitable method to eradicate them.

2. There is no firm evidence that feral cats have increased in recent years, but the Government is aware of the situation and departmental staff will continue to dispose of them when and wherever possible.

NOISE CONTROL UNIT

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

1. How many complaints have been received each month by the Noise Control Unit within the Department for the Environment since the Noise Control Act came into force in July 1978 for:

(a) domestic noise; and

(b) industrial noise?

2. What categories of complaints with respect to:

(a) domestic noise; and

(b) industrial noise,

have been defined by the Noise Control Unit?

3. Is there a priority for attention among these categories and, if so, what is this priority listing?

4. Is the unit able to cope with all the complaints which it now receives and, if not, what remedial measures does the Government intend to take to rectify this situation?

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

1. The number of complaints received by the Noise Control Unit since July 1978 are as follows:

Domestic			
July 1978	92	January 1979	174
August 1978	112	February 1979	145
September 1978	93	March 1979	136
October 1978	113	April 1979	71
November 1978	128	May 1979	109
December 1978	70	June 1979	77
		July 1979	91
		August 1979	79
		September 1979	40
Industrial and Other Non-Domestic			
July 1978	30	January 1979	42
August 1978	20	February 1979	27
September 1978	23	March 1979	32
October 1978	14	April 1979	26
November 1978	30	May 1979	26
December 1978	34	June 1979	36
		July 1979	20
		August 1979	21
		September 1979	16

2. (a) Domestic noise: machines, animals, other.

(b) Industrial noise: machinery, operations, other non-domestic noise (other than industrial); machinery, places of public entertainment, other.

3. Unless there is good reason to vary priorities, complaints in general are dealt with in chronological order.

4. I believe that it is.

CLELAND CONSERVATION PARK

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

1. What are the details of progress in the upgrading of the Cleland Conservation Park in the following areas—

(a) restocking of the aviary with parrots;

(b) extension and upgrading of the koala areas;

(c) introduction of yellow-footed rock wallabies;

(d) reticulated irrigation system;

- (e) new swamp area;
- (f) fox-proof fences and eradication of rats; and
- (g) fire tracks?

2. Has a new entrance to the park been completed and, if so, is this entrance now being used, and, if not, why not?

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

1. (a) A major upgrading of the aviary has been undertaken during the past twelve months. The entire roof and one side has been re-wired and the interior has been landscaped with trees and nesting logs. The aviary has been re-stocked with hardbilled parrots. Twenty-eight suitable birds have been introduced so far, and more will be introduced later in the year.

(b) Minor repairs have been undertaken to the koala areas, including repairs to the lofts, new iron sheeting has been erected to prevent escape and new display stands erected for photographing and handling koalas. Further major work has been deferred pending examination of the Fauna Zone by the Cleland Conservation Park Trust.

(c) Work on the introduction of yellow-footed rock wallabies has been deferred pending examination of the fauna zone by the Cleland Conservation Park Trust.

(d) The first stage of laying of 150 mm main reticulation water system serving the fauna area and surrounding facilities is nearing completion.

(e) The development of a swamp area is currently being considered by the Cleland Conservation Park Trust.

(f) Fox-proof fencing has been completed along the eastern and western boundary, and work has also been done on part of the northern and southern boundary fences. The electric fencing on the entire boundary fence has been upgraded.

Rats have been eradicated from the aviary and other animal enclosures. A continuous monitoring programme is being undertaken to ensure that any isolated infestations are handled quickly and effectively.

(g) The fire track from the fauna zone to Waterfall Gully has been upgraded. Minor upgrading work has been done on existing fire tracks throughout the winter in preparation for the forthcoming fire season.

2. The new entrance to the park is actually a slight re-design of the existing entrance roadway. This roadway is now in use.

ECOLOGICAL UNIT

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

1. What areas of South Australia are being studied by the Ecological Unit of the Department for the Environment at the present time?

2. How are these areas being studied?

3. Will the information collected by the unit be used to assist in preparing a broad land use and land management plan for South Australia and, if not, why not, and, if so, when will such a plan be completed?

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

1. The Ecological Survey Unit is implementing the South Australian Natural Resources Inventory (SANRI). As part of this Inventory, the Unit is working in the Unnamed Conservation Park, Strathearn and Kalabity Pastoral Leases north of Olary and in several areas on minor programmes such as the South Para Reservoir.

2. Studies are undertaken using LANDSAT imagery, ground field work and aerial survey (including helicopter). The ground teams will prepare, at a management level, detailed vegetation maps at scales of 1:100 000 to 1:50 000. The studies place emphasis on defining the ecological boundaries and suggesting practical management strategies derived from these.

It should be noted that this is the first time in Australia that such remote sensing based inventories are being carried out in National Parks.

Similar techniques are being used in the Arid Lands Ecology Programme, but in greater detail. This project is the prime research area in applications of remote sensing.

3. This has yet to be determined. Should such a decision be made the information collected by the Unit would be used to assist in its preparation.

ROADSIDE SIGNS

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

1. What is the Government's policy in relation to roadside signs where the sign is used to indicate the direction to a winery?

2. How does the Department for the Environment define advertising in relation to signs of this nature?

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

1. Roadside signs are subject to the Control of Advertisements Act, 1916-35.

District Councils erect signs coloured brown with white lettering, indicating a winery or a winery tour route. The Government has decided these will not be subject to removal where such signs have the approval of Council and the Department of Tourism.

2. The Control of Advertisements Regulations, 1928-77 refers to signs as being:

"... any sign, placard, poster or boarding or any device whatsoever designed to be an advertisement."

HILLS FACE ZONE

86. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice): What is the Government's policy relating to the installation within the hills face zone of services by—

(a) E.T.S.A.;

(b) E.&W.S.; and

(c) any other Government instrumentality?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The present policy for installation of services in the hills face zone is related to the requirements of the Metropolitan Development Plan and the Hills Face Zone Regulations.

BOLIVAR TREATMENT WORKS

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

1. What is the capacity of the toxic liquid waste disposal facility at the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works?

2. Is this capacity utilised by the community to its fullest extent and, if not, why not?

3. Is this the only toxic liquid waste disposal facility in South Australia?

4. Can the Department for the Environment and/or the Engineering and Water Supply Department estimate what percentage of toxic liquid waste produced in South Australia is disposed of via this facility at Bolivar and, if not, why not and, if so, what is this percentage?

5. How is it thought that the remaining toxic liquid waste is disposed of and does the Government consider that such disposal methods present an environmental and health hazard to the people of South Australia?

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

1. 40 700 KL/annum of acid, alkali, cyanide and sulphide wastes.

2. The design capacity was based on waste volumes

determined by a questionnaire sent to major producers of toxic liquid wastes in November, 1973.

Liquid wastes delivered to the facility since its construction have been less than its capacity.

3. No. There are other private and local government liquid waste disposal sites.

4. Yes. Approximately 65 per cent of oil-free toxic liquid wastes produced in Adelaide are disposed of via the Bolivar facility.

Following recent discussions between the Engineering and Water Supply Department and a major liquid waste producer, it is anticipated that the proportion of oil-free toxic liquid wastes produced in Adelaide and disposed of at Bolivar, will increase to over 90 per cent.

5. The Department for the Environment believes that the remaining waste is disposed of to landfill, and other sites. There has been no evidence that this practice has resulted in any health or environmental hazard. It is considered that these problems will be overcome in large part with the formation of the South Australian Waste Management Commission.

MARINE CONSERVATION

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

1. Will the marine localities described as:
 - (a) 202 hectares at Troubridge Hill; and
 - (b) the east side of St. Vincent Gulf between Barker Inlet and Port Wakefield,

be reserved for conservation purposes?

2. Have requests been made to the Minister about these localities by any organisations and, if so, from what organisations, and will the Minister grant these requests and, if not, why not?

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

1. The Department of Fisheries is presently seeking comment from interested parties about the two marine localities at Troubridge Hill and Barker/Port Wakefield. No decision has been made as to their proclamation.

2. Two requests have been received:

- (a) The Scuba Divers Association of South Australia requested that the area near Troubridge Hill be considered as a site for an aquatic reserve.
- (b) The South Australian Nature Conservation Society recommended in 1972 that the area which has been included within the proposed boundaries of the East Gulf St. Vincent Mangrove Aquatic Reserve be set aside for conservation purposes.

A meeting is being sought of bodies affected by any proclamation and a decision will be made when the matter has been fully considered.

HILLS FACE ZONE

105. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice):

1. Is the Minister aware of the problem caused by persons riding trail bikes in the hills and gullies immediately east of Para Hills?

2. Will the Minister review the current difficulties which prevent the police and other authorities from stopping the nuisance and annoyance to residents and damage to the environment of the hills face?

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

1. The Department for the Environment has not received any complaints regarding persons riding trail bikes in the hills and gullies immediately east of Para Hills.

2. Yes.

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

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

1. What is the policy of the Government regarding the allocation of resources for the development of educational facilities between the inner metropolitan area and the outer metropolitan areas?

2. Can the Minister give an undertaking that children living in outer metropolitan areas will not be disadvantaged as a result of reallocation of funds available for the development of facilities?

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

1. Government policy does not discriminate between areas. It is stated Government policy to place emphasis on upgrading or replacing, where necessary, inadequate accommodation in established areas as rapidly as finances permit.

2. Yes.

SAND REPLENISHMENT

119. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice): Will the Government continue to fund the Coast Protection Board's sand replenishment programme for the metropolitan beaches, and, if so, what is the anticipated cost of this project for the next 12 months and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes, \$150 000.

GOODWOOD ORPHANAGE

125. **Mr. LANGLEY** (on notice):

1. Will the Government be proceeding, in conjunction with the Corporation of the City of Unley, with the landscaping of the Goodwood Orphanage grounds and, if so, when will the project be completed?

2. On what basis will the public have access to these grounds?

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

1. Yes. Stage I in the development of the grounds and additional facilities are planned to be established over a number of years.

2. The premises and grounds have always been available for community use and have been used by the Education Department associated groups, other Government department groups, community groups like the Playgrounds Association of S.A., Lions Club and the Unley Horticultural Society, and individuals from the surrounding Unley City Council areas. In addition, the grounds have been used by St. Thomas' Catholic Primary School.

In the future, it is intended that the grounds be made available for community and individual use. As the development proceeds, the improved standard and increased variety of facilities available will enable more and more people to use the grounds.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

131. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Is it the policy of the Government to vary the current terms of employment for persons employed pursuant to the Public Service Act and, if so, in what manner and why?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Government does not intend at this time to vary the current terms of

employment for persons employed pursuant to the Public Service Act.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES

136. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Is it the policy of the Government to change the constitution, structure or membership of any of the Parliamentary Committees and, if so, why?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Not at present.

PUBLIC ACTUARY'S DEPARTMENT

142. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Is it the policy of the Government to reduce the staff of the Public Actuary's Department and, if so, why?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is no Public Actuary's Department. The Public Actuary's Office is part of the Treasury Department. There are no plans at this stage to reduce staff in the Public Actuary's Office.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES

143. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Is it the policy of the Government that the hearing of Committees of this House be in public and open to the media and, if so, what new facilities, if any, will be required and at what cost?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That matter is being considered.

LAND COMMISSION

146. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Is it Government policy to absorb the Land Commission into the Housing Trust and, if so, why?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Government is currently examining the future role of the South Australian Land Commission, but to date no decision has been made.

GUARANTOR OF LOANS

153. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): Is the Government in fact the "Guarantor of Loans" for the South Australian National Football League and if not, has the Government received an application from the League to become a guarantor for a specified loan and what does the Government propose in respect of that application?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There are Government guarantees outstanding in relation to borrowings by the South Australian National Football League. It is the general policy of the Government to maintain the confidentiality traditionally observed between lender and borrower and not to disclose details of transactions of this kind in normal circumstances.

COOPER PEDY HOSPITAL

155. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice): Will the Government allocate funds to upgrade and extend the facilities at the Cooper Pedy Hospital and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: Yes.

PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE

156. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice): Does the Government intend to allow private interests to take over the running of certain parts of the Parks Community Centre and, if so, which areas will be taken over and what is the reason for this decision?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: No decision has been taken on allowing private interests to take over the running of certain parts of the Parks Community Centre.

PUBLIC SERVANTS

159. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice): Is the Government prepared to allow public servants who have been elected to local government bodies time off to properly dispense their obligations to their electors and, if so, when will this policy be implemented and on what basis?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: No.

HALLETT COVE RAMP

161. **Dr. HOPGOOD:** Has the Coast Protection Board had any discussions with the City of Marion or other interested parties with a view to providing a permanent boat launching ramp at Hallett Cove and, if so, what will be the nature of the assistance?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes. A subsidy of \$5 000 (representing 50 per cent of the estimated cost of \$10 000) has been approved for the City Council of Marion to upgrade the existing beach access ramp for sea rescue use.

VICTIMS OF CRIME

162. **Dr. HOPGOOD:** Does the Government intend to give any financial assistance to the organisation set up at the suggestion of Mr. R. W. Whitrod to give aid to victims of crime and, if so, when and on what basis?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The organisation known as "Victims of Crime Service" has made no application for financial assistance.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL SCHOOL

165. **Dr. HOPGOOD:** Does the Government intend to increase the teaching staff at the Adelaide Children's Hospital Special School in this financial year and, if so, by how many and, if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The school staff will be reduced by one from 1980. The reasons are reduced numbers of children at the hospital, and a considerably shorter stay on average than in the past. Arrangements made within the hospital school should ensure that there will be no reduction in service to the smaller number of children requiring it.

NOARLUNGA SUBDIVISION

169. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Has the South Australian Housing Trust plans to subdivide the area between the Noarlunga Regional Centre and the Onkaparinga estuary and, if so, when will work begin on the subdivision, and will this development involve the closure of a portion of Honeypot Road?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The South Australian

Housing Trust has received planning approval from both the Director of Planning and the Corporation of the City of Noarlunga for a plan of subdivision for the development of the area known as Noarlunga Downs. This approval was granted on 16 July 1977. Since that time further negotiations have taken place on the future alignment of the possible southern extension of the railway from the Noarlunga Centre, and on the southern limit of residential development on the elevated land above the estuary. The latter matter is yet to be resolved. It is anticipated that development may commence in mid-1980. The subdivision proposal shows that a portion of Honeypot Road between Morton and Dyson Roads will be closed. Two alternative routes will be provided to maintain direct access between these roads. I should also point out that the conduct of the road closure procedures are a responsibility of the council.

SCHOOL ENROLMENTS

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

1. How many schools in South Australia allow children to be enrolled on or immediately following their fifth birthday?

2. Does the Government favour this practice and, if so, does it intend that the practice become universal, and, if not, why not?

3. Would such further expansion of the practice be as a result of school-based decisions or at the behest of the Education Department?

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

1. A survey conducted in 1978 showed that 75 per cent of all primary schools were admitting children on some continuous basis following their fifth birthday.

2. The new policy was announced in the *Education Gazette* on 25 July 1979:

The admission of children aged five shall be provided for in all (junior) primary schools at the beginning of each school term but within that provision, schools should endeavour to receive intakes more frequently. The choice will be made on the basis of the interests of children after consultation between principal, staff and local community, having regard to the arrangement adopted in neighbourhood schools, if appropriate. The enrolment of a child aged five is a matter of parental choice and when this choice is made, the child shall be admitted to the school at the next intake.

This is Government policy and will come into effect on 1 January 1980.

3. The policy states that there is flexibility in the system which allows for decisions about more frequent intakes to be decided by the school in consultation with the parents and local community.

NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL

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

1. Does the Government intend that a hospital be built adjacent to the Noarlunga Regional Centre and, if so, will this hospital be public, community or private, and when will work commence?

2. If it is to be a private hospital, will it be built by the consortium which negotiated with the former Government and will a guarantee be available?

3. Will the hospital include casualty, maternity and out-patient services?

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

1. Yes, a private hospital.

2. Yes and yes.

3. These services were not included in the approval

given by the former Government for the scheme to proceed. These two matters are being re-examined.

PRINCIPAL EDUCATION OFFICERS

175. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): How many officers of the Education Department carry the title of Principal Education Officer, and how many of these people are:

(a) centrally based; and

(b) in regions?

The Hon. H. ALLISON:

(a) Central Office:	25
Directorate of Curriculum:	
Secondary subject areas	14
Heads of branches	5
Early childhood education	1
Aboriginal education	1
Special education	1
	<hr/>
	22
	<hr/>
Directorate of Personnel:	2
Directorate of Educational Facilities	1
(b) Regions:	43

CHILDHOOD SERVICES COUNCIL

176. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Does the Government intend to have an inquiry into the Childhood Services Council and, if so, when will such inquiry take place, who will conduct it, and what will be its terms of reference?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Government will not be holding a formal inquiry into the Childhood Services Council.

NOARLUNGA BUS SERVICE

178. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Will the State Transport Authority provide a bus service between the old Noarlunga township and the recently opened Noarlunga Regional Centre and, if so, when, and if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: A private bus operator, Aldinga Beach Hire Service and Sales, presently provides a bus service from Aldinga Beach to Noarlunga Centre, travelling along the Noarlunga By-pass close to the township of old Noarlunga. Based on the present patronage of this service the State Transport Authority considers that it would not be justified in providing a direct service to the old township.

NOARLUNGA RAIL SERVICES

179. **Dr. HOPGOOD** (on notice): Does the State Transport Authority intend to curtail some services on the Adelaide/Noarlunga Centre railway line and, if so, which services and why?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Adjustments to rail services on the Noarlunga Centre line proposed by the State Transport Authority, are aimed at improving the service in the face of increased patronage. Peak period patronage from areas south of Brighton has reached a stage at which it is necessary to make alterations to the service pattern to accommodate the passenger loading. Overall, there will be an additional four services daily, Monday to Friday, to Noarlunga Centre, and one less service between Adelaide

and Brighton. As all trains to or from Noarlunga Centre stop at Brighton, commuters from that station will not be disadvantaged. The proposed changes will provide an accelerated service to the great majority of passengers with no additional rollingstock or crew requirements.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

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

1. Why is it the intention of the Government to provide a Government vehicle to the member for Hanson in his capacity as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee?
2. What is the cost of providing the vehicle?
3. What will be the annual overall expense incurred in providing the vehicle?

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

1. The provision of a vehicle is considered to be in line with the expanded role envisaged for the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee.
2. The cost of purchasing the vehicle was approximately \$7 000.
3. Running costs will be assessed at the end of the first year. No additional staff is required.

RECREATION AND SPORT FUNDING

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

1. Will the Department of Recreation and Sport continue to fund capital facilities on a dollar for dollar share basis with local government and, if not, how will costs be shared?
2. Will there be an upper limit to these grants and, if so, what will that limit be?

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

1. The current funding criteria is continuing with the provision of grants to a maximum of 50 per cent of the total cost of approved projects. Such grants are available to local government, sporting clubs and community organisations.
2. There is currently no upper limit and it is not anticipated that such a restriction will be imposed.

T.A.B.

183. **Mr. SLATER** (on notice): What are the monthly turnover figures for the T.A.B. for July, August and September of this year and how do they compare with the same months last year and the budgeted figure for 1979-80?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON:

Turnover	1978-79		1979-80		Budget
	1978-79	1979-80	1979-80	1979-80	
	\$	\$	\$	\$	
July	7 838 974	8 310 634	8 357 000		
August	7 564 479	8 608 245	8 638 000		
September	8 393 722	*8 725 130	9 266 000		

* The turnover was adversely affected due to nine meetings being cancelled because of inclement weather.

SAMCOR

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

1. What was the loss of Samcor for the year ended 30 June 1979?
2. What is the expected trading result for the year ending 30 June 1980?

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

1. \$3 218 312.
2. An anticipated loss of \$1.9 million.

ELECTRICITY CONSUMPTION

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

1. What was the growth in electricity consumption in South Australia for each of the past 10 years?
2. On current estimates, when will a decision have to be made on the fuel to be used for the power station required to be built after the Northern Power Station is completed?
3. On current estimates, when will this power station need to come on stream?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows:

Year ended	Electricity sold by E.T.S.A. MWh	Percentage increase over previous year
30 June 1969	3 213 863	6.9
1970	3 493 123	8.7
1971	3 663 370	4.9
1972	3 723 767	1.6
1973	4 071 011	9.3
1974	4 277 735	5.1
1975	4 435 052	3.7
1976	4 710 690	6.2
1977	5 256 246	11.6
1978	5 511 207	4.9
1979	5 706 682	3.5

1. By about 1981.
2. By about 1989.

INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS

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

1. For each of the financial years 1970-71 to 1978-79, how many industrial establishments were constructed by the South Australian Housing Trust, and what was the gross square meterage built each year?
2. What was the cumulative gross square meterage of S.A.H.T. factory accommodation accruing rental income in each year from 1970-71 to 1978-79?
3. What was the annual income from industrial rents during those years?

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

Financial Year	No. of Factories	M ²
1970-71	5	22 012
1971-72	9	44 190
1972-73	6	40 431
1973-74	5	9 969
1974-75	12	51 039
1975-76	8	28 273
1976-77	2	1 193
1977-78	3	2 526
1978-79	2	13 871

2. Cumulative gross square meterage of factory accommodation leased and mortgaged—

Financial Year	M ²
1970-71	113 421
1971-72	157 611
1972-73	198 042
1973-74	203 536
1974-75	245 139
1975-76	262 015

1976-77	263 377
1977-78	263 330
1978-79	271 929

3. Annual income from lease and mortgage—

Financial Year	Amount \$
1970-71	371 849.93
1971-72	612 473.79
1972-73	1 088 046.49
1973-74	1 306 999.73
1974-75	1 172 733.94
1975-76	1 861 678.75
1976-77	2 275 902.24
1977-78	2 393 066.27
1978-79	2 359 243.17

GREENFIELD RAILWAY STATION

203. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice): What measures are being contemplated for upgrading parking facilities at the Greenfield Railway Station and, if any, when will such measures be implemented?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The State Transport Authority has developed a programme to upgrade parking facilities at railway stations in the metropolitan area to a uniform standard. The programme includes the Greenfields Railway Station. While it is anticipated that the programme will commence in the near future, priorities have not as yet been allocated.

MAIN NORTH ROAD TRAFFIC

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

1. What are the peak-hour traffic volumes on the Main North Road, north of Grand Junction Road?
2. What does the Highways Department assess as the vehicular capacity of that stretch of road?
3. What are the projections for the growth in usage along the Main North Road?
4. What efforts are proposed to be taken to cater for any increased usage?

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

1. 3 100.
2. The mid-block vehicular capacity is estimated at 5 400 vehicles per hour. This reduces, to varying degrees, at the major traffic signal controlled intersections along this section of road.
3. An increase of approximately 2.4 per cent per annum.
4. The Highways Department has a number of alternative options under consideration.

GOVERNMENT ENVELOPES

209. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Is it proposed to print the letters "O.H.M.S." again on Government envelopes and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No. It is considered that "S.A. Government" more appropriately identifies official South Australian Government envelopes.

MRS. KOTARSKI

211. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Does the Government propose to honour the undertaking of the previous Government to make an *ex gratia* payment to Mrs. Anna

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

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes. The Minister of Mines and Energy is awaiting the return of the properly completed release document from Mrs. Kotarski before forwarding the cheque.

GOVERNMENT CARS

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

1. For which members of Parliament is a Government motor car provided and what is the justification, in the case of each member, for its provision?

2. What is the estimated cost, both capital and recurring, of such provision during this financial year and how is that cost made up?

3. Is it proposed to provide any other members of Parliament with Government motor cars and, if so, which members and why and, if not, why not?

4. For which members of Parliament was a Government motor car provided by the previous Government?

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

1. All Cabinet Ministers, President of Legislative Council, the Speaker, Leader of Opposition, Deputy Leader of Opposition, Leader of Opposition in Legislative Council, Chairman of Committees, Chairman, Public Works Standing Committee, and Chairman, Public Accounts Committee.

Allocations have been made as a result of Cabinet decisions taken in the light of circumstances existing at the time.

2. The estimated costs, both capital and recurring are:

	\$
Cost of running the fleet of cars	34 944
Purchase of new cars less resale return for replaced vehicles	44 000
Cost of chauffeurs including overtime payments, pay-roll tax and operating expenses	436 370
	436 370
Estimated total cost	515 314

3. No. It is considered that there is no justification to provide a Government car for any other member of Parliament at the present time.

4. All Cabinet Ministers, President of Legislative Council, the Speaker, Leader of Opposition, Deputy Leader of Opposition, Leader of Opposition in Legislative Council, Chairman of Committees, and Chairman, Public Works Standing Committee.

PORT LINCOLN SHELTER

218. **Mr. BLACKER** (on notice): What arrangements have been made for the funding of the Port Lincoln Women's and Children's Emergency Shelter and what is the South Australian Government commitment to this shelter?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The Commonwealth Government has provided \$31 000 for the funding of the Port Lincoln Women's and Children's Emergency Shelter during 1979-80. The State Government will make available matching funds of \$16 000.

DENTAL TECHNICIANS BILL

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

1. Does the Government propose to introduce the Dental Technicians Bill prepared by its predecessor and, if

so, when and what alterations, if any, will there be to the settled draft, dated 13 August 1979, and what are the reasons for such alterations and, if not, why not?

2. What action, if any, does the Government propose to take to provide that dental technicians may deal directly with members of the public?

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

1. A decision on future action in respect of the previous Government's draft Dental Technicians Bill will be made following a review presently being undertaken by the Minister of Health.

2. See 1. above.

MEMBER FOR HANSON

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

1. Did the member for Hanson request the provision of a motor car and, if so, what reasons did he give for making such request?

2. In what ways, if any, is it expected that this provision will assist the member in carrying out his duties as a member of Parliament and what restrictions, if any, are there on the member in using such motor car?

3. How is the estimated annual cost of providing the member with a Government motor car made up?

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

1. No.

2. It will assist the member in carrying out the anticipated expanded activities envisaged for the Chairman, Public Accounts Committee. He will be subject to the same restraints in using the car as are other members who have the use of a Government car.

3. See answer to Question 181.

PRIVY COUNCIL APPEALS

224. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Is it the policy of the Government that appeals to the Privy Council be abolished and, if so, why and what action, if any, is proposed to put the policy into effect?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The matter is under review and a final decision has not been made.

PARA VISTA SCHOOL CROSSING

223. **Mr. McRAE** (on notice): When will pedestrian activated crossing lights be provided outside Para Vista Primary School, permitting the safe crossing of Montague Road, instead of the school crossing lights now provided some distance to the east of the school?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: As previously indicated, the Highways Department intends to replace the school crossing with pedestrian actuated traffic signals in 2-3 years time. A decision has not yet been made as to the precise location of the new crossing.

SAMCOR

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

1. Who will be appointed to undertake the inquiry into Samcor operations required under the South Australian Meat Corporation Act?

2. When will the inquiry begin?

3. When will the report be tabled in Parliament, as required under the Act?

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

1. Mr. J. E. Burdett, Assistant Commissioner, Public Service Board, has been appointed.

2. It has already begun.

3. As soon as the inquiry has been completed and the report has been submitted. (The last statutory review was commissioned in February 1976 and tabled in Parliament in July of that year).

EYRE PENINSULA ROADS

252. **Mr. BLACKER** (on notice): When is it expected that work will commence on the upgrading and sealing of the:

(a) Mangalo to Cleve road;

(b) Lipson to Ungarra road, and

(c) Bratton Way, from Cummins to Mount Hope?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The three roads mentioned are under the care, control and management of the District Councils of Cleve, Tumby Bay and Lincoln respectively and the honourable member should approach the Councils concerning their upgrading. The Highways Department has no immediate plans for work on these roads.

DENTAL TECHNICIANS BILL

261. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice): Will the Government guarantee immunity from prosecution of those dental technicians who freely made their activities known to the working party set up by the previous Government to look at the proposed Dental Technicians Bill?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The Government is not in a position to give such a guarantee.

SINGLE VEHICLE ACCIDENTS

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

1. How many single vehicle accidents occurred in South Australia in the three months to 30 September 1979?

2. How many deaths and injuries occurred as a result of these accidents?

3. How many of these accidents were regarded by the police as being the result of liquor abuse?

4. How many prosecutions have been launched as a result of police inquiries into the cause of these accidents?

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

1. Statistics for this period are not yet available. The Highways Department receives accident statistic reports from the Police Department at varying periods of time.

2., 3. and 4. See 1. above.

ROSETTA STREET SUBWAY

266. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice): What action does the Government propose to take to widen the Rosetta Street subway at West Croydon and if any, when, and if none, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Rosetta Street, West Croydon, is under the care, control and management of the Corporation of the City of Woodville. Any proposed widening of the subway is a matter for consideration by Council.

CHIROPRACTORS ACT

268. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice):

1. Has a board been appointed under the Chiropractors Act and, if not, why not, and if so, who are the members?

2. Have the regulations been established yet, and if not, why not?

3. When will the Chiropractors Act be proclaimed?

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

1. No—consideration is currently being given to membership.

2. No—this will be a matter for the board's consideration.

3. When regulations have been finalised.

**PAY-ROLL TAX ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

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

PETITION: HOTEL HOURS

A petition signed by 25 residents of South Australia praying that the House would oppose any legislation to permit hotels opening their bars on Sundays was presented by Mr. Chapman.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 106 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. Ashenden and Billard.

Petitions received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STAMP DUTIES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill, which is at present before the House, and which has the object of granting a concessional rate of stamp duty on the first purchase of a home to be used as a principal place of residence by the purchaser, is intended to apply to transfers lodged at the Stamp Duties Office on or after 1 November 1979 in respect of a contract entered into on or after 15 September 1979.

As today is 30 October, and only two sitting days (including today) remain before this provision is intended to commence operation, it is unlikely that the Bill will pass all stages and receive assent before the Stamp Duties Office opens for business on Thursday 1 November.

I therefore wish to inform the House that the necessary administrative action has been taken to grant the concessions, as specified in the Bill, from Thursday 1 November. Such administrative authority will remain in force until the Bill has passed all stages and received the Governor's assent. This decision is consistent with earlier practice in similar circumstances.

In 1975, the remission of duty on the conveyance of a matrimonial home operated by administrative decision for three months before the amending Act was assented to,

and in 1977 the remission of stamp duty on the conveyance of a new dwellinghouse operated, by administrative decision alone, for the full period of six months, without any amending legislation being brought before Parliament.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: URANIUM

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I table seven documents in connection with the statement. The documents are: report by Mr. S. B. Dickinson entitled "Special studies: Uranium"; report by Mr. R. E. Wilmshurst entitled "Report of overseas visit 19 January-11 February 1979"; the Uranium Enrichment Committee's third report; two reports prepared by the Department of Mines and Energy and the former Policy Division of the Premier's Department, dated January 1979; press statement by the honourable member for Hartley, as former Premier, dated 1 August 1979; a memorandum dated 10 August 1979 from Mr. Dickinson to the Director-General of Mines and Energy.

The first two of the reports I have tabled were prepared by the technical experts who accompanied Mr. Don Dunstan on his uranium study tour earlier this year. I had planned to table them in conjunction with the Government's major statement on uranium to be made in the next week or so. However, the premature and unauthorised disclosure of them to a section of the media at the end of last week made it necessary that they be placed before Parliament at the earliest opportunity.

That selective disclosure was strongly reminiscent of the actions of the former Government in the release of information about the sacking of the Police Commissioner, when Mr. Salisbury was denied the opportunity to have his point of view considered immediately and properly. Accordingly, the reports are being tabled, and this statement is being made today.

Honourable members who served in the last Parliament will be aware of the circumstances surrounding the former Premier's trip to review the uranium situation in January this year. The trip was announced as one enabling South Australia's attitude to the mining of uranium to be reviewed, particularly having regard to the resolution of this House in March 1977, in the light of recent developments in safeguards, waste disposal, and related matters. The Premier's study team comprised, as well as himself, Mr. Bruce Guerin, the then Premier's Executive Assistant, the Premier's Press Secretary, Mr. Rann, and, as technical experts, Mr. Ben Dickinson, a former Director of Mines and the Government's adviser to the Uranium Enrichment Committee, and Mr. Ron Wilmshurst, Technical Director of Amdel and a member of that committee.

The study tour lasted for just over a fortnight and set a pace that the former Premier was to describe as "gruelling". It examined in that time technical and policy developments in Great Britain, Sweden, France, the Netherlands and West Germany. Mr. Guerin, Mr. Dickinson and Mr. Wilmshurst also visited Austria and the United States. While the team was away there were signs that the situation revealed to it did in fact give cause for South Australia's attitude to uranium mining to be revised and that developments should be allowed to proceed.

Honourable members will recall that, once it became clear that the study team might take a pro-uranium stance, it became obvious that the member for Elizabeth, then

Attorney-General, and his supporters, would not countenance a change in policy on uranium mining, regardless of what the study team might find. The numbers game was on, and the former Premier had to find the numbers.

I am sure all honourable members recall the outcome. The former Premier, very shortly after his return, came before this House on 6 February, still showing signs of fatigue and, not without ambivalence, the former Premier said:

We cannot be in the uranium industry until we can say that it is safe.

He then described his trip in terms that supported his assumption that the uranium industry was not yet safe. The statement did not come as a complete surprise, even despite encouraging reports from Europe. The manoeuvrings of the member for Elizabeth and his friends have been highly visible. It was becoming clear, even then, that the numbers could prevail over the facts.

It is in this context that the first two of the reports I am tabling today are so valuable. They allow us to look behind the former Premier's statement, behind the machinations of the member for Elizabeth and his cohorts, and to see the facts. Indeed, the facts are allowed to speak for themselves.

The former Premier, it will be recalled, stressed in his statement to Parliament that the findings of his group were unanimous. Indeed, his words on this matter were:

At the end of that time—

he is referring there to the study tour—

we came to conclusions as to the facts. Those conclusions were unanimous.

Two sentences later he referred specifically to Mr. Wilmshurst and Mr. Dickinson, and said:

They agreed as to what the facts are, and they are quite clear . . .

Strong words, you might say. Strong words, indeed, and certainly not altogether true.

Let us look at what Mr. Dickinson had to say on this point of unanimity. At page 2 of his report he has this to say:

The visit resulted in unanimity, that mining and treatment of uranium could proceed in South Australia, subject to the application of rigid international safeguard controls and codes for waste management within the framework of consumer countries.

The consensus view was that effective safeguards could be operative in the early 1980's in most countries whose Governments had made commitments to honour the non-proliferation treaty and International Atomic Energy Agency agreements, including the non-acquisition of nuclear explosives.

In anticipation of these conditions becoming established, it was also the consensus view that the safeguards required for the sale of South Australian uranium to customer countries could now be drafted and form the basis for detailed discussions with the Commonwealth Government regarding their implementation.

Mr. Wilmshurst's statement was somewhat shorter. He stated:

There is no technical reason why concern about waste disposal or safeguards should prevent uranium mining in South Australia.

These two excerpts make it very clear that the former Premier grossly misrepresented at least the two technical experts when in his no-go statement on his return he stated that the study group findings were unanimous. Let us look at the detail of the former Premier's statement. Quite properly, he and his team sought to reassure themselves on matters on which they, their advisers, or the general

public, had doubts. Accordingly, the study team's programme allowed for the canvassing of a wide range of topics. They were covered in the former Premier's statement to Parliament. They were also covered in his technical experts' reports. The adequacy of legal safeguards was considered. Mr. Dunstan, in his statement to Parliament, said this:

We found, amongst all the countries that we visited, a belief, an expressed view, that it was desirable to have an international control system on plutonium. We also found that there was no design of such a system on the ground at all; they have not even begun to talk about it. The international fuel cycle evaluation talks are going on, but in the participant countries that would be involved in necessarily working out how the actual accountability would work, the particular physical way in which plutonium would be stored, accounted for, inspected and issued, none of that has been designed, nor is there any guarantee that it will be designed. We can get no answers on this topic (and that is clear) until after the international fuel cycle talks have been completed, and that will not be for another year. That, then, can only be a beginning.

Let us see what Mr. Dickinson and Mr. Wilmshurst have to say. Mr. Dickinson's views are quite clear (page 23):

The prospect is now in sight for full scope I.A.E.A. safeguards to apply to all those non-weapon States that have at least one significant nuclear facility, thereby embracing most civilian reactors in the world. Already, 60 of the 101 States which are parties to the non-proliferation treaty has concluded full-scope agreements. By the time South Australian uranium is produced in marketable form the application of International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards, presently in their formative stage, should be operating effectively in customer countries.

Mr. Wilmshurst says (page 18):

Agency personnel are quietly confident that a satisfactory scheme can be devised and adopted by the agency and all its members by mid-1980, probably coincident with the review of the non-proliferation treaty in June of that year.

Similarly, the study group investigated technical aspects of waste disposal. Members will be aware that a number of countries have developed waste disposal techniques that involve incorporation of wastes in glass or other appropriate material, sealing of those wastes in containers, and burial of these at appropriate depths in stable geological formations.

In his statement to Parliament Mr. Dunstan referred to Swedish investigations, as follows:

That investigation is under way, and Mr. Wilmshurst has inspected it. It has not been finally proved yet, but each of the bores taken so far has proved consistent with the original. This may well mean that during this year Sweden will prove up a safe, high-active waste disposal programme. The problem about that is that this method can apply only in areas which have similar formations of deep granitic rock and that applies in only a few countries throughout the world. Numbers of customer countries for uranium do not have such conditions.

In the light of this attempt to play down the progress and importance of the Swedish work, and its importance, it is interesting to hear what the experts had to say. Mr. Wilmshurst's views are as follows:

In summary then the burial, after some years of surface storage, of cans of solidified waste in granite at depths in excess of 500 metres has been demonstrated to offer a viable ultimate disposal procedure for highly radioactive waste. The Swedish studies have gone far beyond this and have extended into prediction of the effects of drinking groundwater from a well adjacent to a granite disposal site up to one million years in to the future. These effects have been shown to be, under

conditions deliberately chosen as being unfavourable, far below those of natural background radiation.

More generally, later in his report, he concludes:

There is a proven route available for treatment and disposal of high-level waste. Reprocessing of spent fuel is being practised as is vitrification of high level wastes from reprocessing. Final disposal in granite formations has been demonstrated to be practicable.

Mr. Dickinson commented on the Swedish system, as follows:

Sweden has completed investigations which show that there is no reason to believe that, environmentally, satisfactory disposal means are not available.

A further area of misrepresentation was with regard to the sale of the technology for a reprocessing plant to Brazil. To quote again the former Premier:

The situation that arose in relation to the Brazilian contract was that a contract was made for commercial purposes to sell technology to Brazil, because the commercial people in the Euratom countries wanted to beat France to the sale; it was as simple as that. Having made their commercial contracts, they wanted to water down the arrangements that would be agreed to by the Governments of the supplier countries. This caused the greatest of upset and disturbance

To the extent that the former Premier was suggesting that there were no controls on the sale of reprocessing plant technology to Brazil the assertion is false, as I will stress again in a moment. Meanwhile, let me again quote Mr. Dickinson:

Already the International Atomic Energy Agency has made a commitment to manage stocks of plutonium in Brazil resulting from reprocessing of fuel elements should Brazil establish a reprocessing plant.

Later, Mr. Dickinson discusses the desirability of multinational consortia controlling enrichment plants so that a power of veto can be exercised:

This power of veto had already been exercised by the Netherlands Government in the case of Brazilian enrichment requirements and resulted in the services sought by Brazil being supplied with the International Atomic Energy Agency having responsibility for the custody of any plutonium produced from reprocessing in Brazil.

Before I sum up on the Dickinson and Wilmshurst Reports, I should point out that the misleading of the South Australian community did not end in February; far from it. The numbers game, at which the A.L.P. is so expert, prevailed over the facts to such an extent that the misrepresentations of the Dunstan statement in February were still being re-run as recently as last August. Indeed, a press statement issued by the member for Hartley, who was then Premier, again suggested that the study team had been of one view as to the undesirability of uranium mining, and that the sale of technology to Brazil was without any, or adequate, safeguards.

Mr. Dickinson was invited to comment on this further statement. On the question of the study tour's overall findings he had this to say:

The consensus of the mission was certainly not a "No" to the questions of waste disposal or safeguards.

With regard to Brazil, this was his view:

Ureco countries were not prepared to give Brazil the facility to produce plutonium without safeguards. Supply arrangements with Brazil were not finalised until an agreement was concluded to require Brazil to comply with the provisions of International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards and also International Atomic Energy Agency safeguarding of plutonium.

Later in his memorandum he describes this statement about Brazil as "false" and as "requiring correction". I

will now read in full Mr. Dickinson's memorandum, as it confirms what I have said about how advice and facts have been misrepresented in this Parliament. It also comments on problems associated with the source of some of the advice sought by the former Government. The memorandum states:

To the Director-General, Department of Mines and Energy,

10 August 1979

Uranium policy:

Reference to Mr. Corcoran's reply to the Leader of the Opposition on 1 August 1979, it should be made known to the Hon. Premier that the text contains information which misrepresents the reports of the overseas mission on uranium and on the Ureco sales arrangements with Brazil. There are other technical and economic inaccuracies which also misinform the public.

Firstly, "the Leader of the Opposition welcomed the mission, until the team reported that the answer to both questions was 'No'" (page 1, paragraph 3).

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Order 136 prevents a Minister's making a statement for longer than 15 minutes without seeking further leave.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek leave to continue my statement.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr. BANNON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I grant the importance of the statement being made by the Minister, but I point out that this is, in fact, a statement that should be made in the Government's time and not cut into Question Time or, alternatively, we would be happy to give leave for this statement to be incorporated in *Hansard* so it would be available for members to study.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I point out to the honourable Leader that there have been instances within the past two to three years when statements of this length and nature have been made to the House: in relation to Santos, in relation to the Saffron affair, and in other such instances. I now ask again: is leave granted?

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The memorandum continues:

The consensus of the mission was certainly not a "No" to the questions of waste disposal or international safeguards. I would request that the reports by the former Premier, by myself, and by Mr. Wilmshurst, copies attached, be circulated whereby the issues which were critically examined by the mission for the Government can be much better understood.

Whilst I have not seen Mr. Guerin's report, I would be surprised if it is not dissimilar. Mr. Guerin drafted the former Premier's report. My report may not have been read by the Premier, but Mr. Inns promised to place it in front of him with my request for an appointment with him. I have not had any further advices from the Premier's Department. As Mr. Dunstan's document states, the documents attached are advisory reports to the Government which should be made publicly available along with other advisory reports that were intended to be made public from time to time.

Secondly, "It has already been demonstrated that when problems over safeguards prove difficult, then commercial considerations will come first. That is precisely what happened when Ureco countries—Britain, Germany, and the Netherlands—tried to forge a deal with Brazil, a country ruled by a military dictatorship" (page 2, final paragraph).

Ureco countries were not prepared to give Brazil the facility to produce plutonium without safeguards. Supply arrangements with Brazil were not finalised until an agreement was concluded to require Brazil to comply with the provisions of I.A.E.A. safeguards and also to I.A.E.A.

safeguarding of plutonium. A copy of the safeguards agreement with Brazil is attached.

This statement in the Premier's reply is a repetition of the statement that the former Premier made in the House of Assembly last February to which Urenco took strong exception and the Uranium Enrichment Committee at Urenco's request promised to correct as it was seen to be extremely detrimental to Urenco's world standing and world marketing policy. The Premier should have been informed on this undertaking through his Policy Division representative on the Uranium Enrichment Committee.

Members of the mission recognised that Urenco's global policy on enrichment is offering a practical basis for structuring South Australian enrichment policy with the safeguards sought by South Australia. The Premier should be advised that a continuing liaison with Urenco should be preserved in the interests of it being possible to market South Australian uranium under acceptable safeguards. Urenco, in the case of Brazil, has demonstrated that uranium can be supplied under full protective I.A.E.A. international safeguards. The false statement regarding Urenco's disregard of safeguards in the sale of enriched uranium to Brazil should be corrected at an appropriate time.

Further criticism of Urenco is given in the Premier's statement on page 3, paragraph 1, concerning the reported stealing of plans from Urenco's Almelo plant. This incident would be more related to security at the plant rather than safeguards, as Urenco's competitive position in enrichment depends largely on the retention of its closely guarded technology that has cost millions to develop. The seriousness or otherwise of this theft will be ascertained directly from Urenco and, passed on to the Premier without confirmatory information, this accusation would, on face value, appear to be premature and unnecessary.

Overall comment:

The Premier has experts in Government departments that are able to give technological descriptions on the status of nuclear waste disposal methods in various world countries. Descriptions should preferably come from Government departments and not be composed wholly within the Premier's Department without vetting by experts. The same plea is made in relation to economic and commercial issues where such statements as "Economic viability of any small-scale enrichment plant in this State" is given doubtful economic value for reasons that there will be "A vast over-supply of uranium enrichment capacity from 1985 onwards" and "Tricastin can provide more enriched uranium capacity than the entire plant capacity of Great Britain, West Germany and the Netherlands". This material from journalistic sources is completely misleading in every respect in practical supply terms and future development plans in the nuclear industry.

Recommendation:

In the light of all the issues to be faced the Premier should have an advisory panel (formal or informal) on uranium issues to provide material for his public statements and/or correspondence with Canberra. Policy Division staff and press secretaries prepare minutes, correspondence and other material without experienced back-up advice on matters they know little about. The procedures, presently being followed, can lead to considerable discord and unnecessary strain on the Premier in handling an extremely sensitive and important issue. As an ex-public servant I strongly recommend the need for a uranium advisory panel that can serve the Premier in the days ahead.

S. B. Dickinson
10 August 1979

I have spoken at length on the Dickinson and Wilmshurst Reports for two reasons. First, they add to our store of knowledge about uranium and the nuclear fuel cycle. That

is something that I will discuss in greater detail when the Government's statement on uranium is delivered in the next week or so. Secondly, these reports were commissioned at public expense, by the former Government, and the findings of their writers have never been disclosed to the Parliament, or to the South Australian people. The uranium issue is, to say the least, complex and at times confusing.

The writers of the reports tabled do not shirk from that. This Government does not shirk from that. The writers of the reports simply expected that their reports would be read from beginning to end and their analysis carefully considered. What this Government asks is that this important question be considered with regard to all the facts, in the light of expert opinion. The tabling of these reports is intended to assist the achievement of that aim.

The other reports I have tabled can be dealt with quickly. The two reports by the Department of Mines and Energy and the former Policy Division of the Premier's Department were finalised in January this year, prior to the Premier's study trip. The fact that they were printed suggests that it was intended that they be published following the Premier's return, along with the reports of his advisers. Members will be interested to know that these two reports, prepared with obvious care, are cautiously favourable as to the prospects of uranium mining, but are updated by the Dickinson and Wilmshurst Reports.

The third report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee is released simply because it is already in the hands of some representatives of the media. Members should be aware that this report presents an earlier concept which has been superseded by a proposal that the committee will now investigate. This follows further discussions with Urenco-Centec. When the committee's advice is received, this Parliament will be informed.

I have dealt with these matters at length to put the record straight. The former Government sacked a Commissioner of Police on the charge of withholding information. Its own actions were far more reprehensible. Not only did the former Government withhold, when it said it would reveal, it misrepresented information as well. The facts presented by the experts retained by the Labor Government are plain. I have presented them to the House today.

This Government will take the public into its confidence. This statement has established a basis on which all South Australians can begin to consider the uranium issue safe in the knowledge that this Government is being honest with them. I will continue in this spirit when I make another statement to Parliament in this session detailing the Government's attitude to uranium mining and development. It will canvass the Government's attitude to the matters of fact raised in the documents I have tabled today.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the period for asking questions without notice to be extended to 3.38 p.m.

Question Time is an extremely important period of time for the Opposition. I am sure that statement would be heartedly endorsed by those members opposite who had to spend nine years in Opposition, until recently. It is the one regular opportunity that members of the Opposition have to probe Ministers without notice, on matters of public importance and policy, and what little time is allowed for it

is extremely valuable for that purpose. Indeed, some years ago two hours was allowed for Question Time and I think that was—

Members interjecting:

Mr. BANNON: Indeed, the Government of the day, which happened to be the Government of my own Party, reduced that period of time to one hour. If one looks at *Hansard* record of the types of questions being asked at that time, parochial and “parish-pump” matters that could have been dealt with as Questions on Notice or, alternatively, by letter, one can understand that.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable Leader come back to the reason for his motion?

Mr. BANNON: I do not wish unduly to cut further into Question Time. The amount of extension that I have moved here represents 23 minutes, which is the time taken by the Deputy Premier to give his statement to the House. Clearly, Standing Order 136 allows a time of 15 minutes for Ministerial statements and, without further leave of the House, statements should not exceed that. In fact, his statement with leave went beyond that period of time, and it departed from the general role of Ministerial statements in being an extremely political statement with very little factual information. It should have been dealt with as a matter—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is now commenting and is going beyond the reason for seeking the suspension.

Mr. BANNON: The reason for the suspension is that considerable time was taken in this House, which means that Question Time is reduced by the Minister’s having given to this House a statement that could well have been introduced in the time allowed for the Government’s own business. There was no reason why it should hold up the proceedings here today at such length.

Certainly, Ministerial statements are legitimate. In fact, I have not taken into account any of the normal time allowed for Ministers to make statements, lay on papers, and so on; that is proper and appropriate. This, however, is quite an exceptional circumstance. Despite the importance of the statement, it should not have interrupted Question Time to the degree that it did.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose the motion. I am totally aware of the feelings the Leader may have in this matter, as I have spent some little time in the seat that he now occupies. There has been no precedent for such action as he proposes. I can recall that in this House, during the term of office of the previous Government, we have had long and detailed Ministerial statements on important matters. Although we have regretted the loss of Question Time, no doubt we have benefited from much of the detail that has come to us by way of those Ministerial statements.

I would have thought that the Leader would want the details which the Minister of Mines and Energy has given to the House. After all, the Leader has been making a great deal of fuss about the matter over the past few days. I cannot understand why he should be anything but delighted that the Minister has tabled these reports and made such a succinct statement regarding an analysis of them. It was high time for the record to be put straight, and I believe that that has been done admirably. The Leader knows that, if Ministerial statements go beyond 2.15 p.m., questions are asked until 3.15 p.m. When he got to his feet to raise the matter, the time was just after 2.30 p.m.

Mr. Wright: Two minutes after.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It may have been two minutes after 2.30 p.m. That leaves 45 minutes for

questions. I can recall occasions in the past when we were lucky indeed to have that period. I cannot accept the Leader’s point, and I oppose the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Abbott, Lynn Arnold, Bannon (teller), Max Brown, Corcoran, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hoppood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O’Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (25)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Webster, Wilson, and Wotton.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

SANTOS LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER: Last Thursday, the Opposition Whip advised me that he believed that the honourable Premier’s recorded reply to a question asked by the honourable Leader of the Opposition on 16 October regarding the Santos legislation was not in accordance with his recollection of the answer. *Hansard* of that date, at page 66, records the honourable Premier’s reply as follows:

The Government’s position in this matter is quite clear; it does not intend to repeal the Santos legislation.

I directed the Leader, *Hansard* staff to check the matter, and he has informed me that, by referring to the master tape recording, he is satisfied that the honourable Premier’s reply was as follows:

The Government’s position in this matter is quite clear; it has no present intention of repealing the Santos legislation. The Leader, *Hansard* staff has expressed sincere regret for the error which occurred. I have instructed him to correct the annual volume accordingly.

Mr. BANNON: In view of the statement just made by the Speaker in relation to the *Hansard* record, will the Premier now clarify beyond doubt his and the Government’s intentions regarding the Santos (Registration of Shareholdings) Act? Some confusion has now ensued following that reply given by the Premier which appeared unequivocal in the record as first produced; it was not my recollection or that of other members, and it has since been corrected. Since that time, there has been considerable trading in Santos shares, with the result that the price of those shares has reached a record \$6.20. At one stage, share prices jumped 88c in three days. If market speculators are in fact operating on the basis of some misunderstanding of the Premier’s position, it should be put beyond doubt.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is no doubt about the statement that has been made. I repeat the answer I gave to the Leader last time. The Government’s position in the matter is quite clear; it has no present intention of repealing the Santos legislation.

ROAD TRAINS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Transport consider bringing the regulations controlling the operation of road trains in the Far North of South Australia in line with the ordinances currently operating in the Northern Territory? I have had drawn to my attention by a South Australian operator that road trains from Queensland and the

Northern Territory can enter South Australia and compete at far more favourable rates to the people who have stock and goods to be carted than can our own operators, because of the regulations currently in force, which are under the control of the Transport Control Board.

I can provide the Minister with more details and actual photographs to explain the situation. I am sure that the Minister and the Government would not want to see trade that ought to come to South Australia go to the Northern Territory because of what would appear to be an anomaly in the regulations.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I ask the honourable member to present me with the other details to which he has referred. I am becoming increasingly concerned at the differential that applies between this State and other States on the whole question of heavy road transport, and I intend to give this matter serious consideration soon. Regarding the honourable member's specific question, I will have the board investigate the matter as soon as possible.

URANIUM

Mr. WRIGHT: Did the Minister of Mines and Energy authorise the back-door leaking by his department of the report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee and reports by Mr. S. B. Dickinson and Mr. R. E. Wilmshurst, because the reports, once properly examined by his senior advisers, did not justify the Minister's extravagant claims that they showed that the former Premier, Mr. Dunstan, misled this House as to the findings of the January fact-finding mission on uranium and, therefore, would weaken the Minister's planned fanfare release?

The Minister was quoted in the *Advertiser* on Saturday as saying that the clear advice in the reports was that international developments in waste disposal and safeguards were proceeding at a rate which justified a go-ahead to uranium mining development in South Australia now. In his report, Mr. Dickinson referred to the lack of development of international safeguards to prevent the diversion of nuclear materials for non-peaceful purposes.

Mr. Dickinson went on to say that until gaps in the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards are given better coverage in bilateral agreements "the marketing of Australian uranium continues to be exposed to serious proliferation risks". There was nothing about that today. Mr. Dickinson said that the mining and treatment of uranium should be subject to the application of rigid international safeguards controls and of codes for waste management within the framework of consumer countries.

Mr. Justice Fox, Australia's ambassador at large on nuclear matters, has himself pointed to the inadequacy of international safeguards arrangements. Indeed, another member of the uranium fact-finding mission, Mr. Rann, said that Mr. Dickinson's calling for rigid international safeguards controls is no different from the Australian Labor Party's viewpoint that we should not mine, develop or sell uranium until it is safe to do so. This was the view of the former Premier, and Mr. Dickinson himself said in his report:

... the logic of the former Premier's approach to this extremely important issue was recognised and supported by the majority of Ministers and responsible people in Government and operational executives in nuclear plants in the countries visited.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had listened carefully to what I said, he would know I made it abundantly clear that I did not leak the reports to the press, nor, to my knowledge,

did anyone from my department. I found out at about 6 p.m., or after, on Friday that some of the reports were in the hands of the *Advertiser*, and I was invited at that stage to comment. If the honourable member had listened to what I said in Parliament, he would know the answer to his question.

TEACHERS

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Education say what is meant by the term "displaced teacher"? A situation has occurred at a high school in my district where, it is estimated, the student enrolment will be reduced by 120 students next year. This has meant that there will have to be a reduction of 5.5 teachers next year (I do not know how one reduces by .5 teachers). I have been informed that the Headmaster, in consultation with other officers of the department, reassessed the programme; two members of the staff have volunteered to take transfers elsewhere. As the number of teachers had to be reduced by another three, it was the Headmaster's responsibility to inform the teaching staff involved that they would have to be transferred. I understand that none of the staff at this high school wanted a transfer. What has happened now is that three teachers have been classified as displaced teachers for next year. The staff of the high school is concerned, because they fear retrenchments. I understand the Minister has given an assurance (and I would like his assurance again) that this will not happen. The problem is where these teachers go and what are their future prospects.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: As I understand it, displaced teachers are those unnamed on any staff where there are fewer students than there were in the preceding year. The teachers would generally be subject to transfer to areas of greater need. I assume that generally they would be transferred subject to negotiation between the Principal and his staff members. In the event of a school being so popular that the staff simply did not wish to transfer, the decision would have to devolve on the Principal himself. The Government has undertaken not to retrench any staff within the Education Department. The position is that we will be employing more teachers in the primary branch than were employed last year. Certainly, in the event, some teachers may have to be transferred to areas of need where the complement of the school staff is, next year, less than the present year complement.

Dr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Education say on what figures, real or imagined, predictions or hunches he relied when he made his statement to the *Advertiser*, which appeared on 9 October, page 4, and which states:

I also believe that in three or four years time we, the department, will be looking for teachers.

It is well known, and has been widely commented on at times, that enrolments in all Australian schools are declining and, in fact, on predictions from the State Education Department's figures that were made available to the Australian Education Council 12 or so months ago, it was suggested that by 1985 enrolments in primary schools throughout Australia will have fallen by 118 200 and enrolments in secondary schools will have increased by 89 500, leaving a substantial deficit on the enrolments that currently occur. In a letter that was circularised widely, particularly to the Minister of Education at the time, Mr. Max Costello of the Australian Teachers Federation suggested the following:

If we accept the logic of the study and use all teachers which the study predicts will be supplied in roles in schools or departments which would be included in the pupil-teacher

ratios, then by 1985 for Australia, pupil-teacher ratios of primary 14:7 and secondary 9:7 would need to exist to eliminate any surplus of teachers.

It has been put to me that, if this improvement in the pupil-teacher ratio is what the Minister has in mind in order to place the Government in the situation where it is looking for teachers those few years ahead, that would be a very good thing so far as the education community is concerned. However, my informants are sceptical.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I understand that the heading on that report that the former Minister has to hand quotes me as being a "supreme optimist at heart". That is obviously half the answer! There are some grounds for optimism, I believe, on the basis that fewer youngsters will want to go to teachers college in the light of the present rather difficult situation for teachers generally. We had some 2 700 applicants in South Australia for what will probably amount to 600 or 700 new positions next year. In addition to that, we expect that there will be ancillary and pre-school staff appointed, but the final numbers cannot be determined at this stage. However, there is no doubt that, of the teachers who are available in South Australia, a large number are not available for ready transfer to areas of need, and that there will be fewer graduates emerging from teachers colleges in years to come.

Apart from that, certainly there are cases where other States are experiencing some increase in teacher need, and it is not enough to say that schools currently cited will be the areas where teachers will need to be. Western Australia and Queensland are experiencing a slight upsurge in teacher requirements. The New Zealand Minister for Education was in South Australia only yesterday canvassing towards a target of some 800 secondary teachers who will be needed in his country over the next year or two.

I am sufficiently optimistic to think that with the steady reduction in class ratios, particularly at primary level (secondary level, of course, is already in a very favourable situation by comparison), there will be an increasing need within South Australia for good quality teachers over the next few years. I emphasise "good quality teachers", because there are already indications within this State that people looking at the possibility of being employed within the teaching profession may decide to move elsewhere. In fact, the students of high calibre may already be deciding to move into alternative professions. I qualify that statement by saying that, with the possibility of teachers colleges accepting an increasing number of students with five C standards or above at Matriculation level, this may in fact be too low a standard to ensure the type of students that the Education Department would be looking to employ. So, there were a number of factors that made me think that perhaps in a few years we would be looking for a high quality of teacher, a quality that may not necessarily be available in the quantities needed.

LOWER NORTH-EAST ROAD

Mr. ASHENDEN: Will the Minister of Transport say what is the planned programme for the completion of the widening of the Lower North-East Road? I have been approached by a number of constituents who live along this road and who have complained of the present unacceptable standard of the road from Dernancourt through to Hope Valley. In particular, the residents at Highbury suffer very badly whenever there is rain, because at the moment there is no stormwater drainage whatsoever and all water flows from the road on to their properties, which causes inconvenience and, frequently,

damage. Quite rightly, the residents of this area would like to see drainage works, at least, completed as soon as possible on this road to protect their properties. Residents along the entire length of the unreconstructed section of Lower North-East Road are all aware that plans are in hand for the widening and realignment of this road. With the increased traffic, they believe, as I do, that the remaking of this road must be given top priority.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It is my understanding (in fact, I am sure) that the widening of Lower North-East Road will be completed as far as Grand Junction Road by 1982. I will get a report and more specific details about the drainage problems to which the honourable member referred.

PORT PIRIE BRIDGE

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs say whether the Government has any plans to encourage industry to establish in the industrial estate across the Port Pirie River that has been opened up by the construction of the Solomontown Bridge? My question arises out of an answer given by the Minister to the member for Rocky River last week. Since then I have taken the opportunity to speak to a number of people in Port Pirie who have told me that they are sick and tired of their city being used as the butt for Liberal Party jokesters. One person informed me that these jokesters include Don Jessop, John Oswald, John Olsen, Howard Venning, and now Dean Brown.

The Mayor of Port Pirie, Mr. Bill Jones, has authorised me to quote him as saying that he is disappointed that neither the Minister nor the member for Rocky River, who represents part of Port Pirie, saw fit to contact him to discuss this matter. He would have been happy to inform them that the bridge was built at the request of the Port Pirie city council, which wished to open up land for industrial development. RED scheme money was used, and jobless persons in the area were employed on the construction of the facilities required and requested by the council. The Minister has said many times that the bridge was built as a ploy to win votes in Port Pirie. Such statements are surely a reflection on the integrity of members of the Port Pirie city council, when it was that council that requested that the bridge be built.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It was suggested by the honourable member that the bridge was built to establish an industrial estate on that side of the river. I understand the bridge was built in the mid-1970's and, if that is the case, (and to my knowledge there is still no industry on the other side of the river), it is a sad reflection on the former Government of this State, as during a period of 4½ to 5 years it was totally unsuccessful in attracting any new industry to that area. In the previous answer given in this House (that given by the then Premier Don Dunstan) he said he was hopeful of establishing a small boat building industry on that side of the river. To my knowledge, no such industry has been established.

I would have thought that the fact that the bridge led to what is currently a piece of barren land is a reflection on the inability of the previous Government to attract any new industry to this State, let alone hold existing industry. The honourable member has also asked me whether I am aware of any industries wishing to move to the area. No, I am not, except for that which has been drawn to my attention by the previous Government and for which it was not successful. Under the decentralisation policies announced by the new Government, which include a full rebate of pay-roll and land taxes, I believe it may at last be possible to get new industry established in country centres.

Therefore, I am hopeful that the bridge may be used at some stage if such an industry is desired by the Port Pirie council on that location.

OLD RISING SUN INN

Mr. WEBSTER: Will the Minister of Education ask the Attorney-General whether he is aware that an application under the old Historic Inns Act has been received for restoration and licensing of premises situated in Kensington and known as the Old Rising Sun Inn? This application would be pursuant to section 192 of the Licensing Act, and I understand that it might require an amendment to the existing Act. If an application has been received, what is the current position concerning it? The area referred to is situated in Kensington. It is an old inn in which various people have shown interest. Residents of Norwood are concerned about the future of this building. I understand that submissions have been made in the past to the two previous members for Norwood, but to date no replies have been received and nothing has happened about it. The future of this inn is causing concern, and I seek a direction from the Attorney-General concerning it.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I do not have a ready reply, but I shall be pleased to obtain a report from my colleague.

ABORIGINAL WELFARE

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs state what benefits the Aboriginal people of South Australia can expect to flow from his appointment? How does the Minister intend to provide these benefits when the majority of funds for Aboriginal advancement is controlled by the Minister of Community Welfare?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: This State has not had a Minister of Aboriginal Affairs for a considerable time. I think the initial pleasure that has been expressed generally by the Aboriginal community to my office over the last few weeks is sufficient to give me heart to think that they already realise that some good has flowed from the appointment, in that they are delighted to think that they have a Minister to whom they can now relate and that they are not automatically tagged with the community welfare syndrome. They do not regard having a Minister of their own now as meaning their being automatically tagged as a relatively impoverished section of the community. This has been a common expression amongst the Aboriginal community. They are very pleased.

More than that, the impression I have of Aboriginal affairs generally across Australia is that the Federal Government tends to fund Aboriginal communities on an isolated basis. There are 30 or more communities in South Australia, for example, that are receiving direct grants from the Federal Government. We will try to co-ordinate the activities in which the Federal Government is engaged with the natural activities of the State Government, by which we automatically consider the Aborigines to be part and parcel of our normal treatment of people in the State in relation to their housing, health, community welfare and education. I believe our treatment of Aborigines is very often better than that given in other States, and we will co-ordinate our normal State treatment of Aborigines with the extra funding they get from the Federal Government. To that end I have already been negotiating with the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs to establish a happy working relationship. We will in fact be

looking to greater co-ordination of State and Federal funding and activities for the future wellbeing of the Aborigines in South Australia.

DRY LAND FARMING

Mr. OLSEN: Is the Minister of Agriculture satisfied that the State Government's role in providing personnel with agricultural technology to the Middle East and neighbouring countries is in the interests of South Australia and the South Australian community generally, and in particular to the South Australian-based industry? There has been a deal of conjecture lately over the Government's role of transferring South Australian technology to developing countries in the Middle East and North Africa. This conjecture has gone so far as to suggest that the private enterprise tail is wagging the Government dog and that the Government has stepped aside to allow the private sector to take up these development projects.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I am aware of the claims referred to by the honourable member. I am amazed that they continue in the vein that they do, despite at least one accurate press report of an earlier Ministerial statement that I made on this matter. However, I am pleased to have the opportunity to reiterate that the Government will honour its undertakings in the countries of Libya, Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco, Iraq and China.

Those undertakings that we have agreed to uphold are consistent with the undertakings given in those directions by the previous Government. Moreover, the Government will continue to use the undoubted expertise of departmental officers or other specialists under contract to the Government to carry out and fulfil those obligations.

I recognise that the successful transfer of the South Australian dry land farming system to other countries is a difficult process, requiring much attention to detail, and I appreciate that it can be done well only under Government leadership, and not by small private consultants. I have attempted to demonstrate to the critics of the present Government that we are not in a position to take on any further assignments, at least for the time being, in countries outside of those I have mentioned. In our view, this would stretch departmental resources past their limit, and would have a detrimental effect on our existing commitments in the directions I have mentioned, and within our own State.

I have written to the Department of Foreign Affairs and the Minister assisting the Minister for Trade and Resources, saying precisely this, and adding that, as and when additional opportunities or firm propositions arise in places such as Iraq, Algeria, and China, South Australia will continue its vigorous approach to the gaining of contracts in those countries. We will also continue to present the philosophy that, as a world leader in dry land farming, this State has much to offer the developing nations elsewhere. However, I am inclined to the view that co-ordination of overseas projects of an aid nature is primarily the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government. For this reason, I intend to liaise closely with the Commonwealth as and when overseas work is offering.

We are not an aid State as such, and if the Commonwealth Government is or becomes involved in the role of benevolence or aid to others in need, we are prepared to discuss those responsibilities with our colleagues at Commonwealth Government level, with a view to assisting beyond the current programme I have outlined, that is, involving commercially based projects. However, that type of added aid, which we believe is primarily the responsibility of the Commonwealth, if assisted by the State, will be at the expense of the Commonwealth. I

repeat that we are in a period of consolidation, and, while adamant about meeting and expanding commitments within the countries mentioned, we are not in a position for the time being to extend business based programmes to other countries, beyond Libya, Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco, China, and Iraq.

VICTORIA SQUARE INCIDENT

Mr. ABBOTT: Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say whether he was consulted by the police before the arrest of a number of Aborigines in Victoria Square on Friday last; if he was, do these arrests signify any change in the handling of what is admittedly a very unfortunate and delicate situation; if he was not, will he consult his colleague, the Chief Secretary, to ensure that he will be involved in future?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I was quite unaware of the incident. I was in Perth last week, so I may be excused for not getting South Australian news, and I was in the South-East until yesterday morning. I will have the matter investigated, as part of the Aboriginal Affairs portfolio, in consultation with the Chief Secretary, and I thank the honourable member for bringing the matter to my notice.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 25 October. Page 430.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This is an extremely important Bill in terms of the Government's announced intention, during the recent election campaign and subsequently in this House, to seek to expand employment opportunities in this State. The Premier, in introducing the Bill, described it as being central to the Government's strategy for stimulating employment in South Australia. Its object is to give effect to that major election promise to create new jobs for our young people and, to quote from the Premier's policy speech, it is "a bold initiative that could mean more than 7 000 new jobs for them".

Therefore, the Bill deserves close consideration by the House, both as to whether it achieves those objectives and also as to the manner in which the Government is fulfilling the promises made in the election period and subsequently. Certainly, we on this side have no quarrel with the object of the Bill. Any measure that can be introduced by this Parliament that will stimulate employment opportunities and create more jobs is to be welcomed and supported. To the extent that the Bill seeks to do that, we must support it.

Certainly, it is not the way in which we on this side would approach the problems of the current economic malaise throughout Australia, and particularly as it relates to South Australia. It is not the approach we would take in relation to stimulating employment in the economy. One fundamental difference between the new Government and the Opposition has emerged over the question of job creation. We believe very firmly that there is a place in the armoury of Government measures to stimulate employ-

ment for job creation schemes, and that apart from their value in providing worthwhile employment to individuals and supplying them with job skills, and their flexibility of application, schemes such as the State Unemployment Relief Scheme leave behind lasting monuments to their effectiveness.

If one looks back to previous periods of major economic stagnation in Australia, particularly to the depression of the 1930's, albeit the schemes introduced were crude in nature, but they have left behind many monuments in terms of major public works, major development schemes, roads, and so on, which helped provide an infra-structure for later development in this economy and community. I use the word "community" advisedly, because one of the great essential features of Government job creation schemes of the type sponsored by the Federal Government (the Regional Employment Development scheme), and by this State Government (the State Unemployment Relief Scheme), is the community aspect. They leave facilities, the community assets, in communities throughout South Australia and in under-privileged areas, because those projects are geared towards areas where unemployment is highest, and therefore those areas of least social privilege. In time, as employment conditions improve and as the economy improves, one would see less and less the need for such schemes. What they leave behind is a valuable infra-structure to aid and accelerate economic development when the economy turns upwards.

That is a fundamental philosophical difference. The people of South Australia will have to judge over the next few years whether or not those two approaches can be properly measured against each other. Whatever happens in terms of the general economic stimulation of the economy, we sincerely hope that the process which, as I explained to the House, was begun well before the recent election (in fact, from the beginning of this year) will continue. If that process does continue, while it will be difficult to measure the two approaches to solving employment problems, I think an attempt must be made to do so.

We on this side still stand firmly behind the view that, in the current economic conditions, there is enormous value to be gained for the unemployed, and for the community generally, through an unemployment relief scheme. It is a tragedy that for philosophical or ideological reasons the Government refuses to continue that scheme, at least in a modified form. The Government has scrapped it. The Government's alternative (and it is a pity that it is not a supplement) is the scheme we have before us today. To the extent that it creates jobs, we have no quarrel with it, but I think we must examine this Bill to be sure that that is what is happening.

Unfortunately, not all of the details of the scheme are yet before us: some are to be embodied in regulations, according to the Premier's second reading speech, and are, as yet, unspecified. The second reading explanation given by the Premier has obviously been cobbled together somewhat hastily. It is certainly true that the essential elements of the scheme (the broad guidelines for it) have been spoken about and outlined to the community at large over some considerable time and were certainly explored during the election campaign. Indeed, they were costed in a specific costing document by the then Opposition.

There is a world of difference, particularly if one is looking at the effectiveness of a scheme, between those broad outlines and the actual specific administrative details and conditions attached to it. It is only those which will ensure whether it does, indeed, achieve its objectives, and the broad-brush financial measures outlined by the Government do not, in fact, give us any real assistance in

assessing whether this measure can or cannot work. In fact, I suggest that they have created considerable confusion, and that that confusion has not been clarified to any great extent by the measure before us.

I think that the second reading explanation shows signs of hasty preparation. Indeed, we were urging that the Government announce the specific details of its scheme as soon as possible. I do not think that that meant that we needed to await legislation coming before this House. The two, in a sense, have been released together. When one looks at the second reading explanation, to the extent that it tries to spell out detail of the scheme, I am afraid it is very deficient. I will now go into some detail regarding its deficiencies.

Let us examine each of the approaches that the Government has suggested to this strategy for stimulating employment. The first of these is the raising of the general exemption from pay-roll tax from \$66 000 to \$72 000 as from 1 January 1980. The second prong of the Government's attack, which relates to creating employment, deals with an exemption from pay-roll tax in respect of the wages of employees aged less than 20 years who are engaged after 30 September 1979. The third prong, related to the second, is the provision which proposes a system of rebating a portion of the pay-roll tax to those firms that increase total employment after 30 September by engaging one or two additional employees aged less than 20 years.

The first proposal (a general exemption which is aimed at stimulating employment generally) is one that is quite familiar to this House. It is a measure that has been adopted by previous Governments, certainly by the previous Administration, on a number of occasions. I do not think that there is disagreement between the two Parties about the problems of pay-roll tax in relation to the positive incentive that it sometimes provides to an employer not to take on extra labour. It is a pity that that tax can have that effect. It is the sort of tax that, if we can find a suitable replacement, should be done away with, in my view. That was always said by this Party when it was in Government. The problem is that it is a major growth tax for the State Government, and it certainly contributes a large proportion of State revenue, so Governments cannot afford to scrap it, even though it has been starkly revealed that it may, in fact, be a disincentive to employment.

The various other taxation measures proposed by the Government—abolishing this, that and the other tax (and I will be dealing with them later)—make it even more difficult to tamper with pay-roll tax. That is a pity, because I would have thought that some of those other measures were secondary to pay-roll tax because of its clear lack of incentive to employment. However, we cannot do away with pay-roll tax completely: there is agreement about that on both sides of the House. What we are trying to do is ensure that the incidence of pay-roll tax falls as lightly as possible. That is certainly what the first general exemption does—it lifts the exemption from \$66 000 to \$72 000. As such, it is consistent with amendments that have been made in the past.

A criticism of this is that the exemption does not really go far enough. Traditionally, our level of pay-roll tax has been related to that of Victoria, and there is some sense in that: the structure of industry and employment in Victoria is similar to that in South Australia. Victoria is a direct competitor of South Australia's in so many areas of manufacturing employment. Because of South Australia's distance from Eastern markets, we have some cost disadvantage which, in part, is compensated for by the fact that we have wage rates in South Australia slightly lower than those in Victoria. The fact remains that, unless our pay-roll tax is moving in somewhat the same vicinity as

that of Victoria, we have an immediate disadvantage in this area. The previous Government was at pains to maintain that sort of parity. I need go no further, I think, than refer the House to a statement made by the then Premier (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) on 2 October 1978, when he announced that there would be new South Australian pay-roll tax exemptions effective from 1 January 1979.

At that time the exemption figure was raised from \$60 000 to the current amount of \$66 000. It is important to look at the reasons for that increase because, in fact, that announcement was made only a few weeks after a State Budget was introduced. Why did the then Premier not include the revalued calculation and that exemption in his Budget document? Of course, the present Premier has referred to it in accompanying legislation.

The fact was that, in the intervening period between the preparation and introduction of that Budget and 2 October, the Victorian Budget was brought down. That Budget improved the exemption level of pay-roll tax for employers in Victoria. Mr. Dunstan moved swiftly indeed to make sure that pay-roll tax exemptions in South Australia matched those in Victoria. He pointed out that that was the fourth year in succession in which pay-roll tax exemptions had been increased. This is the fifth year in which they had been increased. Exemptions had been lifted in the previous year by 25 per cent; last year there was a further increase and this year we have yet another increase. This is the crucial point that I am drawing to the attention of the House. I quote from Mr. Dunstan's press statement, as follows:

However, the South Australian and Victorian pay-roll tax exemptions have always been closely linked. South Australia will increase its pay-roll tax exemptions in line with those of Victoria to provide jointly the lowest tax schedules in the country.

I think that the first important comment to make about this Bill is that the general exemptions do not go far enough, because the Victorian Budget, which was presented to the Legislative Assembly in that State on 26 September, increased exemption levels to a figure above those that appear in the Bill before us.

Whereas our exemption levels are \$72 000, and a \$32 400 minimum on a pay-roll of \$131 400, applying from the same date (1 January 1980), the Victorian exemption level will be \$84 000 to a flat exemption of \$37 800 on pay-rolls of \$153 300 or more. Clearly, theirs is a superior scheme, and there seems to be no reason why the present Government should not do as the Dunstan Administration did last year and in other years, namely, move to ensure that those rates are as close as possible to parity.

Having dealt with the particular general pay-roll advantage/disadvantage, I turn now to the second and third prongs of the Government's proposal. These both relate to what the Premier describes as "the most imaginative and ambitious contribution yet made by any State Government to tackle the problem of youth unemployment". Unemployment is falling most rigorously on the young, and any special measures or proposals that can assist the young unemployed are to be supported. Again, I say that the Opposition, although sceptical about the success of the proposed scheme, would like to see it work. Anything that will improve the plight of the young unemployed should be supported. Therefore, the criticisms which I will make of it in the course of my speech, and which subsequent Opposition members will make, will, I hope, be treated as constructive contributions by the Opposition to attempt to ensure that the Bill achieves what the Government says it should achieve in terms of job creation.

In his second reading explanation, the Premier refers to

what he calls an imaginative and ambitious contribution. He says that the two prongs "are based on the view that permanent job creation will be achieved only by increasing the levels of economic activity and profitability within our community, that is, by increasing the capacity of employers to engage more staff". One could quarrel with some of that statement. Indeed, permanent job creation should be our aim, and it can be readily pointed out that the unemployment relief schemes, which I was discussing earlier, do not provide permanent jobs and, as such, they can be criticised.

The answer to it is that they provide essential job skills and, although the jobs themselves and such schemes are of a temporary nature, they are introduced to ride out a period of economic recession. They are not regarded as permanent, but they can lead to permanent jobs. Impressive statistics have been garnered over the course of the scheme's operation that suggest that many participants eventually find permanent employment as a result of jobs undertaken under the scheme. The argument is not cut and dried in the sense of contrasting permanent as against temporary job creation.

The Premier believes that permanent jobs can be created only by increasing the levels of economic activity (and we agree with that) and profitability. Perhaps there is some connection with profitability, but profits are not necessarily spent on job creation. They can be pocketed, invested, or sent elsewhere, and are not necessarily a direct contribution to the community. I suspect that that was more of an ideological or rhetorical twist to his phrase. If the record of the Federal Government, which has operated on the view of returning as much profitability as possible to the private sector as its key to providing greater employment, is any guide, clearly it is a failure.

Companies have been showing increasing and, in many cases, record profits over recent years, but there has been no consequent increase in the level of employment in our economy. So, I am not sure that the connection between profitability and employment has been established to anyone's satisfaction. It is extremely doubtful; nonetheless, the Premier is probably obliged to refer to it.

The next paragraph of general explanation in his second reading speech is, I think, a pity, because it really just drums up the same old tired rhetoric, and in the present circumstances (and particularly as it is a new Government that is seeking to do certain things, such as to introduce a programme to stimulate economic activity and increase employment) I do not think that the Premier should be spending his time looking backwards, particularly as our economy is, and has been, on the mend for some time. The Premier said:

That view is, of course, rejected by the Opposition, which both now and when in Government was intent on reducing economic activity and reducing business profitability.

That is a fairly extraordinary statement: I am not sure why any Government in its right mind would be intent on reducing economic activity, the consequence of which is that business profitability is also reduced. That was an extraordinary statement for the Premier to make about a previous Government. Whether or not economic activity was reduced, in the opinion of the Premier, by the actions of the Government—to claim that we intended reducing it in a democracy—is an extraordinary statement. It is a pity that that sort of rhetoric is constantly creeping into the Premier's description of our economy and economic events. The time has stopped, he should realise, for knocking the State. He has swapped sides and his job is to talk up the economy.

We have swapped sides, too, but we do not see that coming to the Opposition side has given us some kind of

brief to talk down the economy, as he did for so many years. Our brief is to assist the Government, wherever possible, in any measures it may introduce to improve our economy and improve jobs and general prosperity in the community, and to criticise and comment on those that will not achieve that purpose. We have set ourselves that constructive task. It is a pity that the Premier, who is able to do something, should resort back to the tired rhetoric of the election campaign and say that the previous Government was intent on reducing economic activity. To illustrate that, he points to the fact that South Australia has the highest rate of unemployment, youth unemployment, and immigration amongst all States. Those statements in bald form may be right, but there are explanations for those things; and there are signs of improvement in relation to them.

Regarding immigration, there is always a lag between that indicator and unemployment and general economic downturn in a State or country. There are numerous explanations one could give and debate one could have about those figures, yet they are trotted out baldly in that way to try somehow to distance the new Government from the economic situation. I think it a pity that the Premier is still behaving as though he is in the middle of a campaign.

Let us look at a number of points in relation to these two measures, which are aimed at stimulating youth employment, in particular, and creating permanent jobs—particularly the second prong of this approach, that which provides a rebate for the employment of one or two new young employees. It is similar to a Commonwealth scheme that has been in operation for some time now, namely, the Special Youth Employment Training Programme (or SYETP, for short), which provides a direct grant or subsidy of \$45 a week to an employer who employs young people under certain conditions. The scheme is of limited duration; certainly a shorter duration than envisaged in the measure before us. At present, it applies for four months.

That scheme has been in operation for two years. In an earlier stage, the period of employment was up to six months. It has many features similar to those in the scheme before us. Certainly, the amount of subsidy provided is very much greater than that provided under this scheme. Clearly, the Premier is fully aware of the details. In fact, his tables attached to the second reading speech, showing how much an employer could benefit, add the amount that a person might receive under the SYETP scheme and show considerable benefits when one couples the SYETP amount with the concessions provided under this Bill that an employer could enjoy.

I think a point to note here is that the SYETP scheme has been in operation for some time and has had no marked effect on the level of youth unemployment in Australia, or in South Australia for that matter. It could be argued that it has been hedged with too many restrictions, and that the programme has been constantly revised and adjusted over a time. Certainly, its intention and funding basis are very similar to the schemes we have before us. If one tries to forecast whether these schemes are going to work (and we on this side hope they do, although we are a bit dubious about it), one cannot get too much consolation from the SYETP scheme and its operation, because it has not had the sort of dramatic effect that the Premier is suggesting his pay-roll tax scheme will have, yet the subsidy rate under that scheme is very much higher and more valuable to an employer, certainly over that shorter period.

A second thing to note about the two-pronged attack on youth employment creation is the disparity in the costing, particularly as revealed in the costing document attached

to the Premier's policy speech in the last election, the costs as shown in the Budget, and in fact some of the comments that have been made about them by the Premier in his second reading explanation. It appeared to be a hastily put-together document, and this is borne out by some of the statements made in it and some figures contained in it. There was an arithmetical mistake in the paragraph referring to details of indexing pay-rolls and the general exceptions. The costing document attached to the Premier's second reading speech states that, on an annual payroll of \$100 000, existing payroll tax is \$2 833, but, by increasing the maximum exemption level as proposed, this amount will reduce to \$2 133, which he said was a saving of \$500.

If those figures are right, the saving is \$700, or alternatively we must adjust the level of reduction. That sort of arithmetical error sits ill in a money Bill, a measure of this kind. I refer to another error, which relates to a statement by the Premier in the course of his remarks, when he covered criticisms that had been made in another context by the Opposition regarding the costing of the Government's proposals. The Premier stated:

It has been alleged that the budgetary provision of \$2 000 000 for the total package of pay-roll tax promises is considerably less than the Government's pre-election promise of \$6 450 000. Let me assure the House that this is not so.

The Premier goes on to explain why he believes that that is not so. He said it was a budgetary provision of \$2 000 000 for the total package of pay-roll tax promises, yet only two pages later he said:

The final point in regard to the cost of the scheme relates to the specific allocation of \$2 000 000 that is provided in the Budget.

That comes at the end of a passage in which he said that in our costing, or our criticisms of the costing, we have not taken into account the exemption scheme and the effect of that in terms of cost benefits. Either the total package is \$2 000 000 or, in fact, only one part of that package, namely the rebate, is \$2 000 000. I think that should be made fairly clear to the House.

There does, if one examines the figures (and we have looked at this in the Budget context previously), appear to be a discrepancy of about \$1 000 000 between the promise and performance in part A, the general exemption scheme, and in element B there is no mention at all in the policy speech of precisely what the exemptions will cost. The Liberal election costing document says it is small, but an examination of some of the financial implications of the scheme suggests it might be a larger figure. That is not made clear from the Budget documents or anything the Premier said in his second reading explanation. There seems to be a discrepancy of \$2 700 000 on the maximum costing, or \$1 100 000 on the more reasonable costing which was referred to by the Premier, which somehow has never been explained to this House either, so precisely what the scheme is costing, what basis of calculation is being made, is not clear.

That has some relevance because, apart from the financial implications to the planning of the Government's Budget (and admittedly, if the scheme is a huge success and more money is needed, the Premier has provided a \$2 100 000 surplus in his overall Budget results), whatever the cost of the scheme, we must use figures like this to try somehow to judge whether that scheme can honour the extremely important election pledge that something of the order of 7 000 jobs would be created by it. During the election, much was made of this magic figure of 7 000 jobs. It has been mentioned again and again since then, and not simply by us. It appeared in advertisements, in the

Premier's policy speech and in the costing document, although when one looks at the costing document in relation to the magic 7 000 jobs, one sees that that document, which purported to try to look somewhat more closely and honestly at the costing proposals (and we believe many of the costings are in error) was an attempt to get down to the nitty-gritty of the actual costs to the Government, and it talks about the figure of 7 000 additional jobs as being very optimistic. Indeed, it might be. In fact, it is extremely optimistic if one looks at the costings provided by the Government.

Let us say the amount provided for the rebate scheme is \$2 000 000. It is easy enough to calculate an upper and lower number of jobs that may be created in this financial year by that scheme. For instance, if every employer employed two individuals under the scheme, he would have enough money for 2 962 jobs. On the other hand, if every employer who took advantage of this scheme employed only a single individual, on our calculations 4 444 jobs would be created. Clearly, the actual figure would be somewhere between those two figures—say, 3 500. That is a long way below the 7 000 jobs. It is certainly clear from this Bill and from the costing in it that it is not the Government's intention (it has not been provided for) that those 7 000 jobs will be created. It will be a figure considerably less than that. I think that should be made clear to people and that they should understand it.

I have dealt with the question of costs and the question of the number of jobs. I would like to deal now with a number of important points relating to the actual feasibility of the scheme in administrative terms. I do this, of course, in a situation where it is not yet completely clear to us precisely how the scheme will work, but there do seem to be loopholes and there also seems to be room for possible abuse. Remember, this is a scheme that aims to provide permanent employment. As such, it differs from an unemployment relief scheme, which provides employment for a temporary or fixed time. It is seeking that those employers who take advantage of the rebates or exemptions given to them shall continue to employ the individuals employed under the scheme. The scheme has to be judged against that.

It will be quite useless if a number of people are employed for a short term and then get put off. With regard to how the scheme works administratively, for a start, one of the problems that immediately raises itself is how we can be sure that employers are actually permanently increasing the size of their work force. For example, in the retail trade during the next few months a large number of people will be employed. This is a seasonal factor; about 3 000 were employed in November and December last year in order to meet the demands of the retail trade. These people are not employed permanently; some of them go off the pay-roll through January and there is a general tapering effect. This can be seen quite clearly in the employment figures. This scheme operates from 1 October 1979, and any employer in the retail trade can take advantage of the exemptions and rebate, provided that he meets the criteria of actually increasing the size of his work force and that the employees are under the age of 20 years.

What happens after that? After he has taken advantage of them, is there some way in which we can ensure that these people are being employed on a permanent basis? If they are filing a monthly, quarterly or annual return (it is not clear from anything said in the second reading explanation exactly what sort of requirement there will be in terms of that administrative detail), what is to prevent employers from employing persons in December,

obtaining the benefit of the exemption over that month, and then in January putting them off? In the case of the exemption, perhaps one could reclaim that in time. In the case of a rebate, is it the Government's intention that that will be claimed back? That important question ought to be answered and made quite clear to people, otherwise the employers will see a loophole of which they can take advantage.

It is not unknown that that sort of advantage is taken of any sort of Government tax concession or exemption scheme. Regrettably, while some employers try to do the right thing, there are a number who see the Government and any of its tax measures as being fair game, and they try to work the system to their greatest possible financial advantage. This example of seasonal taking-on of employees is one of these advantages. It is important to note that one could declare that the scheme had been a remarkable success with, say, 2 000 or 3 000 people being employed under it in that November to December period. The point, of course, is that those people would have been employed anyway. To what extent has the number of employees been increased in some real way rather than in a seasonal or temporary way? The answer is that they have not. In that case, the Government is really simply giving a handout to those employers employing on that basis. One could be excused for thinking that this is a nice Christmas gift to a group in the community which supported the Government and which very considerably helped the Government into office. Whether this scheme will help the employment situation in South Australia to pay employers to employ people they would have employed anyway is very questionable indeed. In due course, the Deputy Leader will be dealing with that point.

Another matter of concern is the stress that is laid in the scheme on full-time workers. "Full-time" is defined in the forms outlining qualifications for the scheme as "work of 35 hours per week or more". The problem with that, of course, is that it is clearly a discrimination against part-time workers, many of whom are women, members of a greatly disadvantaged sector of our work force. What this means is that an employer has been given an incentive to convert part-time jobs into full-time jobs and claim the subsidy for whatever period of time the subsidy operates. When the exemption or rebate cuts out he can probably revert to his former arrangements with regard to organising the job. Because part-time employees are excluded from the numbers in the employer's establishment (that is made clear in the form issued by the Commissioner of Stamps—they cannot be included in the head count, as it were), if an employer employs, say, 30 persons, 10 of whom are full-time workers and 20 of whom are part-time workers, he can simply dismiss the 20 part-time workers, convert that into 10 full-time jobs, employ persons under 20 years of age, and claim the exemption. In that instance a number of people would be put out of the work force, namely, 20, and 10 would be put into the work force. Admittedly, these would be employed on a full-time basis, but it would be achieved at some social and employment cost, the net result being not to improve the employment situation at all. That is the sort of loophole that ought to be looked at in relation to the scheme.

The administration of the scheme seems to depend very much on the honour system: what numbers did employers have at the commencement of the scheme on 1 October 1979? I cannot find anything on the form which requires them to state that; perhaps a record of that is held in the office of the Commissioner of Stamps and this may be clarified during the course of the debate. On looking at the form, one can see that the employer is required simply to declare the number of employees for whom he is claiming

the special exemption. He does not have to provide any more detail than that. Who is to inspect and measure the number that he has?

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Doesn't he provide a regular return?

Mr. BANNON: If indeed he is providing a regular return of the number of employees and that return shows what his numbers were at the crucial date, that point would be covered because on record would be the number that he was employing.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: If he wasn't providing a return, it would mean he wouldn't be employing enough people to involve paying pay-roll tax.

Mr. BANNON: Yes.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: That wouldn't really apply then, would it?

Mr. BANNON: That is true. That is a very interesting point that I will come to shortly. Another area is that of tax harvesting, which relates to the seasonal effect that I was discussing earlier. What is there to prevent an employer from employing people at the end of the financial year in June, actually increasing the number of employees employed over that annual period, claiming exemption or rebate accordingly, and then dismissing them some time soon after the commencement of the new year. Again, is his exemption cancelled out? Does he have to return any rebate that has been paid to him?

A lot of these details have been left to administration, and that is admitted in the second reading explanation. The Premier, when in Opposition, used to wax long, loud and eloquent about leaving matters to regulation. In an area such as this, where the position has to be made clear to people seeking advantage of this scheme, the more one can spell out in legislation, the better. I was surprised to find, in one of his first major Bills, that the Premier did not put into effect the sort of principle that he always talked about when in Opposition—to ensure that as little as possible is left to regulation and as much as possible is allowed to come before the Parliament for discussion and examination.

I now come, finally, to what I believe is the worst feature of this whole proposal. In fact, one could put it almost as strongly as to say that one of the effects of this measure is to positively discriminate against small business in this State; it is almost an attack on small business. Certainly, I know that that would not be the Premier's intention and, certainly, none of his election policies or his rhetoric would suggest in any way that an attack on small business is the sort of thing his Government would stand for. Yet, this is what is happening under this scheme. As the Premier implied a moment ago by way of interjection, there are indeed a large number of businesses in this State that do not pay any pay-roll tax. In fact, one can use the figures from the costing document issued by the Liberal Party during the course of the election campaign. The Bureau of Statistics return as at December 1978 gives figures of the division of South Australian businesses by employment size. The number of enterprises employing one to four employees is 18 239. A further 5 427 employ five to nine employees (we are getting, in that bracket, I imagine, to those firms which would pay pay-roll tax). A total of 22 000 to 23 000 firms in this State do not pay any pay-roll tax.

These businesses would therefore receive no benefit from either the exemptions or the rebate scheme. They represent about 70 per cent of businesses in this State. Therefore, more than 70 per cent of businesses in this State will not be able to take advantage of this scheme. There will be no benefit to them from employing more people. Surely, if the Government is trying by this means

to create comprehensive long-term permanent employment for people it should introduce a scheme that would benefit that group of businesses. Not only is 70 per cent of the businesses in that category but, using the same table, a total of more than 75 000 employees work in businesses employing between one and nine people. About a quarter of the employees in this State will thus not be covered in any way by this scheme. In devising this scheme the Government should have found some way in which to help small businesses of that nature. Within the scheme there is the opportunity to do so, if in fact the rebate were extended to cover those firms not paying pay-roll tax. In other words, if it were made generally available to all firms, that might be creating something more in the way of permanent employment. Perhaps the Premier will comment on that matter.

I think that in summary we can conclude that the scheme is being rather hastily cobbled together. It has been insufficiently costed, and it is extremely problematical whether it will work. One or two aspects of it require further consideration. Without prejudice to the date of its operation, the Government should take this Bill, rework the scheme, provide some further details, and then let it continue through the course of debate in this House. Accordingly, I seek leave to continue my remarks later, in order to provide the Government with the opportunity to take the Bill out and have another look at it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: No.

Mr. BANNON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in that case I will continue my remarks by saying that I hereby conclude them.

Mr. WRIGHT (Adelaide): I move:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Abbott, Lynn Arnold, Bannon, Max Brown, Corcoran, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Noes (25)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Webster, Wilson, and Wotton.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. WRIGHT: I want to place on record that the exercise just conducted by the Opposition was to give the Government the opportunity to examine the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition in which he criticised but did not condemn or oppose the legislation; he set out articulately the parts of the Bill to which the Opposition believes attention should be given. I do not think it does the Premier any credit to refer to John Bannon and myself as "Laurel and Hardy"; I heard the Premier say that across the Chamber. I could say lots of things personally about the Premier if I wanted to, but I have never done so. I think it would do him some good if he refrained from saying such things. After all one cannot help one's build or one's lack of hair.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not think there is anything in the Bill about Laurel and Hardy.

Mr. WRIGHT: That may be true. I cannot find it in the Bill, but the matter was introduced by your Leader.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not reflect on the Chair.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I support the Bill but I do so on humane rather than philosophical grounds. I am a humanitarian, as are the other members of my Party, and that is why for so long we have been concerned about the plight of the unemployed, and have taken the actions we have taken over the past three or four years to try to combat unemployment.

Philosophically, we disagree with the Government. The Labor Party and the Liberal Party have always disagreed philosophically, first, on the issue of unemployment, and, secondly, on the method of solving the problem when it has to be faced in Government. I believe that the way to solve the unemployment problem is to have an injection into the economy, and I do not think the method adopted by the Liberal Party is doing that. It is virtually a handout to employers, and I am sincere in saying that I hope it works.

I believe that the method by which South Australia has operated (and it is the only State to do so over the past three years), namely, through funding of \$50 000 000 to SURS, has been the method to solve this problem, provided the scheme could have had back-up funds from a sympathetic Federal Government. Had a Labor Government been in office federally during the term of office of the South Australian Labor Government, I believe we would have had capital works programmes, schemes of the nature of the RED scheme, and so on, which would have been more conducive to stimulating the economy than is the proposition before us.

However, that is in the future. I hope that the proposition put forward by the Government will rejuvenate the economy and find work for young, middle-aged, and all other unemployed people. However, I have grave doubts about the effect on the economy, as forecast by the Government. The Government has made many forecasts. All sorts of figures have been bandied around about what the scheme will and will not do. During the election campaign, I read a declared statement that 7 000 jobs would be found in South Australia, if the Liberals were elected, because of this action. I recall advertisements in the daily papers telling us that there would be 7 000 jobs. In this House, the Minister of Industrial Affairs said recently that there was a possibility of 12 000 jobs being created. I do not decry that. I doubt it, but I sincerely hope the figures are right. If they are correct in the next 12 months or so, I will be the first to congratulate the Government on getting us out of a situation in which no-one in this Parliament likes to see us; but I have doubts about it.

The Bill contains three elements. The first is the overall rebate scheme, which is not new to this State or to any other State. What concerns me is that, for the first time, concessions offered to businesses in South Australia are below those offered in Victoria.

Those of us who were here last year, or anyone who has taken an interest in the matter, would know that, last year, we had the second bite at the cherry following the introduction of Victoria's Budget. It was necessary for the South Australian Government, on that occasion, to increase allowances and concessions to compete with what was being offered in Victoria.

Such a course is tremendously important in this area, because Victoria is our closest neighbour and probably our biggest competitor in attracting industry. Unless the Government is prepared to re-examine the position, we will be at a disadvantage in comparison with Victoria, to the best of my knowledge for the first time. I know that we corrected the situation last year. I draw that to the attention of the Premier in the hope that he will examine it. It was one of the points I picked up in going through the Bill.

The second element is that the scheme is to operate for two years, with no limit as far as employees are concerned. The conditions of the exemption from pay-roll tax will apply if an employee is less than 20 years of age at the time of employment. Has consideration been given to the effect of that? The first question that comes to mind is what would happen to someone who is aged 19 years and 9 months. Has that aspect been considered? Will he get the benefit of two years and three months, perhaps at the expense of someone else?

The Minister of Industrial Affairs said the other day that that matter was under consideration, and the example given then was not as drastic as the one I have just quoted. I hope that an employee will not be discriminated against because he turns 22 years of age before the expiration of two years.

Mr. Mathwin: There has to be a cut-off point.

Mr. WRIGHT: Of course, but I am pointing out difficulties that could occur. People have phoned me, expressing concern about the position of people who were 18 years of age and who could qualify for the full two years, as against someone aged 19 years 10 months.

The third element of the scheme is the rebate system which is maximised for two employees and gives benefits at \$150 a quarter for one employee or \$450 a quarter for two employees. In my view, those three elements will give some assistance to employers, especially considering also the SYETP scheme, which has been operating since 1977, although there have been some variations during that time in relation to qualifications, and so on. I do understand that, at the moment, under the SYETP scheme, provided a person has been out of work for the preceding four months, an employer is entitled to employ him and receive a subsidy of \$45 a week for the next four months.

Combining the three elements, the scheme does not appear to me as lucrative for employers as is the SYETP scheme, with a flat rate of \$45 a week. Under this scheme, a fortunate employer, finding the right employee at the right time, is able to drag in all the considerations, giving him a large benefit indeed. I heard the Leader dealing with these figures.

The \$64 question concerns the SYETP scheme. One of the strongest currents emanating from the Liberal philosophy has related to this scheme. The suggestion is that it did not work for the past two years or, if and when it did, it had complications. These complications are clear. Employers in those circumstances were engaging people under the SYETP scheme for the duration of the payment period, then dismissing them and re-employing other people. I believe that similar openings exist under this scheme. I do not rely on my own authority for that remark, but on the authority of the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations at that stage, Mr. Street, who told Federal conference after Federal conference that employers were dishonest in their attitude towards the SYETP scheme.

I am not saying that, collectively, or overall, employers are dishonest people. I am saying that there are people in the community who, in any circumstances, will try to find some way to gain any concession offered by the Government. That will always happen.

Mr. Mathwin: You get that on both sides of the fence.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am talking about employers at this stage. We have heard enough in the past about employees wrongfully claiming social services payments, and the like, also. The honourable member has said that this happens on both sides of the fence, but there is irrefutable evidence that employers have used the SYETP scheme to their own advantage and not for the purposes for which the scheme

was introduced. It was designed to train people so that they could get other employment, yet we found that employers were using it to their own advantage rather than to the advantage of employees. I think that those openings are just as evident in the scheme put forward today by the Premier as they were in the SYETP scheme. I hope that the officers in charge of administering this legislation have considered the incidents on record as having occurred under the SYETP scheme so that that sort of thing will not occur under this scheme.

I urge the Premier to watch this matter closely. He should have officers of his department continually checking this aspect of the matter, because it will be absolutely no good if we find that this scheme is being used for purposes other than those for which it was designed. It is designed to help people find new, additional jobs, not for employers to put some people off and put other people on so as to obtain the subsidy granted under this scheme or, in the case I have illustrated, subsidies; that is how generous this scheme can be. There can be more than one subsidy in these circumstances. If employers are allowed to use this scheme to their own advantage, nothing has been gained.

I turn to another area that needs to be watched closely, one that I do not think the Government has examined closely enough. The ability to do that may only come with experience, so I point out this possible anomaly so that the Government can take care of it and, also, so that it does not take credit for recognising this problem when it occurs. One of the things which will happen in two or three days and which will continue to happen through November and December is that there will be an increase in private employment. Each year there has been an increase in private employment of about 3 000 to 3 500 persons at this time of the year in South Australia. I have checked the 1978 figure, which shows an employment increase during this period of 3 500 persons.

In the main, those people will be employed by the retail stores in Adelaide. The Christmas selling explosion comes at this time of the year, and there is always an influx of employees into positions in the stores in November and December, which sometimes continues until January when those people are then laid off. This increased employment is created by the explosion in the shopping habits of people at this time of the year and shop assistants are put on in their thousands. I do not think it is proper, unless it can be established that those people are additional full-time employees, that a benefit be given to employers in that area. If persons have been employed wholly and solely for the Christmas rush period, will those employers be entitled to these concessions, or will it be necessary for a person to be employed for a period of 12 months before the rebate is given?

It is obvious that, if this proviso does not apply, there will be a tremendous rip-off by the retail trade through these concessions. The increased employment figure will be the same this year as it was last year, because these employees are a must for the retail traders, in order for the retailers to get over the Christmas shopping period. I think that it would be throwing money down the drain if these employers were to receive the benefits provided by this scheme when they were not engaging additional full-time employees. As the Premier said, this scheme involves the employment of full-time employees. I hope that the seasonal situation was considered when this legislation was drafted.

My last point, which I believe is as important as the point I have just made, concerns the protection of what can be described as full-time part-time workers. A situation that has operated in the retail trades for quite

some time is that two people may be on full-time part-time employment. They are employed for 52 weeks of the year and each person is employed for 20 hours per week, making up 40 hours in total, so that two employees are putting in the hours of one full-time employee. An award covers this type of employment, and the employees get annual leave, sick leave and all of the other benefits involved. They are recognised by the award. I believe that it is possible, under this legislation, that those two part-time workers could be retrenched and replaced by one full-time worker.

Members must realise that there is no concession or rebate exemption available to the person employing the two permanent part-time employees. However, by the stroke of a pen an employer can retrench those two part-time employees by giving them notice under the terms of the award and then employ one full-time employee for 35 or 40 hours a week to make up the deficiency. One might then find the employer is entitled to receive the concessions offered by the Government. I do not believe that that is a proper use of the provisions provided in this legislation.

I hope that the persons advising the Premier have taken the matters I have raised (as well as the intricate matters raised by the Leader) into consideration so that there can be absolutely no chance of an employer using this legislation (as some employers used the SYETP legislation in the past) to his own advantage rather than to the advantage of employees, doing whatever he can to obtain money quite wrongly from the State Budget.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I find it difficult to believe that the Leader and his Deputy have come into the House so totally unprepared about this legislation. Judging by the amount they have said during the past few days (and, indeed, weeks) and the amount that they said during the election campaign, I find it extraordinary that the only documents that seem to have been used are the ones on costing produced by what was then the Opposition in the run up to the election campaign, and the second reading explanation I made in this House. Very little that those members have raised needs replying to.

It was also interesting to note the attitudes of the speakers. It was only a little way into the Deputy Leader's speech that I learnt that he is supporting the Bill. Judging from what he said at the end of his speech, I am still confused about whether he is supporting or opposing the Bill. The Leader did not say whether or not the Opposition is supporting the Bill.

Mr. Mathwin: He had 20c each way.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would prefer to say what Sir Thomas Playford used to say—two bob each way. Indeed, the Leader certainly is doing that. It seems to me that the Leader has been in two minds about this whole business all the way through.

He has not known whether to support it or criticise it. He has desperately wanted to criticise, yet he has been forced, on what he calls humanitarian grounds, to support it. He agrees that it is an extremely important piece of legislation, and hopes that it will expand employment, and he has made that clear. He expressed the view that the SURS scheme was a better way of stimulating employment, and there we differ. While he has no quarrel with the objects (I do not think that anyone has), we differ on the major means of achieving the end: increased employment, particularly for the young.

I do not intend to canvass the pros and cons of the SURS scheme; suffice to say that, while there may be many major monuments to the scheme around the State,

few permanent jobs have been produced as a result of it. I would far rather have increased productivity in the private sector and self-supporting jobs that become permanent, resulting in far greater benefits not only to individuals but also to the community. The Leader has tried to take the credit for anything nice that has happened in the past few weeks, saying that the basis was laid down during the years before the change of Government. Then he says that nothing good has been happening. He is criticising for the sake of criticising.

The scheme has been examined by authorities in many States and, I understand, in Canada, and I believe that it has every chance of working. I am not pretending that there will not be little problems in the administration of the scheme, and the Leader would be foolish if he thought that I would not accept that. The legislation has been drawn up in an extremely good way, and much will be done by regulation, but it is the spirit that matters. We are here representing all South Australians, and want to do the best we can for unemployment in South Australia. No-one on either side of the House would deny that that is our major object. We have a scheme which will do things, we hope, to improve youth unemployment, in particular.

I believe that the scheme can and will work, particularly if there is the degree of community commitment to solving the problem which, I believe, exists in the community now. The Leader says that the whole situation has created confusion, but I cannot for the life of me see that it has. The scheme, in its three prongs, has been clearly outlined before and after the election campaign, and it has been outlined in the House. So, how the Leader can accuse it of stimulating confusion, I do not know. He himself said that it had been well canvassed before the election, whereas now he says that it is confusing. He does not know where he stands. It is that dichotomy of purpose, which seems to be characteristic of him at present.

He says that the exemption here is not high enough. I contrast that with the statements he made during the election campaign roundly castigating the Liberal Party for daring to raise the exemption at all. Obviously, the transition from the Government benches to the Opposition benches has made the Leader change his attitude toward this matter by saying that this is not enough and that the Government should be doing more. I wish that he would look a little more closely at the total package that has been presented to the House. If he is comparing us with Victoria, which, as he pointed out, has recently raised its exemption again, and looks not only at the increase in the exemption level but also at the exemption for additional employment and the positive rebate incentives for youth employment, he will see that our package deal is better than the Victorian deal. The sooner he gets that through his thinking the better. None of the criticisms he has made this afternoon really stand up to analysis. It is obvious that they have been made with a lack of thought and in a shallow manner indeed. He makes a point about the 7 000 jobs that we said could be created from the scheme.

Mr. Bannon: You said 12 000 the other day.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Indeed, 12 000 jobs could be available. The Leader complains because they have not been created. It is only about six weeks ago that the Government changed. During that time, it is absolutely ridiculous to believe that 7 000 jobs will have been created overnight. Certainly the potential is there and I believe that, over a 12-month period, it will happen. The \$2 000 000 rebate, which seemed to concern the Leader particularly, applies only to the rebate scheme, and not to the exemption provisions. If the Leader reads my second reading explanation more carefully, he will see exactly

what is involved. It certainly may be true, as he said, that the appropriation of \$2 000 000 is sufficient only to produce a maximum number of about 4 400 jobs, and that is fair enough: we have not said that 7 000 jobs would be created immediately in the first year. The \$2 000 000 is not even for one full year; it is only for the nine months from October to June next year, which is when the Government will decide how the scheme will continue in the second year. New jobs will continue to be created in the second and subsequent years and that is the whole principle behind this scheme. The Leader says that he would like to see this scheme work but that he is sceptical.

Mr. Mathwin: He's hoping that it won't.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I rather gained the impression that he is hoping that it will not work, but cannot say so.

Mr. Bannon: That's not so.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I hope not, because it would be an unfortunate situation indeed. He agrees that economic expansion is important, but says that profitability is not important. Profitability does not mean ripping off large profits; it means that an organisation, company or enterprise is working properly and is viable and self-supporting, and that is absolutely essential. If the Leader believes that any organisation can survive without being profitable, again he is not as bright as I have been led to believe. He knows perfectly well that, if a company is not profitable, it will go under, and jobs will be lost. Profitability is a major point in this matter.

He talks about the loopholes and continuity. For "loopholes", I read the words "difficulties he is creating". Benefits being paid to employees in respect of part-time employment during the Christmas period were raised. It was suggested that there would be a rip-off, but the situation is clear: full-time employment means 35 hours a week over a continuous three-month period with one exception, namely, the maximum break of three weeks that will be allowed any employer to fill a vacancy caused by the resignation of an additional full-time employee.

As for the suggestion that there should be two permanent part-timers retrenched and one full-time employee replacing them and claiming the benefit, the regulations will ensure that that cannot occur. We heard the Leader asking how can we be sure that people are complying with the present requirements. We will be sure that they are so complying in exactly the same way we can be sure that they are obeying the present law. He says, too, that it is an attack on small business.

That was an even more specious argument. What about the increase in exemption generally? That is going to benefit small business more than any other section of industry. Many firms do not pay pay-roll tax at all, and now even more of them will not pay it because of that exemption. How this can be an attack on small business, I do not know, but obviously it seems to be something that the Leader is determined to do. As for the tactics of trying to hold up the legislation, which is desperately needed and which everyone agrees is absolutely essential, it does the Leader little credit, even in this early stage of his leadership, to indulge in such tactics. He has not got the best interests of the South Australian community at heart.

Further, I believe that the pay-roll tax incentive scheme, the total package, is an extraordinarily good one. It has every chance of success and every chance of creating all the jobs that we would want, provided that it has the support of everyone in the community and that we do not have any doubting Thomases and Jonahs torpedoing it or trying to sabotage its operation. I believe that not even the Opposition would want to do that, and I suggest to it that it should stop doing it forthwith.

Last week the State Taxation Office recorded about 700 inquiries into the youth employment aspect of the Pay-Roll Tax Act Amendment Bill. It was estimated that at least three-quarters of those inquiries were from employers asking how they could go about putting on more employees. In other words, they wanted to take advantage of the scheme.

The confusion that the member for Mitchell talked about has been in the mind of the Labor Party, and that was the point of my earlier comment about sabotaging this scheme. The Opposition would do a whole lot better to support and get behind the scheme, as every other South Australian will. I have been impressed and heartened by the degree of support that this scheme is receiving already from employers in the community, and I suggest that we would all get on much better if the Opposition stopped nit-picking and got down to the business of helping to make sure that the scheme worked.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Deduction from taxable wages."

Mr. BANNON: Can this clause be used to deal with all the amendments standing in my name, Mr. Chairman, because they all relate to the same point?

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry. I should have sought that information earlier from the Leader. I am prepared to treat the first amendment as a test amendment, and the honourable member may canvass all the matters on which he has amendments.

Mr. BANNON: I move:

Page 1, lines 20 and 21—Leave out "two thousand seven hundred dollars" and insert "three thousand one hundred and fifty dollars".

All my amendments are part of an exercise to put into effect the proposal which I made in the second reading debate and which is that the general exemption in pay-roll tax in South Australia should be brought into line with the level of exemption applying in Victoria. The arguments for that are quite compelling. There has been a historical connection, and it is not sufficient for the Premier to argue that the total tax package should be looked at in the course of this examination. The fact is that the youth employment aspects of this Bill are aimed at a particular section of the population and a particular employment purpose.

Here we are dealing with the general exemption, and it is that on which the normal calculations are made as relates to cost benefit. Employers who may wish to relocate in South Australia, comparing or weighing the benefits of South Australia as opposed to Victoria, obviously look at a number of factors, not the least of which is pay-roll tax. I suspect that, if they have a staff or complement of a certain number, they will not then try to extrapolate what will happen if they put on further employees in this or that circumstance. That may bring them benefits indeed, but the basic comparison must be made between the general exemptions.

There has been a historical connection. Our Pay-Roll Tax Act has been amended annually for the past five years in order to improve the exemption level and, as I stated in the second reading debate, that is an appropriate procedure. Pay-roll tax is a growth tax, but the indexing of pay-roll tax is most important because of the bad effect that pay-roll tax can have in the sense that it is a positive disincentive for employers to put on more staff.

It is unfortunate that it has that element in it. It has been particularly damaging in this period of economic downturn, but that is the large growth tax with which the States are stuck. I would have hoped that areas such as wealth taxes could be looked at by the Government.

However, clearly the Government is looking to get rid of wealth taxes as quickly as it can, which is a pity, because a wealth tax is of such a nature that it falls on those who can most afford to pay it.

The Government does not seem to think that that is a way of compensating for the abolition of pay-roll tax, and we are stuck with pay-roll tax because there is no adequate substitute. However, that puts a strong onus on the Government to ensure that the rates are constantly updated to ensure that there is indexation and that that tax remains competitive with the taxation in those States with which we seek to compare ourselves, particularly Victoria.

Victoria has a similar pattern of industry, a manufacturing base, and is a close and fierce competitor with South Australia. Victoria is in the middle of the eastern markets to which we seek to export, so it has that immediate advantage. At least our pay-roll tax level, in terms of general exemption, could match Victoria's. There is ample precedent for it. It was a policy of the previous Government. I quote from the release of the Hon. D. A. Dunstan when he was Premier, only a little over 12 months ago, when he stated:

The South Australian and Victorian pay-roll tax exemptions have always been closely linked.

He went on to say:

South Australia will increase its pay-roll tax exemptions in line with those of Victoria.

The nexus has been established. The response—

Mr. Mathwin: This—

Mr. BANNON: I know that the member for Glenelg will definitely support this, because he can see the problem.

Mr. Mathwin: I never supported Mr. Dunstan in my life.

Mr. BANNON: An examination of the record in *Hansard* will show that the honourable member did support Mr. Dunstan in raising the exemption on that occasion, so I do not think that the honourable member is correct. I will have the records checked to ensure that the honourable member has not led himself into falsehood. The honourable member said he had never supported the previous Premier, Mr. Dunstan, in his life. I suspect that on that occasion he did, and I hope that, for the same reasons as he did then, he will support the Opposition in its move now. I emphasise that that nexus has been established, and it was maintained by the former Government. My amendment seeks to move the pay-roll tax level of exemption in line with the level of exemption in Victoria, which is an important principle, and we hope that this Government will continue to subscribe to it.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I received a copy of the amendments only as the Leader began to speak. I can understand his being reticent about circulating them.

Mr. BANNON: They were available and, in fact, were circulated prior to my rising to speak in this debate. I am sorry the Premier did not see his copy.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Whether the amendments were circulated early or late does not matter; I think it would be better if they had not seen the light of day. I make again the point I made earlier: it would be almost credible for the Leader to move this series of amendments if his Party had not been so vocal before the recent election, about six weeks ago, about condemning any increase in the level of exemption. The Labor Party was very critical (as only the Labor Party can be when it is really worked up) about the whole business. The Leader talks about indexation, and that is exactly what the increase proposed in this Bill will do. It is in line with indexation. It is effectively indexing the exemptions upwards again. In so doing, the increase is following the procedure that has been adopted by Governments of

Labor Party persuasion in the past. The position in Victoria has changed recently because of the Victorian Budget. It is fascinating to see how the Leader has latched on to that. I am not sure that his attitude is shared by the Victorian Leader of the Opposition regarding pay-roll tax. I invite the Leader to check out that little matter.

Mr. Wright: What's that got to do with it?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader seemed to be placing a good deal of importance on Victoria.

Mr. Keneally: You're either going to accept the amendment, or you're not.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have made it clear that I will not accept the amendment. The member for Stuart was obviously not listening. He was probably too embarrassed by his Leader's reference to a wealth tax. I would probably be ruled out of order if I extended the debate at the moment, but I would love to hear the Leader's views on wealth tax, as would, I am sure, the people of South Australia. The Bill effectively indexes the exemption on previous years, and there is no way that we will accept this amendment.

Mr. BANNON: I would like to get the record clear, because the Premier seems determined to fudge the issue and indulge in great circumlocutions which have got us nowhere at all and which avoid the basic point raised in moving this amendment. The point is simple. Certainly, during the election campaign, I was not aware of a specific policy promise by the previous Government that it would alter the level of exemptions of pay-roll tax, but I point out to the Premier the Government's record. In 1978, in circumstances in which the previous Government had introduced the Budget in this State, and Victoria subsequently introduced its Budget and raised the level of exemption, we acted swiftly and immediately to change the level of exemption to bring it into line with that in Victoria. I think that that indicates the policy of the previous Government.

Indeed, at the time of the last election campaign, any movement in the Victorian Government's pay-roll tax exemption was not known or flagged in this State. The Budget speech was presented on 26 September, after the election of 15 September. I suggest that, if indeed there had not been an election, if the previous Government had presented its Budget in due course in September, and if this movement had occurred, the precedent of the previous year shows that some adjustment of pay-roll tax would have been made in South Australia. This did not have to be stated as an election policy. That is what the previous Government did in the past and that is what the employers in this State could have reasonably expected it to do again. I am sure the employers are surprised indeed that that precedent, that well-established nexus, is not being adhered to by a Government which has come in with their wholehearted and active campaigning support and which has said it will represent them. I would like the Premier to say what is his information that suggests that there was no intention of the previous Government to change the level of exemption of pay-roll tax. The precedent is there and clearly established.

Naturally, we were critical throughout the election campaign of many of the taxation promises made by this Government. There was a wide range of promises and, indeed, we were critical of them because the provided costings were inaccurate. The implications for the State revenue were extremely severe. The Premier has been fortunate indeed that in his first Budget he has not really had to come to grips with the full revenue implications of the promises he made at the last election. That is to come, and it is extremely disturbing.

A responsible Government, a Government which has

held the Public Service in a no-growth situation and which has balanced its Budget and come out with a surplus Budget in the last financial year, is not a Government that will fling away large amounts of revenue unless it faces up to the reality of doing away with a large number of services. There was no real talk by the then Leader of the Opposition about what services he would do away with, but there were quite sweeping promises about the revenue he was prepared to forgo. This measure relates to one of them. As it was an election promise, we agree it should be put into effect, and the special youth employment scheme should be tried. For that reason, we are not opposing nor seriously amending this Bill. What we say is that a clear precedent has been established by the previous Government that I am sure the business community of South Australia values, and there seems to be no reason why the present Government cannot maintain that nexus and that competitive position in relation to Victoria.

Mr. KENEALLY: I take it that the Premier is not going to answer the questions raised by the Leader of the Opposition. My view is that in this amendment the Premier has been found out. He made much play earlier today about the Opposition's attitude towards this Bill. He suggested that we were not in favour of it at all and that, in fact, if we were given the opportunity, we might oppose the Bill. What we have given the Premier the opportunity to do is to put South Australia on the same footing as is Victoria; what he is doing is putting South Australia at a disadvantage compared to competitor States. He cannot have it both ways. The Premier cannot profess to be the great supporter of industry and private enterprise in South Australia by providing business with incentives to increase its employment base and also providing incentives for industry elsewhere to come to South Australia, and at the same time make exemptions from pay-roll tax that are lower than are those available in other States. If the Premier is dinkum, he will put South Australia on the same footing as the other States, particularly Victoria.

The Premier has been found out. He did not imagine that the Opposition was aware of the exemptions available in other States. He was quite confident that the exemptions that he had introduced were greater than those the Opposition would support. That is not the case at all. We are supporting greater exemptions that will provide, on his logic, greater incentives to industry and more jobs for the young people in South Australia. Why does he oppose this? If he is at all serious in his intention to provide jobs, he will accept the amendment; if he is not serious, and the Bill is window dressing, he will reject the amendment. The Premier is deliberately putting this State at a disadvantage compared to its competitors, a fact of life that is obvious to us all. The Labor Party, when in Government, was not prepared to do this to the employers of South Australia and to the young people in this State. At one stroke of the pen, the Premier (the much vaunted supporter of employment for youth and of private enterprise in South Australia) has rejected a sensible and serious amendment put forward by the Opposition.

I would like the Premier to tell this Committee and the people of South Australia why he insists on putting this State at a disadvantage in comparison with Victoria, the State with which South Australia has always had a nexus on pay-roll tax. The Premier is breaking that nexus. Why is he prepared to do that? I suggest that, if the Premier is not prepared to answer my simple query, he has a guilty conscience indeed, and so he should have.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: I am not swayed by hypocrisy.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is about the standard of debate we expect from the Premier. He has been caught out and he does not know where to go; I do wish his officers would

advise him what to do. In Victoria and South Australia in 1979 the initial exemption in relation to this tax was \$66 000 and the minimum exemption was \$29 700. Those figures were put into operation after the Victorian Government had made its position clear in the 1979-80 Budget.

South Australia's exemption was lower than was the exemption in Victoria at that time, so we corrected the situation. This year the initial exemptions in Victoria and South Australia are \$84 000 and \$72 000 respectively, and the minimum exemptions are \$37 800 and \$32 400 respectively. That is a tragedy.

I cannot understand why this vanguard of private enterprise opposite is not prepared to accept this amendment. The Liberals must have an ulterior motive, because we cannot get an answer. If positions were reversed and the Labor Party was putting forward the proposition in the Bill we would be accused of discriminating against business. I do not know how many times in this place we were attacked by the then Leader of the Opposition about not giving sufficient handouts to private enterprise. Now that the position is reversed, we have the Labor Party fighting to have these concessions increased, and we find the Liberal Party opposed to it. I challenge the Premier to give us a proper answer. Why is he not supporting business in this State?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I repeat what I have said. I find it absolutely astounding that the Opposition—

Mr. Keneally: Just answer the question.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will give the answer but it might not be what the honourable member wants to hear. The answer basically is that, when members of the Opposition were on this side of the House, they were extremely critical about any increase at all. They said that they could not afford to do it, that it would cost the taxpayers too much money. If the Deputy Leader would only use his thinking processes a little more than he does he would recognise that in relation to Victoria he has given the answer to his own question. He has already said that the Victorian Budget came in on 26 September and that in South Australia we have always followed the Victorian example. We have not always done that exactly. Usually, however, after six months or so, quite often in the February session, we have got around to coming alongside the Victorian exemptions.

Now the Leader and the Deputy Leader are saying that because Victoria granted an increase on 26 September we should now be doing the same thing. I have never heard such rubbish in my life, bearing in mind their attitude before the election. If they had not had this totally unexpected, unnecessary and delightful election, we would have had our Budget in long before then. At that election the policies of this Government in relation to pay-roll tax exemptions and rebates were clearly outlined. No-one could possibly be in any doubt as to what was intended, down to exact figures. I applaud the total about-face of members opposite on this question of pay-roll tax exemptions, and their new-found support for the private sector. I am delighted that, for a change, they want to help employers in this State, after nearly nine years of pushing them into the ground. However, I just cannot go along with their expressed motives for moving this amendment. I repeat that it is a piece of hypocrisy with which I cannot go along at all.

This legislation puts into effect the promises on pay-roll tax which were made before the election, and I am sure that it would be far too embarrassing for the Leader if I were to go into the details of what percentage of the South Australian population totally supported those proposals. Those are the proposals which are now before the

Committee and those are the proposals which will now be passed.

Mr. BANNON: I cannot let pass the comments made by the Premier, particularly when he calls members on this side hypocrites. I quite agree with him when he says that the people of South Australia have indeed endorsed a package of tax concessions, which include some detailed pay-roll tax proposals; indeed, they are embodied in the Bill. However, since the election certain changes have taken place in Victoria, and we are saying that those changes must be recognised, and that we have a prime and immediate opportunity in this Bill to recognise the changes.

We are accused of hypocrisy. A hypocrite is someone who says something he does not mean or acts in some way which is inconsistent with his true feelings or belief. In relation to this issue we are simply asking that the Government does what we, when in Government, have done in the past, and we have pointed to the specific example of last year where, following the preparation of our own Budget, further supplementary changes were introduced in response to the Victorian Budget in order to preserve that nexus and competitive position. We are not telling the Government to do something that we do not believe in, because we did it 12 months ago and we are suggesting that the traditional relationship ought to be preserved today. We are not hypocrites.

On the other side, the present Government has said that it is in favour of stimulating this economy, of creating employment, using pay-roll tax as a means to do this. I would imagine that its rhetoric would certainly include the preservation of our competitive situation in relation to pay-roll tax. If the Premier is now saying that the Government will not do this, I would suggest that he is being the hypocrite because, in so refusing this opportunity, he is going against the very things he is talking about. We are being quite consistent. We are proposing that we do what was done last year, as this is a benefit to business in this State. We benefited business in this State last year, and we would like it to be benefited again today.

I again ask the Premier why he is standing against this measure. Are we no longer to try to maintain a position in which South Australia has the lowest pay-roll tax in this country, or will we simply allow our pay-roll tax rates to drift out until our competitive position is reduced? The Premier's response to this question so far has been to accuse the Opposition of being hypocritical. I will speak to a few businessmen around town (and the Opposition enjoys good contacts with them, despite the last election) in an attempt to sound out their views and get their opinions. When I discuss this issue with them, I anticipate that they will acknowledge that I am not being hypocritical, because the Opposition is being quite consistent. It is not good enough for the Premier to sit back and say that the Opposition is hypocritical. Can the Premier clearly state why he believes his Government cannot afford to accept this recommendation? If his non-acceptance is because of financial reasons, let him spell that out. If it is for reasons of philosophy, I am at odds to understand them.

Mr. KENEALLY: I cannot let a remark made by the Premier pass without commenting on it. The Premier has said that the exemption in the Bill is the result of an election promise, and because of that he is unable to amend the Bill, because that would be backing down on something he told the people. I remind the honourable gentleman that he did not express that sort of concern in relation to promises he made about the Public Accounts Committee because he has since dishonoured promises

made about that. Nor does his concern extend to his promises relating to land tax, and a number of other issues. Because the Premier has dishonoured promises he made before the election, it might be a welcome change for him to give the people something that he did not promise at the election.

I ask the Premier to make one quick decision. If he sees some value in the Opposition's amendment, let him report progress and consult with his officers to see what effect it will have on Treasury finances; he can report later this evening. If the Premier is not prepared to do that and is simply going to disregard the amendment out of hand, that indicates to the Opposition that he is not serious about the reasons he has given for introducing this legislation in the first place. The Premier should be seeking to put South Australia at an advantage, and not a disadvantage, compared to the other States.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Abbott, Lynn Arnold, Bannon (teller), Max Brown, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (25)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Webster, Wilson, and Wotton.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 8) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 October. Page 431.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This is another Bill to give effect to promises made by the new Government in the course of the election campaign. As such, we recognise that the Government has some mandate for the Bill. Therefore, we propose to support the Bill at the second reading. However, the Opposition is extremely unhappy about this Bill; the tax involved and the manner in which concessions are being made are not such that inspire confidence in the way in which the new Government views the taxing system and the equity of taxation in this State. The Government can claim a mandate for the Bill, which gives effect to a specific statement made by the Premier in his policy speech. It is interesting to note that in that speech the Premier did not make any reference to a particular time scale. However, the costing document which accompanied the Premier's speech (of which much was made during the campaign) clearly showed an amount, which I think was \$1 600 000, which this concession would cost in the course of the 1978-79 financial year. The document thereby indicated that it was indeed the Government's intention to introduce this exemption as from the time it came to office, and in fact that has not been done. I will mention that matter later. While the costing document referred to \$1 600 000, the amount provided in the Budget speech referred to by the Premier for the cost in a full year of this revenue promise made by the Government was somewhat greater than \$1 600 000. He said (*Hansard*, page 16):

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

I point out that three-quarters of \$5 000 000 is not \$1 600 000. So, it would appear that, after the Government has come into office and costed the thing more accurately, the famous precise costing document produced in the election campaign has proved to be erroneous. Be that as it may, let us examine the philosophy behind this tax, the reasons why we have got a land tax, and the reasons why the Opposition is not happy with the way in which this Act is being amended.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Are you supporting the Bill?

Mr. BANNON: I have already said, if the honourable Premier had been attentive, that we regard this Bill as fulfilling one of the mandates properly claimed by the Government and we will therefore be supporting this Bill at the second reading. Incidentally, we will be moving an amendment, of which I hope the Premier has a copy, so that he has had suitable time for his officers to check it out.

Land tax was introduced in the 1890's. It was very much part of the debate about the single tax which was proposed, of course, most effectively by Henry George, who still today has many adherents. The economic theories of George had an enormous impact in Australia, particularly following his lecture tour. Today, there are still many people in the community who would support the single tax, economic, fiscal and monetarist theories of that very persuasive economic thinker. Indeed, in terms of equity there is a lot to be said for the "Georgist" approach to taxation, and land tax, of course, was at the base of that approach. Therefore, it is not surprising that the 1890's was the time when this came into operation. I think in fact this year we are celebrating the centenary of *Progress and Poverty*, the famous influential text written by Henry George. The argument for land tax is that it cannot be shifted on to other people. It is borne by those on whom it is levied.

Land tax in Australia is on the unimproved value of properties. It is a site value tax and not a tax on the improved value of properties, as it is in the United States. If one invokes the United States tax revolt, which is centred around property taxes, as some kind of precedent or suggestion that people in South Australia, in particular, find this is a pernicious or burdensome tax, I think that argument would not stand up very much to the light of day. It is a site value tax on the unimproved value of properties. Land tax is a growth tax and, as such, it is an important revenue source for the State Government; for, as real property values rise with economic development, obviously so does the tax collection. It is important that we have growth taxes in order to provide services and facilities that the people of South Australia expect from their Government.

The most important thing about land tax is that it is a highly equitable tax. Property ownership is widely recognised as an indicator of economic well-being. The owning of property, the extent of ownership of property, the location of that property, its economic value—all these are indicators of the general economic well-being of an individual. As such, it is also an indicator of the ability of persons to pay the tax. The South Australian land tax is highly equitable because it is levied at progressive rates on an asset for which the ownership is highly concentrated. Clearly, it is one of those taxes where those most able to afford the tax pay the tax.

The United Kingdom Royal Commission into the Distribution of Income and Wealth found that land was one of the two most concentrated assets in terms of ownership. Relatively small numbers of people owned large amounts of land, and the less well off people tended to hold their assets in the form of savings bank deposits, building society deposits, and so on. Less well off people

in our community rent homes, from the Housing Trust in particular, and what property and assets they have tend to be held in the form of bank deposits, long-term holding deposits, and so on. The Australian pattern of asset ownership is likely to be similar to that of the United Kingdom. We have not had the same detailed inquiry as that of the United Kingdom Royal Commission that I have quoted, but the general pattern of their findings would probably be reflected in Australia, land being a quite concentrated asset.

Land tax is an appropriate tax for the components of a Federal system, as the asset itself cannot be shifted across State boundaries, as other assets can. That is one of the cornerstones of the "Georgist" theory of land tax which is so important. One is dealing with an asset that is not moveable; it is not transferable in terms of being physically located somewhere else.

In a Federal system, where all sorts of tax can be avoided by devious means, by using section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution, this is not possible in the case of land because one cannot shuffle land backwards and forwards across the Victorian or Western Australian border. So, it is an important tax for a State Government.

It is also justifiable on the basis of the benefit principle. As I have said previously, those that benefit from the provision of a tax should perhaps be expected, depending on the other indicators of economic wellbeing, and so on, to contribute to it. Those who benefit from the provision of particular Government services (in this case, servicing of their land) pay more. Many services provided by the Government are property-oriented. The provision of fire services, a large element of police services, the protection of property, and the various other components that make land held in the city centre more valuable than that in the suburbs and in country towns, and so on, depending on the wealth and infra-structure of the community, are involved. So, although tax on residences is to be abolished, the owners of those properties still will receive the same benefits from State Government property services, and that seems to be a further inequity in abolishing this tax.

Land tax is a tax on what economists call location rents. These are differences in the value of land from place to place. The differences are caused by a number of fundamental factors such as population growth, the provision of Government public transport facilities, and utility services. As a result of the combination of all these factors, some areas have higher land values than have others.

Because of the way in which it is levied, land tax helps to return to the general community some of the value being created by the provision of those Government services. In effect, it requires that those properties on which the values are increased should, because of the infra-structure of services and facilities provided by the community, make a higher contribution to that community in recognition of the better facilities, services and provisions that they have. That surely is a prime piece of equity in terms of taxing policy. It is for those reasons of equity that the Opposition feels very strongly about land tax. It considers that, although it has to support the Bill at this time, it does not feel fully in one mind with the Government over its approach to this matter.

Why is the removal of land tax advocated in Australia? First, it is important to look at the overall Australian taxation system in order to keep these demands in perspective. A major study by three economists was done at Macquarie University several years ago. That study concluded that the then pattern of State taxes was highly regressive, with lower and middle-income families paying a higher proportion of their income in State taxes than

were the higher income families.

Clearly, something is wrong with a system that requires that. There are a number of taxes and ways of raising money that have this regressive effect. We all must pay taxes, unless we can devise some splendid means of tax avoidance or evasion. That is done, but it is done usually by those who can most afford to pay it. All of us value the idea of a progressive taxation system. Unfortunately, many taxes, particularly State taxes, are regressive in effect, with the lower and middle-income families paying a much higher proportion of their income in taxes than are the higher income families.

Australia is virtually unique among the rich industrialised countries of the world in having little or no capital taxation. All industrialised countries in Europe and the United States, the homeland of capitalism, have, in addition to income tax, estate duties plus either a net wealth tax or some form of capital gains tax. There are now virtually no estate duties in Australia. In fact, the Government, as part of its election promises, is doing away with that tax in this State, and capital gains tax is very limited and easily avoided.

The Premier justifies the abolition of land tax by saying that high land tax has forced many people out of their homes. However, he did not produce any concrete evidence in support of that. If it is land tax that has forced people out of their homes, we should know about it. We should have statistics and figures, and perhaps case studies, but they have not been put before us.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Well, look up *Hansard*. You haven't been here long enough; that's your problem.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BANNON: If one looks at the level of land tax generally, one sees that it is not the factor that is involved. There are a number of reasons that relate to someone occupying a prime piece of real estate where the use has changed to, say, commercial use. One can think, for instance, of the rows of houses along the borders of our park lands in Adelaide. Although a number of economic factors may force one eventually to sell one's house or to move somewhere else, there are very few examples where land tax would be the factor involved in that move. So, that assertion must have evidence to back it up. Secondly, it needs to be kept in some perspective.

I now look at the level of land tax. After all, land tax payments on principal residences typically are in the range of \$20 to \$40 a year. So, who would be driven out of his home by paying an annual sum of that magnitude? Contrast that with council rates, which are often \$200 or more a year in areas where only a few years ago they were half that amount. There has been a tremendous increase in council rates, based also on property values. However, we are looking at a tax where, typically, people are paying between \$20 and \$40 a year. In sheer money terms, that is not a major imposition on the ordinary householder in relation to his principal place of residence. So, the statement that people are being forced from their homes is extraordinary. The member for Stuart says that he pays \$5 land tax, so that is an example.

Possibly a major reason for the pressure to abolish State land tax on private homes is the Fraser Government's refusal to increase its \$300 limit on rates and taxes claims against income tax. Inflation has pushed most property-owners above the \$300 limit in this respect, and the excess is worthless to them. The combination of rates and other taxes far exceeds that \$300. So, perhaps pressure has built up because that Federal concession is not available.

However, if that is the reason (although it will certainly be the effect), we are simply abolishing land tax in South Australia, or, in other words, doing away with an

important revenue source for South Australia, and transferring that tax effectively to the Federal Government, but for what return I do not know. The argument for abolishing land tax is based on the conservative myth that money can be found easily to finance the loss of taxation, as considerable Government waste and extravagance occurs. In other words, we can afford to give away large slabs of our revenue because we do not really need it. There are all sorts of amazing economies which are to be made and which will not result in a cutting of Government services but which will ensure that we can exist on a much leaner budget.

The facts simply do not bear this out, and I am afraid that the evidence that will be available to the new Government as it strives to find these areas of massive waste and extravagance will simply not exist. The Public Service was held to zero growth last year, so it should be difficult to uncover further waste and extravagance this year. Indeed, the Budget has been balanced in South Australia by extremely good financial management. There is no great evidence of financial waste and extravagance there.

Possibly, those who own valuable property but who have little income may experience some problems in paying property taxes. However, it should be pointed out that pensioners already receive land tax concessions from the Government. It may be that land tax is allowed as a deduction against the estates of pensioners. We can make further concession increases in this area. The actual level of concessions can be upgraded or updated. All these things are possible in order to ensure that hardship does not fall on a person who is in an anomalous situation. This could apply, for instance, to a valuable property which someone has occupied for many years and which it would be difficult for them to leave, where the land tax is a great imposition.

A concession, a deferment, may, in fact, be all that is necessary. That, in itself, is not a reason to abolish land tax completely. Who, in fact, benefits from the abolition of land tax? Clearly, as it is a tax on property, property owners will be the major beneficiaries. In relation to this current concession, people who rent homes will not benefit at all, despite the fact that current land tax levels will be reflected in the rents they pay. Landlords will not receive land tax cuts on properties they own, because the reduction applies only to the principal place of residence; therefore, rents will not be cut when land tax is abolished on privately-owned homes.

Property owners tend to be in the more affluent section of the community. In recent years the high level of interest rates has been absolutely crippling on young couples trying to maintain a home, but home owners are still in a better position, because of the asset they have, than are those renting a home. They will get an advantage at the expense of those who are renting.

Persons who rent accommodation are often in the lowest wage bracket and in the poorest and most difficult circumstances. They cannot afford to own property, and this tax exemption will discriminate against those people. Those who own more valuable properties will benefit more because, as the tax is a progressive one, the abolition of it is a more marginal benefit to those who have more than to those who have less. Clearly, it is quite inequitable. The biggest individual gains are likely to be among persons living in more affluent suburbs, such as Burnside or the eastern foothills, not in the city of Port Adelaide. That is where the gains will be made from this measure. If that is tax equity, then there is something wrong with the Government that proposes it.

There are alternative measures. Why not abolish other

taxes which are more regressive? Why not abolish stamp duties in a wholesale manner? After all, most members of the community pay these taxes and the payments are not linked with income, wealth, or ability to pay. Land tax is. Land tax is soundly based on a firm and equitable principle.

Mr. Evans: What if people paid land tax on a mortgaged property and they owed for the largest part of the property on a mortgage—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Fisher will have a chance to enter this debate.

Mr. BANNON: If there are anomalies or inequities in the present land tax system, let us deal with them item by item. Perhaps the interjection by the member for Fisher concerned an anomaly of that sort. Perhaps some distinction ought to be drawn between freehold properties and properties held on mortgage, and some allowance made. The whole point is that at least we would be maintaining or hanging on to this progressive tax.

We would be happy on this side to look at the particular items and elements of concession or adjustment that should be made. There have been outcries about the procedure used for valuing land, for instance. That has caused tremendous problems in certain areas. These problems could be solved without abolishing this tax. The point I am trying to make (and make strongly), is that the tax in itself is equitable and just. If we are to have taxes (and we must have them), then we should not be giving this one away. We have dealt with a number of anomalies in the past. When we were in Government we helped the rural sector by abolishing rural land tax.

The previous Government made concessions; it recognised a need by abolishing rural land tax, and I have mentioned pensioner concessions. Let us look at the features of the Bill as proposed. First, it will exempt owner occupiers from paying land tax. Secondly, it will hold land tax constant for those who have subsequently received an exemption at 1978-79 levels. It is not clear from the legislation whether holding land tax constant at those levels will involve the Government in making cash refunds to property owners. If the value is held constant, and the land tax has been levied, should the Government refund the difference in terms of the tax extracted. That is not clear, and there has been no reference to it in the Bill. Perhaps that matter will be clarified later in the debate. A proposal for constant taxes is to be introduced retrospectively when those properties which are to be exempt are finally determined. If refunds have to be made it is worth knowing what the costs are in terms of administering the payout of that money by the Government.

I could ask, "Does the Government's land tax policy conflict with its economic growth objective?" It has been made clear by a Government spokesman that land tax paid by businesses is to rise in order to finance the land tax cuts for home owners. That matter was referred to by the member for Fisher, prior to the election, in the column he writes for the *Sunday Mail*. He made it clear that land tax paid by businesses could be expected to rise. The Opposition believes that business should pay its proper share of land tax, but it seems a bit inconsistent for the Government to impose this extra cost on business (if that is, in fact, its intention) to make up for the loss of revenue in that area.

Last week the Minister of Industrial Affairs foreshadowed the introduction of new land tax incentives for business to be decentralised. Further remissions and exemptions in this tax seem to be foreshadowed, so there is some confusion there: on the one hand, trying to stimulate business activity and, on the other hand, to tax it

more highly. The Premier's Budget speech clearly confirmed the errors in the Liberal Party's election costing document in respect of land tax. The Budget made it clear that the cost of abolishing land tax for the principal place of residence would be at least \$5 000 000 per annum, whereas the Liberal Party said the cost would be about \$1 500 000 per annum. The Premier said "Our tax cuts have been carefully costed." As with so many of those careful costings, which no doubt influence people's attitudes to the revenue proposals, the cost, on examination, has proved to be quite deficient. The Liberal Party's costing document clearly indicated that land tax exemptions were to be introduced fully in this financial year.

We now come to the point of promises kept. The Premier's election statement that people have been driven from their homes by high land tax seems to count little with him in Government, because, if he believes his own statement, one would think that he would get on with abolishing this tax as soon as he could so that more people are not driven from their homes. There may be people on the point of being driven out of their homes, and he is in the position to do something about that. His costing document stated that that was his intention, yet he is taking refuge in "administrative problems" in delaying the introduction of the land tax exemption referred to in the Budget. It is not as if the cost would be so high; if one takes the Liberal Party's own costing this year's Budget surplus of \$2 100 000 would finance the entire abolition of land tax on the principal residence in this financial year. It could be done retrospectively. I think my colleague, the member for Mitchell, will be referring in his remarks to some specific methods he believes could be brought into operation to ensure that this promise is acted upon quickly. In saying that, and in urging the Government to fulfil its promises, I stress that I am not being inconsistent with our general feeling of opposition to the abolition of or exemption from the effect of land tax.

I have gone to some pains in this speech to explain why we believe that land tax is an important tax that should not be forgone. But the Government clearly believes otherwise. It put to people, very clearly, its belief that certain concessions should be made and the people have supported those concessions. So, so soon after an election, we are bound to support this measure in terms of allowing its passage. If our support is in fact based on the mandate given to the Government, and on the honouring of its promises, we have a right to raise very strongly indeed our view that the Government should keep its promise to the letter, because that is what it is all about. That is why we are making this point about ensuring that the tax exemption shall operate in this financial year, as the people of South Australia were given to understand.

Why are there administrative difficulties? I think these questions ought to be answered. They cannot lightly be tossed off, as they were in the Budget and in the second reading explanation. The Premier said, "Unfortunately, for administrative reasons this has proved to be impossible." There is no detail of those administrative reasons, and the Premier owes us a full explanation of what they are and why he believes they cannot be overcome. Is the Government having difficulties defining what is a principal place of residence? Presumably, it is. Are abuses possible; for instance, the title to a holiday house being in the wife's name and therefore put forward as a principal place of residence? Obviously, a number of questions have to be asked and we deserve more than just a one-line reference to "administrative reasons". Those reasons should be spelt out and explained to us fully.

Other administrative questions that could arise are

problems for the Government's computerised land tax system. It would seem that considerable administrative costs are going to be encountered by the Government in trying to introduce this partial exemption, because of the selective nature of it. Are the costs high in relation to the money saved by members of the community? Can we set a figure of, say, \$5 000 000 per annum against the administrative costs that are going to be involved in dissecting and administering this tax? Can the Bill cope with the problems caused by land changing its use within a year? The Bill has a clause addressed to this problem, but whether it can deal with it remains to be seen.

There are complex administrative questions in this. Again, one can only speculate from looking at the Bill and making predictions about what problems the Government has perceived. We have yet to have a statement from the Government; that is what I am calling for. The Land Tax Bill is storing up future financial problems for this State, just as a number of the Government's other revenue measures are doing. We are to be faced with a loss of land tax revenue next financial year, just when the present guaranteed share of income tax collection ends, and at a time when the State could lose tens of millions of dollars as a result of the review of relativities in income tax revenue sharing.

This financial year is crucial, because this is the year in which that further Commonwealth agreement is negotiated. It is the year in which the Premier will go to the Federal Treasurer and say, "We want more money from you federally, and one of the reasons is that we have given away a whole lot of our taxes at the State level." That argument is going to sound very hollow indeed, and the message will be spelt out to him clearly by Mr. Fraser, as he has spelt out to the States since he has been in office, that he expects the States to take as much of the tax burden as possible. For our Premier to argue the best case for the State in terms of the new financial arrangements, and preserving benefits of the railway agreement in the light of a package of tax promises which has squandered our revenue collections, puts him in an extremely weak position.

How is the revenue loss on account of land tax exemptions to be financed? Are there any new taxes in contemplation to try and make up for it? Is it likely to be replaced by more inflationary taxes, more inequitable taxes? Are fees for Government services to rise, as in the United States, following the tax revolt? The rise in those fees and the diminution of those services is providing considerable impetus for an anti-tax revolt—a movement to ensure, not that taxes are done away with, but that taxes are made more equitable—which is sweeping the United States at the moment. It is precisely taxes such as this that people are arguing should be retained in order to spread that equitability. The disparity of taxation on the individual as opposed to corporations in the United States is increasing, and we may run into that sort of problem in South Australia.

Many questions are raised by this measure. It is an unfortunate measure, a promise that was made without any real reference to the nature or purpose of land tax. No doubt it garnered some votes, but the implications were not responsibly put before the people of South Australia. I am afraid that it is further evidence of not succumbing to the tax revolt so much as ensuring that there is some sort of tax shift, so that the have-nots are being taxed more heavily than the haves. That cannot go indefinitely without causing major social problems and without causing danger to our social fabric because the sort of injustices that arise from that shifting of the tax burden eventually will come home to roost for the Government of the day. Those who

cannot afford to buy a home or who must pay rents which reflect the landlord's tax, those that own their own home (putting aside the question of a mortgage—and I am suggesting that if that is an anomaly it can be looked at) are going to benefit. The more valuable the property, the more one will benefit from the abolition of this tax. What is the justice of that?

We will be supporting the second reading. We will be moving some amendments, because we believe that the Government's promises must be honoured. It has an obligation to honour its promises, but it is with considerable regret that we see the Government's tax policy put to the people in the way that it has been and giving away taxes which, of their nature, are progressive and equitable and inevitably replacing them with taxes that shift the burden to those who can least afford to pay.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): I rise to support this Bill, in concert with my Leader and with exactly the same emotions and feelings in mind. The reason that I commence my remarks in that manner is that I support the Bill on the premises put forward by my Leader and not by way of philosophy or by way of believing that this was a proper thing for the Government to have done. Abolition of land tax on the principal place of residence was a measure before the electors at the time of the recent election, and I accept that. The Government was elected, and it was a part of its package of electoral promises put before the people. Government members are seated on the benches of this House with the reins of Government in their hands. Therefore, I am prepared, on that basis only, to give my support to the second reading of the Bill.

As my Leader has already pointed out, amendments are necessary to put this Bill in a form which more nearly approximates or matches the matter on this topic put before the people at the election. I will be supporting my Leader in his efforts to have those amendments passed by this House.

I should like to canvass now whether there is justification for saying that because of administrative difficulties, the date specified in the Bill must be the date which applies. The Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, was quoted in *Hansard* on 14 September, 1976, at page 987, as follows:

The Liberal Party will undertake at the appropriate time to announce a land tax policy, which, as in the case of succession duties rates, will bring positive relief to all sections of the community who pay land tax.

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

Mr. PAYNE: We are dealing with a matter that has involved Liberal Party policy for some years. If the argument put forward is that these administrative difficulties are the problem about meeting the election promise, one can only assume that promises and statements made by the Premier, either inside the House or outside it, are not based on sound homework and are made simply in the hope of gathering votes. I believe it would be fair to further examine that promise and to point out that, as I think all members will be aware, the matter began on 28 August 1979 when, at least in respect of taxation matters (matters affecting the revenue of the State), three promises were made. The first was to abolish succession and gift duties from 1 January 1980. We could say that that promise was carefully qualified and a date supplied. To that point, I have no quarrel. That promise was succeeded by another, as follows:

We will abolish land tax on the principal place of residence.

That appeared in the policy speech of the present Premier and also in subsequent policy documents which were issued and which were available to all members of this House. There was no qualification about that promise, but one can only canvass what was meant by it, and I think that to do that is quite fair. Was it to be next year, or in the life of the present Parliament? Was it to be during the full term of the present Government, assuming that that term is three years? Was it to be some day, maybe? It is clear that that promise was aimed at an electorate that accepted it on the same basis as that on which it had been made, namely, if the Party making it was elected to Government. A third promise on the same date was:

We will exempt from stamp duty the first \$30 000 involved in the purchase of a first home.

We had the first promise, where a date was stated, and presumably that date will be adhered to, if legislation before the House has a proper and fair passage. In relation to stamp duty, I believe that the course of action adopted by the Government was quite fair. A date was chosen, taking into account transactions that occurred after the date when the decision was given on the promise; that is, 15 September. Notwithstanding that, a further qualification was applied, and I have no quarrel with it. That was that it would also apply to transfers that occurred on or after 1 November. I do not believe that anyone can find any reason to quarrel with that.

I go so far as to say that, in this House today, we had a statement by the Premier, doubtless stung by remarks that I had made earlier on the land tax matter, that the Government had hastened to use administrative action (they are the words used by the Premier in this House today) concerning the legislation providing for the remission of stamp duty on a first home. Should there be any doubt, if there was any consanguinity involved in the matter, the Premier has hastened to assure the House and the people of South Australia that administrative action will apply, so, irrespective of any dates for applying the legislation that has not yet gone through Parliament, the promise will be honoured.

We come now to land tax. We had three promises, one qualified by a date and two not qualified. The one qualified by a date presumably will be met, on statements supplied. One of the two not qualified by any date and open ended, but definitely vote catching in nature, will be met by what most people will agree is a reasonable approach to implementing something put forward to gain the support of the electorate. What are the factors surrounding the other promise that may have a bearing on the matter? First, we are talking about loot. We are talking about the amended costing, after the election speech by the Premier and his Government, of about three-quarters of \$5 000 000, which is not much below \$5 000 000 and certainly is more than \$4 000 000.

Is that the problem that is causing reconsideration about meeting that election promise as indicated in the Bill before us by a date that postpones the application of the measure until the end of the financial year, so that, in effect, the amount of about \$4 500 000 will be retained by the Government? Is this an indication of how the other promises were costed, off the top of the head, off the cuff, out of the hip pocket, and not accurately researched? Is it an indication that, when faced with the problem of meeting the promises endorsed by the electorate, it is necessary to get hold of money to make sure that the impact on the State's resources is not too great?

I do not believe that I am being too uncharitable in suggesting that that sort of factor has entered the argument, because, as my Leader has pointed out in this House today, we have had no explanation, nothing but a

bold statement "because of administrative difficulties". What actually happens in the application of land tax with respect to a land tax pay-out is that, under the Act, the actions required are quite clear. A valuation and assessment is carried out at 30 June in the year in which the tax is to apply; that is, at the commencement of that financial year. Subsequently, the assessments are sent out. The amounts contained in those assessments are then due for payment within 30 days. A landowner, whether owning land on which his principal place of residence is located or otherwise, is not required to pay the State one cent until the assessment notice is received, indicating the amount due. We ought to keep that point in mind while we are discussing this issue.

If we look at the Bill and at what was said in the Premier's second reading explanation, it is clear that the department concerned has certain machinery and records to be able to take a course of action in this matter, which I believe can just as easily be applied with respect to deferring the collection of land tax until the necessary work (those administrative difficulties which have been advanced as an excuse) has been cleared up, and then only those persons who would then be due for land tax under the new proposed requirements would be required to pay the tax.

I am arguing that the department has the expertise, the machinery, the computer facility, and so on, to be able to adopt the course which I have already proposed on one occasion in this House and which I intend once again to suggest to the Premier so that he can extricate himself from the position that he has put himself in of not honouring an important promise in respect of the abolition of a tax on the principal place of residence for landowners in South Australia. In his second reading explanation (*Hansard*, page 431, 25 October) the Premier stated:

The Commissioner is empowered to grant the exemption either upon application or otherwise. He will notify the owner of exempted land of the ground of exemption and, if it appears that he has acted on a mistaken assumption of fact, the owner must notify him accordingly.

That indicates that, under the method proposed to be used by the department, most persons in South Australia who live on the land in their principal place of residence, and are owners of only that land, will be notified by the department in subsequent years that they are not liable for land tax. How can the department do this and at the same time the Premier claim that administrative difficulties will prevent the implementation of the measure before us before the date specified in the Bill, that is, 30 June 1980? The present provision for aggregation of land tax in respect of multiple ownership of land would presumably mean that many taxpayers are already categorised in the records, in the computer, or wherever the department keeps this information, as owning only one block of land on which is located their principal place of residence. I understand that as many as 60 per cent of the total possible land tax payers in South Australia are in this category.

It is all very well for the Premier to laugh about this matter, but this involves a \$4 500 000 rip-off from the people of South Australia which the Premier did not previously put before the people in the election campaign. The abolition of land tax on the principal place of residence was an important plank in the election policy of the Liberal Party, and it is the reason why I am now supporting the Bill; otherwise I would not be supporting it, because it is foreign to my philosophy and thinking on these matters. Clearly, to plead administrative difficulty is not necessarily supported by the facts. If the date is to be 30 June 1980, presumably some administrative work must be done.

I cannot see why that administrative work cannot be done in the same way as is now proposed, but for assessment notices not to be sent out. It is only when the taxpayer receives the assessment notice that he is due, within 30 days, to pay the amount stated in the assessment: it is not some duty inherent on the taxpayer each year to remember that he must pay his land tax. Section 56 (2) of the Act clearly indicates that a notice shall be sent and, on receipt of that notice, the taxpayer is liable to pay the tax. That is what we are coming down to.

Where is the administrative difficulty? If the notices are not sent, the time needed to sort out who in future is going to be able to claim principal place of residence or otherwise is available whether or not the notices go out. The Premier did well to leave the Chamber at this stage of the debate, because it would be difficult for him to answer such a question. If the assessments are withheld, the money will not be collected until the position is clear concerning those who are to be liable under the Act.

Lest any honourable member should spring to his feet and say, "But what about the legislative backing for that matter?" I remind him that the Premier himself indicated today that by an administrative action, when legislative backing is not there, he will ensure that the stamp duty remission will still apply. If reinforcement is needed for that, the Premier cited previous precedents in the matter involving other Budgets and other Governments, including those Governments of a different political persuasion. Let not any member claim that there is some special difficulty in this matter. It comes down to one clear point: does the Premier believe that when he gives an undertaking, open-ended and clear (and not qualified in any way, as I have demonstrated) it is reasonable, taking a bracket of three promises, to meet one, which was qualified, when that date comes and to take two, which were not qualified in any way, and say, first, "I am doing the proper and reasonable thing on that," which is certainly so in the case of the date that he has chosen (I have no quarrel with that), and to take the other one, where a good deal of taxpayers' money is involved, in order to meet his own miscalculations entered into probably in a spirit, before the election, of not really believing that he would ever be in Government? Having got stuck with that proposition, he then tries to get some assurance on that matter by saying, "It is too hard to do this year; it is awkward and the administrative difficulties are such"—no detail, nothing spelt out whatever, just that it is too hard to do for another year—"that we will hold it at the old level. But don't feel too bad about being ripped off; you will still only pay at the old year's rate," at the same time being smug in the knowledge that there will be \$4 000 000 to \$4 500 000 that will allow him to be able to cater for the irresponsibilities shown in making the promises, as my Leader clearly showed when examining in detail some of the amounts specified.

I wonder whether the Premier can explain in detail the administrative difficulty that will cause this matter not to be applied until 30 June 1980. It will have to be something new. I discussed certain details, such as I have outlined to the House, with officers of the department concerned. I did not ask them about policy matters; that is not their province and I would not place an officer of the Public Service in that invidious position. The Act is clear in that there is no onus to pay until the assessment notice is received. Therefore, if the assessment notices are withheld, there is no requirement to collect until the position is clarified. There can be no argument, I believe, with those concepts.

It is incumbent on the Government and the Premier to explain this action. Whatever connotation one puts on it,

this action allows the Government to collect millions of dollars that the electorate never anticipated being collected. It is quite clear that no-one expected this action, because the promise was given in an open-ended manner that the tax would be abolished. There was no doubt in the minds of the electorate. The then Leader of the Opposition did not say, "We will do it if we can organise it, if we can get the computer to handle it, if it is not too hard administratively, or if we can afford it"—it was abolition and there was no argument about that.

The Premier has now referred simply to an administrative difficulty. The same difficulty arises in order to meet the deadline proposed in the Bill. The key is not to send out the assessment notices until the position has been clarified. At that time, surely the collection can then apply only to those who will pay the tax in the future. People had every right, in voting for the present Government, to expect that the tax would be abolished and that that promise would be honoured. This is an important matter that every member of the House should consider, particularly the Premier. The second major point I want to raise—

Mr. Mathwin: He's got a complex—

The SPEAKER: Order! This is the second occasion on which the member for Glenelg has interrupted the debate. Interjections are out of order at any time, particularly when an honourable member is out of his seat.

Mr. Mathwin: I was speaking to my colleague in front, Mr. Goldsworthy.

The SPEAKER: The conversation of the honourable member disturbed the debate. That is an interjection. I ask the honourable member for Glenelg to be seated.

Mr. PAYNE: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your protection and I point out that, as I heard the interjection, the honourable member stated that I have a complex. If that is so, I point out that the complex I have is simple; if you give your word to electors, you ought to damn well keep it, and that is what I ask the Premier to do—keep his word to the people. Many people took the Premier's word as being a 100 per cent straight promise. The Premier meant it as a promise, not realising perhaps that he and his Party might get into Government. Once one gets into Government, one has to stick to one's word.

Mr. Becker interjecting:

Mr. PAYNE: The honourable member ought to keep his mouth closed because I had the dubious pleasure of hearing him last night on the Jeff Medwell show, having been telephoned by Jeff Medwell. He was trying to explain away the fact that he had promised on behalf of the Government that the Christies Beach Hospital would proceed and the Liberal Government would stand by its word regarding that matter. It was interesting to note that it took the honourable member 10 minutes to explain how he was no longer an active member of the Government. He hummed and hahed, dodged the issue, and talked about what Labor had said.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about hospitals.

Mr. PAYNE: No, but there is a certain amount about keeping one's word and promises, if we relate the Bill to what was said on a recent occasion. Under section 12 (5) a levy is payable in respect to land in the metropolitan area. The proceeds from that levy go to a certain fund for the provision of recreation and other areas. This is actually contained in the booklet provided by the State Government, entitled *Land Tax*. The purpose of that levy is to provide funds to assist in the provision of parks and open space areas, and the development of facilities for such areas. I cannot find anything in the Bill or in the Premier's explanation that refers to this matter.

Presumably, if we are to suffer a loss or if money is to be recovered from commercial properties (that is, money forgone by way of tax remission), the Government may have to make some provision for this fund. I look forward to hearing what the Premier may have to say about this matter.

Dr. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I support this Bill with some diffidence. My support has a similar base to that which has already been explained by my Leader and the member for Mitchell; I do not want to go into that matter more deeply. I planned to debate this topic later but, as my colleague finished on this point, I will raise the matter immediately. I refer to the subvention to the Planning and Development Fund, arising out of the surcharge on land tax introduced by the Dunstan Government in 1970. Section 12 (5) of the Act provides:

There shall be an additional levy payable in respect of land within the metropolitan area of one cent for every twenty dollars, or part thereof, of the taxable value of the land.

At that time, in his second reading explanation on that measure, the then Premier stated (page 2219 of *Hansard* of 29 October 1970):

Clause 6 provides, first, for the rebate on present rates upon primary producing land that I have already described and, secondly, for the surcharge applicable to metropolitan land. The purpose of the surcharge is, as indicated in the policy statement issued prior to the election, to raise an amount equal to an average of about \$2 an allotment. There are about 300 000 allotments in the metropolitan area, which has been defined to include the metropolitan planning area within the meaning of the Planning and Development Act plus the municipality of Gawler. To raise \$600 000 a year on the basis of the estimated aggregate valuations within the area requires an additional rate of 1c for each \$20 of unimproved value. This means that a housing allotment valued at \$4 000, which would pay an ordinary tax of \$8 a year, would pay a surcharge of \$2 a year; a more modest one valued at \$1 000, which would pay an ordinary tax of \$2 a year, would be called upon for a further 50c; whilst a \$10 000 allotment, which would pay an ordinary tax of \$20 a year, would pay a surcharge of \$5 a year.

The Premier went on to talk about tables that showed the effect of the proposed reductions for rural land and surcharges from metropolitan land, and asked leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard*. It is a great pity that the second reading explanation in support of this Bill did not go into that sort of detail, because it would be much easier for us, as a House, to be able to analyse some of these matters and the real effects of the partial abolition of this tax, if we had this sort of information.

I suppose it would not be too difficult for me to find out how many allotments there are in the metropolitan area. I believe that about 60 per cent of them are likely to be affected by this legislation, but I have not gone to the trouble of getting that information. It would have been a service to the House if that sort of information, the basis of the Government's calculations, had been provided in the legislation, particularly when we consider the very great amount of detail provided by the then Premier in 1970. A further reason for providing us with that sort of detail is that it is a little difficult to determine just what sort of revenue for this purpose is being forgone by the measure before us.

I have looked at the Auditor-General's Report, from which I can ascertain the source of funds that go into the Planning and Development Fund. For example, from a total income of \$2 165 000, \$800 000 came from loans and \$619 120 was from "contributions from landowners for reserves". On the next page of that report it is made clear

that of this sum, \$226 520 arises from the specific provision in the Planning and Development Act which requires that on small subdivisions, rather than setting aside 12½ per cent for reserves, a certain amount of money can be paid into the fund; and \$392 600 arose from the Real Property Act as strata titles. Neither of those two components of a total of \$619 120 arises from the surcharge on land tax, under section 12 (5) of the Act. Then there is \$420 000 for recoup of payment for land and improvements. Finally, there is \$100 000 from Consolidated Revenue. The figures I have given do not add up to \$2 165 000, because I have not bothered to detail the smaller miscellaneous items, as they are not important. It is clear from the list I have given that it is the \$100 000 from Consolidated Revenue that has been transferred as a result of what the Treasurer collects under the 1970 surcharge.

I have not been able to determine from the Auditor-General's Report what actual amount came from the surcharge, whether it was less than or exceeded \$100 000. It certainly would be desirable, in terms of the spirit of the 1970 amendment to the Act, that roughly what was paid into the Treasury by way of the land tax surcharge should have been transferred to the Planning and Development Fund. Either that information is not available in the Auditor-General's Report or else I simply have not researched far enough to find it.

It seems to me that that amendment in 1970 was very worth while, and that this revenue is now being forgone. That revenue was earmarked for a specific purpose, and whether all of it has been set aside for that purpose or whether in fact more has come from Government revenue than has been collected for that purpose is another thing. As I say, perhaps I have not researched that thoroughly enough. It was a worthwhile source of revenue that we are now, in part, forgoing simply because of the forgone revenue that arises from these amendments to the Act. That demonstrates that revenue-raising is by no means the monster and the ogre that some people would have us believe.

As people who are involved in public life, in Government or who have ambitions to be in Government, we must look very closely and carefully at this whole business of revenue-raising. As Minister of Education, I spent some time lecturing those people who have a vested interest in some continuing high level of expenditure by Governments. Unfortunately, for the most part, those people did not listen, but acted purely as pressure groups rather than people who had a real vested interest in a reasonable level of public expenditure. By that I mean that it is common place to hear teachers or students talking about more money being spent on education. It is common place for people in community welfare or the health field to similarly argue that their particular field should receive a larger slice of the cake.

Too rarely do these same groups address themselves to the whole question of public revenue, and accept that there is a responsibility on Government, if it is to meet the demands that we are placing upon it, to protect public revenue to a reasonable degree. Because these groups, for the most part, have not been prepared to act in that particular way so they have been seen purely as pressure groups trundling their own barrows, and to that extent they have acted against their own vested interests.

It is clear that the background against which these pieces of legislation are being introduced is one of something of a revolt by the wealthy upper middle class interests in our society, largely led by sections of the media. I believe the phrase that was used by J. K. Galbraith was "Jacobins of the great conservative revolution". In another context, that of the price of oil, which is relevant to any discussion

as to the balance between what rich and poor have to pay for commodities and the burden they carry in the community, Galbraith said:

For the free market purist, the poor do not count. Professor Milton Friedman, the acknowledged leader of the free market convocation, is not a thoughtfully hard-hearted man. The use of high prices to deny gasoline and heat to the lower-income family is for him, as for his communicants, a technical matter devoid of moral content. Nothing distinguishes such action from the tax revolt of the affluent against welfare, schools, parks, public recreation facilities, libraries and the police, all of which are also far more important in the lives of the poor than for those who can afford privately-earned or purchased substitutes. But for others, including some who must run for public office, the differential-income effect of the free enterprise solution has moral or anyhow political content. Not everyone yet views the revolt of the rich against the poor with complete equanimity.

I certainly do not view the revolt of the rich against the poor with complete equanimity. Members on this side of the House certainly do not regard the revolt of the rich against the poor with complete equanimity nor, indeed, the legislative measures that are being introduced into this House by a Government which seems to applaud the revolt of the rich against the poor. I do not pretend for one moment that land tax and the way in which it was collected or its incidence was perfect, but there were ways or means by which its incidence could have been altered.

Mr. Gunn: You had nine years to do something about it.

Dr. HOPGOOD: One of the things we did in those nine years was to introduce the amendment, the topic of which formed the first five or 10 minutes of my speech and I can point to other amendments that occurred during those nine years. For example, in that same period we provided the rural land tax concession. I wonder whether the member for Eyre regards that with some distaste.

Mr. Keneally: He might have opposed it when it was before the House.

Dr. HOPGOOD: I do not think he did, but nonetheless there it is. I am a householder who pays \$20 a year in land tax, and I can well afford to pay that sum. There are many people on higher incomes than I enjoy who pay rather more land tax than that and who can well afford to pay that additional land tax. The Government is giving away revenue that it has to make up in some other way, or else it must reduce the cost of services to the community.

These services to the community by and large are necessary because there are those people in the community who cannot appropriate these services by their own purchasing power. After all, that is the basic justification for any sort of public expenditure. It is in the interests of those people that I support a continuing high level of activity by Government and I deplore a willy-nilly giving away of public revenue. Nonetheless, the Government can legitimately claim that this was a fairly prominent feature of its election manifesto. The Government is now on the Treasury benches and can therefore legitimately claim the support of the House for this measure. For that reason I will cast my vote for it at the second reading.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable Premier speaks, he closes the debate. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): The performance of the Opposition this afternoon and this evening, particularly on this latter Bill, has been quite pathetic. I am amazed that Opposition members have attempted to bring forward the arguments that they have, and that they consider them weighty arguments. I would

like first of all to deal with the question of the promise given at election time by the Liberal Party. The promise that was given is being honoured with this legislation. As the Leader of the Opposition said, there was no time set for the commencement of this promise; that is quite clear in all the documents, but of course it becomes essential (if the member for Mitchell and other people on the front bench are to find something to pin their very thin arguments on) to establish facts, to twist the truth, and to say that that was a promise which he, having created for us, then proceeds to say that we are breaking. It amazes me that he has the gall to stand up in the House and without batting an eyelid make those assertions. They are not true, and he knows they are not true. What is more to the point, I bitterly resent the implied slur on the officers of the department which the member for Mitchell has clearly indulged in.

Mr. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I take it that the Leader of the Opposition would not stand up for his departmental officers. Well, I will stand up for my departmental officers and I will accept their advice on this matter and I will be understanding of it. Obviously, the member for Mitchell has not taken the time or the trouble (I do not know from whom he sought his advice) to find out what the real situation is. The situation is quite clear: principal places of residence are not identifiable at present and it will be some little time before they are. The member for Baudin talked at some length about surcharge, the result of an amendment that came into this House. I am informed that the surcharge that was levied has not in every case gone direct to the Planning and Development Fund but it has gone, by the Labor Government of previous times, straight into the general revenue. So much for the value of the amendment and all of the boasting that went on over here by the member for Baudin. I cannot really find anything else to answer in the mass of verbiage which the Opposition members have put forward on this Bill. They have been talking for the sake of talking; the legislation stands on its own, and I am pleased to hear that, in spite of all their philosophic and ideological opposition to this matter, they intend to support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Enactment of section 10a of principal Act."

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

Page 1, after line 23—Insert new subsection (1) before the present subsection (1) of new section 10a:

- (1) Land is exempt from land tax under this section if—
 - (a) proper grounds exist for exempting the land from land tax; and
 - (b) the land has been exempted from land tax in pursuance of this section and the exemption is, for the time being, in force.

Amendment carried.

Mr. PAYNE: I move:

Page 2, line 20—Strike out "fourteen" and insert "twenty-one".

It is clear that, upon receipt of notice from the Commissioner, a definite onus is placed upon the recipient to take action, default of which is likely to cost a maximum of \$500. After listening for quite a few years to what the former Opposition members had to say about placing onerous responsibilities on citizens for matters over which they may not have immediate control, I found it whimsical to be on the Opposition bench and find that one of the very first measures to come before us required a person receiving the notice to respond in a very short period.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin interjecting:

Mr. PAYNE: The Premier cannot hold any threats over my head. I am putting forward my amendment for consideration. Irrespective of what the Premier says, I am entitled to point out that the period of 14 days involves a fairly onerous responsibility on a person if he is to avoid a maximum fine of \$500 in connection with pointing out an inaccuracy. The notice may be couched in language that the person cannot understand. He may need to seek advice; it is not unknown for a person to go on holiday or to be ill in hospital, and so on. So, 14 days is not a very long period. Indeed, on looking at my amendment, I am somewhat worried as to whether even 21 days is sufficient. However, I am taking a middle course and not embarrassing the Government too much about this failure on its part, despite the fact that it has legally qualified persons in its ranks who should have noticed that this was at the very best an unfortunate omission on the Government's part. The Government should allow a reasonable period for citizens to be able to respond to a Government notice.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am entirely convinced by the weight of the honourable member's argument, and I therefore accept the amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

Page 2, lines 39 to 41—Leave out subsection (9).

This amendment is consequential.

Amendment carried.

Mr. BANNON: I move:

Page 2—

Line 42—Leave out "An" and insert "Subject to subsection (10a) of this section, an".

Lines 44 and 45—Leave out "but no such exemption shall be effective before the thirtieth day of June, 1980".

After line 45 insert subsection as follows:

(10a) An exemption granted by the Commissioner before the thirtieth day of June, 1980, shall be deemed to have been effective as from the thirtieth day of June, 1979.

Although there are three separate parts to the amendment, they all relate to the same point. The amendments seek to delete the reference to the exemption applying to 30 June 1980 and to make it apply effectively from 30 June 1979. The Opposition, in moving these amendments, is seeking to give effect to the Government's promise regarding this tax. One could ask why the Opposition, which has already expressed some disquiet about this measure, should seek to move an amendment which will ensure that the measure comes into operation earlier than the Government proposed.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Because you think it's good tactics.

Mr. BANNON: The reason why the Opposition is supporting a measure that it finds repugnant is that it believes that it is bound by the decision of the electors made on 15 September. Those electors accepted not only a fairly broad programme but also some specific tax measures that were proposed by the Liberal Party. This has influenced the Opposition's approach throughout this debate.

Of course, the Premier will lightly wave that matter aside, as Government members, and particularly their colleagues in Canberra, do not appreciate these constitutional niceties. To them, the Westminster system is to be used and abused so long as they have ultimate control over it. They have certainly ensured that they have always had that control in this State through their control of another place. So, Government members have never had to grapple with the question of how one observes the proprieties of our constitutional system.

The Opposition believes that good things are inherent in

this system, and that a part of the system involves a recognition that, after a Government has been elected, and when certain points have been spelt out specifically in its policy, although the Opposition has a right to criticise, amend, suggest improvements, or even to oppose outright, in the ultimate, particularly if the measure is a taxation measure such as that now before us, it should support it. However, I suggest that the price of that support is that the Opposition expects the Government to carry out that mandate as it told the people it would. In this case, however, the Government is not doing so.

It is certainly true, as the Premier said and as I said earlier, that no particular timing was attached to this land tax exemption. However, the detailed costing document that was a supplement to the Premier's policy statement specifically allocated a sum for the 1978-79 financial year. That may have been a mistake, and the Premier may, in response to my remarks, be willing to say that it was a mistake and that the Government did not really intend to put it into operation in that financial year. However, I make the point that that costing document was quite influential, as it is usual for Parties to make promises during an election campaign. Certainly, in terms of a superficial glance by the electorate, some attractive promises were made by the then Opposition. However, that Opposition then gave those promises some credibility by that detailed costing document and by stressing constantly throughout the campaign that its promises were indeed responsible because of the precision of its costing.

The then Opposition made a lot of that and, with respect to the media, a glance at that document, with its impressive tables and statistics, suggests, without a closer examination, that indeed the then Opposition was correct when it said that its proposals had been fully costed and were responsible.

During the course of the Budget debate and in debate on separate measures, the Opposition has indicated clearly that that costing document was inaccurate and that, therefore, the people who believed that the sort of tax return being promised by the then Opposition would accrue generally were wrong. The Government has chosen simply to ignore that. It has forgotten about that costing document and has rather hoped that it would go away or be buried. That is a pity, because that document must have added considerable credibility to its promises and given its tax concessions an aura of respectability and financial probity that made them quite compelling in the eyes of the electorate.

However, in this instance when one looks at the costing document one finds that in 1978-79 the sum of \$1 600 000 will be made available to the community through land tax remissions. If that was not correct, it should have been stated during the election campaign. It is a pity that that document, on which so much weight was put, was inaccurate.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin interjecting:

Mr. BANNON: No, because we considered at the time that there were many inaccuracies in the document. Indeed, I think we demonstrated that during the campaign. If it was correct and the Liberal Party intended to introduce it this session, clearly it is administratively possible because, for a start, we have not had specified to us, despite the contributions made by my colleagues and me, what those administrative difficulties are.

The member for Mitchell has given a simple solution to any problem that the Government may face in terms of making the tax concession apply this financial year. So, it is reasonable for the Opposition to suggest that this amendment can be made and, indeed, that it can be handled administratively by the Premier and the

responsible department. I have therefore moved the amendment so that the concessions will, as promised in the Liberal Party election campaign, apply from 30 June 1979.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It probably should not be necessary for me to keep repeating that the Liberal Party's statement on land tax did not specify anything like the amendment which the Leader has moved and which he is misrepresenting as Liberal Party policy. If the Leader is concerned about the matter, he should look again at the statements in order to satisfy himself that what he has said is absolutely inaccurate. I am surprised at the Leader, who is obviously twisting the facts to suit his argument, which, to say the least, is a very thin one. Not only is the Leader misrepresenting the Liberal Party's point of view but also, once again, as has been so typical in today's debates, he is having two bob each way. The danger of it is that I do not think the Leader knows that he is doing so. In a facile manner, the Leader moved from one case to another.

Mr. Bannon: Honour your promises; that's what we say.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Indeed, and that is exactly what this Bill is all about. I wish that the Leader could see that. He says that the costing document put out before the election was a very influential one. I am certain that my staff will be delighted to hear about this reversal of form. Before the election they were told from the rooftops that the proposal was totally inadequate and that the figures were out by as much as 125 per cent. Mr. Hudson, the former member for Brighton, was reported in the 28 August 1979 issue of the *Advertiser* as saying that any abolition of succession duties and land tax would simply hasten the introduction of a State income tax. Perhaps that explains why members opposite are so keen to support the Westminster system. Perhaps they think that in some way or another this will hasten the development of a State income tax. That is the most pathetic argument that I have ever heard.

Opposition members do not know whether they are coming or going. In the next breath the Leader said that this was a most important document. In the next breath he said it was rubbish and not to be believed. He is changing the rules almost second by second to suit his argument. It just won't do! I suppose that, if we had promised to abolish land tax forthwith, it could have been from 1 January, as we promised with succession and gift duties, or perhaps it could have been from 15 September (a date of great renown in this State—and it will be for many years). If that had been the date, that would be reasonable, but this amendment goes back to 30 June 1979. What a ridiculous situation. Obviously, the Leader does not realise that some 50 000 properties change hands in South Australia in the course of a year. There is no way of telling how many of the persons who will own a property on 30 June 1980 will be the same persons who owned that property on 30 June 1979.

Mr. Bannon: What about the Lands Title Office?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That shows the Leader's abysmal ignorance. Because a property is exempted as a principal place of residence on 30 June 1980, that does not necessarily mean that it was the principal place of residence on 30 June 1979. It may have been purchased and let out to rent. The whole suggestion is totally impracticable. Being reasonable as I am, I cannot believe that the Leader really expects us to think he is serious. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. PAYNE: I support the amendment. It seems to me that seldom, if ever, could anybody have run for cover in this Chamber more quickly after assuming a higher office than he had held for some time than the Premier did on the very points about which we are now concerned; that is, whether this exemption from land tax should apply (in

round terms) a year hence or in accordance with an election promise. The Premier hid behind his officers—a cowardly form of behaviour. He has often said that to make allegations in Parliament in respect of persons outside Parliament is using coward's castle, but what sort of person is it who occupies the Premier's seat and, at the first little bit of pressure and probing by the Opposition, says that the Opposition is not really having a shot at him but is having a shot at his officers, and that is wrong. What a load of garbage that is!

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

Mr. PAYNE: The Minister is the person who is responsible. The member for Glenelg will never be in the position of carrying that responsibility, because his chance of getting into the Ministry is less than Buckley's—he ought to sit there and think about that. It is the Minister (in this case, the Premier) who carries the responsibility; he must take the kicks or get the kudos, so I urge the Premier to come out from behind coward's resort and accept the responsibility for not taking this action, because it is clearly on his shoulders now.

The officers are not sitting on the benches opposite; they are not being asked to consider the amendment; it is the Premier and his Government who are. If the Bill needs some reorganisation, the Premier is at liberty to move that progress be reported at any time and to cart the thing off and straighten it out in accordance with any date proposed, if he is so disposed. It is clear not only that he is not so disposed but that he never intended matters to be that way.

I ask the Premier to state unequivocally in this Chamber that a promise to abolish land tax on the principal place of residence means "When we are ready and we work out the administration difficulties involved for electors." It is absolute nonsense to suggest to this House that the promise was a shortened version of what was really meant at the time of the election. There was nothing whatsoever stopping the Premier (the Leader as he then was) from saying to the electors of this State, "We will abolish land tax on the principal place of residence when we work out how to do it." That required an addition of only a few words. At no time was that ever suggested in back-talk or cross-talk on the radio, during questions in which the Leader was involved, in amplifying discussions, and so on. He cannot point to one instance where he qualified that promise. Now the chickens come home to roost, right now in this Chamber, because that is the position in a nutshell. Here is an amendment which tests the Premier's intention at the time he made the promise.

Mr. Keneally: His integrity, too.

Mr. PAYNE: It is also, as my colleague points out, a test of the Premier's integrity. All that is needed is for the Premier to say in this House, "I accept the amendments. There will be problems, but we can handle them administratively." The Premier pointed out to us earlier in this House that there is no legislative backing for another measure, so he proposes to handle it administratively. I give him an assurance (and I am sure my Leader will go along with me—maybe I am sticking my neck out, but I do not think I am) that if he wants to do this administratively, thus enabling him to honour his promise, nobody on this side of the House will question how he does it.

That is not his excuse, however. He is taking refuge by saying that it is an administrative difficulty, and he is refusing an invitation to detail that difficulty.

The Premier has never answered the contention I have put forward that no money is due to the State until the assessment notices are received. The way to prevent the money being collected from the wrong people is not to send the notices until it has been determined who should

be paying this money. The Premier cannot answer that question, and does not want to do so. He tries to dissimulate by talking about the Leader having two bob each way. What a shallow effort! Of course, the Leader, quite properly, canvassed what was involved in each question. There is no reason why that form of address should not be adopted in this House. It was very shallow indeed of the Premier to try to hide behind what he said were the Leader's intentions in the matter. It is unanswerable, except in one way; by the Premier saying, "Yes, I was fair dinkum. I will accept this amendment."

Mr. KENEALLY: I rise because it does not appear that the Premier intends to make any more contribution to the debate on this amendment. I ask the Premier whether he believes he has any responsibility to all those people who, he has told this House, and his colleagues have told this House and this State, have gone bankrupt because of the incidence of land tax. What is going to happen to those people he alleges will go bankrupt between now and June of next year? Does he feel that he has any responsibility to these people? Is he going to give any special consideration to their needs? Can they come to the Premier and have the land tax, which he says is so onerous on them and which sends them bankrupt, voided? Is the Premier prepared to give us any assurances at all about this matter? I point out to the Committee that these are the Premier's allegations, not ours. It is the Premier and his colleagues, in justifying the abolition of land tax on the principal place of residence, who have said this tax is onerous and that people will find great difficulty paying it. Also, they have said that they had been told of people going broke and being forced out of their homes, because of it.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Ah!

Mr. KENEALLY: The Premier recalls making such statements, so I ask him to give an assurance that all of the people who have been forced out of their homes over the years because of land tax can come to him and expect satisfaction because of their requests.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am grateful. That is probably one of the more sensible contributions that has come across the Chamber this evening, but it was only sensible part way. The honourable member talks about people going bankrupt. I think he refers to statements which have been made in this Chamber on many occasions in the last six or seven years, quoting cases of people who have had to leave or consider leaving their house because they have not been able to afford the land tax payable. Unfortunately, it is a fact of life that those people, over the last six or seven years, have had to leave their houses because of the policies of the Labor Government. I wish members opposite had had this attitude towards land tax on the principal place of residence before now. There has been tremendous change; they have come around to supporting our policies. If they had shown that attitude over the last nine years, people would not have had to leave their houses. I say yet again that they got every cent out of those people that they could; the only satisfaction the people got was that if they did not pay their land tax it would be a charge on their estate.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: If they can't afford to pay, they can shift out!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, that was said—"If they can't afford to pay they should move out." This was the sort of attitude and the policy espoused and totally supported by honourable members opposite over the last nine years. It does them little credit. Those people who have been forced into that position by their oppressive policies, having moved, are beyond help. At least they can be assured that from now on, once this legislation is passed, that they will not be forced out of their place of

residence; they will be secure and they will be intensely grateful that they have elected a Government which takes due cognizance of the difficulties that they had had.

I am grateful that the honourable member has resurrected the past in that way. As the honourable member well knows, in relation to people who are being forced out now, steps are being taken to maintain the cost, the charge and the last payment they will make of land tax at its previous level. They can look forward to the fact that, from 30 June next year, they will not have to pay land tax. That is something for which I will be intensely grateful and I am sure that they will be too.

I did not bother to answer the member for Mitchell; as he made no sense. I am not prepared to give dignity and weight to an argument that is false, spurious and twisted. That is what it is: set up a falsehood, a false premise and then accuse somebody else of not honouring what in fact they did not promise in the first place. The honourable member is totally lacking in moral integrity if he persists in that line.

Mr. PAYNE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I believe that it is unparliamentary to reflect on the moral integrity of any honourable member. I ask that the remark be withdrawn immediately.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold the point of order. It is entirely a matter—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Opposition members will not interject while the Chair is addressing the Committee. It is a matter for each individual member to determine whether or not he wishes to withdraw a remark or not. The honourable member for Stuart.

Mr. KENEALLY: One always knows when one is getting to the Premier. He gets down into the gutter—a term used frequently by one of his colleagues. His reflection on the member for Mitchell is typical of what happens when he loses his cool. He reflects upon people's personal morality. He is going to have plenty of opportunity in the next couple of years to vent his spleen because they have the effrontery to disagree with him.

The Premier did not answer the question I put to him. He waffled on for about eight or nine minutes and said absolutely nothing, misrepresented what I said, became hysterical and historical, but did not answer the question. My question was, "What is he going to do about those people whom he and his colleagues allege to be so severely overtaxed currently as to be put in a position where they think they might have to leave their homes or be forced out of their homes?"

If the honourable gentleman opposite and the Government were genuine in their attitude and were concerned about people in that position they would not force another 12 months on to them. They would do something about it now. The Premier said that the previous Government has taken advantage of the home owners in South Australia and imposed upon them a tax that is so onerous that it is going to force them out of their homes. However, he is going to wait another 12 months before he gives them any respite. Where is the morality in that?

The honourable gentleman raised the question of morality. There is no morality in that. Either the Government is not fair dinkum in what it is doing, or it could not give two hoots about the people whom it allege are in that position. Another 12 months might be the difference between selling up their home and moving out of a place that they have lived in all their life amongst people, shops, and traffic to which they have become accustomed. It means a lot to some old people.

If the allegations that Government members have been

throwing at us for five or six years or more are correct, one would think that they would be anxious to introduce legislation into this House that is retrospective to as far back as they could make it to overcome what they consider to be injustices in the taxation system. They cannot have it both ways. If they believe that the land tax in South Australia has been unjust over a number of years and has caused all this concern amongst the community, they would be working quickly to overcome it. They could not say that they cannot do anything about it for another six or eight months.

Obviously, the Government is not fair dinkum. It has been caught with promises made when it was thought they would have no opportunity of putting them into effect. They went to the people with promises in the knowledge that they were going to lose the election. I cannot come to terms with the hypocrisy of the Government on this issue. If members opposite are concerned, as they say they are, about the matters that they say exist within the community, let them do something about it immediately. If the problem is as bad as they say, how can they justify putting it off for another seven or eight months? I know that some of the back-benchers in the Government take the point I am making. They know that what I am saying is correct.

Will the Premier explain why the operation of this Bill, which amends legislation that he considers so onerous, is to be delayed for another eight months when, in so doing, if his allegations are correct, great concern and privation will be caused within the community?

Mr. PAYNE: I think that this is the first time in the nine years I have been here that any member has questioned my moral integrity. However, be that as it may: I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman, that it is up to the member who makes the allegation to sort that out. I am willing to leave it to those who read *Hansard* (because few people come to listen to debates here) to make up their mind about whose moral integrity is in question. It is clear to me that the Premier does not intend to honour a promise that was made.

Because he has been driven into a corner and is in a dilemma, and because I believe that fundamentally at heart he is a man of good character, quite the opposite of what he believes of me, he has lashed out uncharacteristically and has resorted to personal character attacks. I have not known him to resort to that sort of thing over the years we have shared in this place. Your ruling on the matter, Sir, was intelligent. I am not reflecting: I am simply putting forward the view as I see it. You have stated clearly that members are largely their own masters and, if they wish to resort to tactics of that kind, they may withdraw if they wish.

I support these amendments, because they place the moral integrity of the Premier under close and searching examination. I did not make the promise to abolish land tax on the principal place of residence: the Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, made it, on 28 August this year. The farcical nature of the argument he is now putting forward that it was a statement that would be implemented if possible and if there were not too many administrative difficulties is beyond doubt.

One may be forgiven for picturing a gathering of adult electors in South Australia in a bowling club, hotel, or home, when an election is imminent and a promise has been made. The Premier requires them to say, "Jonesy is running for that. He said he will do that. Do you think he will do it next year? Does he mean now? Is it in the next term? Is it when they can get together with the Public Service and work out when to do it?"

If that kind of thing applied, it would be senseless to

have election policies. We are supposed to be here to protect the ordinary citizen, not our own interests. I oppose the abolition of land tax, and I have made that clear in the beginning. I did not make the promise: the Party now on the Government side, including the Leader at that time, made it, and it is totally within the Premier's power to keep it. If he does not wish to keep it, I will leave it to posterity, those who know me, and those who read *Hansard* to judge whose moral integrity is at stake. I urge any members opposite, many of whom obviously were not privy to the promises, heard them through the media, and were not in the inner group working out the promises, to consider what I am putting.

Are electors to be required to so analyse election policies on the basis of what is really meant? We are considering the abolition of land tax on the principal place of residence—"We will abolish", not, "We will try to", "We will see how hard it is," or "We will try to fit it in at some time." When that is said in the context of an election, every elector is entitled to take it at the face value at which sufficient electors did take it, to put the people opposite in Government. Now the argument is put that there is some administrative difficulty and the Government does not want to do it.

If anyone's integrity is in doubt, the Premier could remove some of the tarnish that will attach to his integrity by coming clean, being honest, and saying, "We put it that way because we did not know when we could do it, and did not know the administrative difficulties." He is not saying that. On the contrary, he is saying that my integrity is at stake because I am asking why he will not keep a promise. The amendment clearly puts the onus on the Premier to put up or shut up, and I hope he will put up.

The CHAIRMAN: In view of the interpretation placed on my ruling by the member for Mitchell in relation to the point of order, I just wish to qualify my ruling by saying that, if any member makes remarks that are unparliamentary, the Chair certainly will intervene.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am disappointed in the honourable member. First, I ask him, if he can (and I know he cannot), to show me the promise made before the election that land tax on the principal place of residence would be abolished as at 30 June last, or at any particular date. It was specifically not put in that way. It was a policy determination to be undertaken during the life of this Parliament, and preferably as soon as possible. Legislation has been introduced as soon as possible.

For the honourable member to persist in saying that every promise in other terms was made with a date on it shows that he does not understand, does not wish to understand, or deliberately chooses to misrepresent me here. If he wishes to continue to misrepresent me here, that is up to him. This legislation has been introduced as soon as possible and it will operate as soon as possible. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. KENEALLY: Am I to understand that an Opposition costing document that states that the loss of receipts of taxation from the varying forms of tax, including land tax, in 1978-79 means that that tax will not be lost during that period? I should have thought that, if a Party went to the people with a costing document stating that this amount of tax would be lost during 1978-79, it meant during 1978-79. Obviously, it does not work that way when the Liberal Party goes to the people: it does not mean that. The Premier evades any comment on the costing document. I wonder why he has not been prepared to answer the good case put forward by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The member for Stuart has either not been listening or not paying attention. I do not

think he has been out of the Chamber. I have dealt with the costing document. If he looks, he will see that every taxation measure has been costed on two bases, one being the cost for the balance of this financial year and one being the cost for a full year. If the honourable member does not choose to understand, that is up to him.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Abbott, Lynn Arnold, Bannon (teller), Max Brown, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Webster, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Corcoran. No—Mrs. Adamson.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 7) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 October. Page 431.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): We have before us another of those measures which the Government promised at the recent election and which it seeks to give effect to by way of legislation at this early opportunity. As with previous such measures, the Opposition believes that the Government does have a mandate for this Bill. It was put clearly before the people at the recent election. Clearly, it gained their support, and it would not be proper for us to oppose this measure.

As with the Land Tax Act Amendment Bill, the Opposition is not happy about the total abolition of succession duties and the way in which this Bill achieves it. Certainly, we concede that it is a popular measure, but I suggest that its popularity derives in large part from the lack of understanding of people in the community about what succession or estate duties mean, about their incidence (namely, where they fall), and about the progressive nature of the tax and the difficulties of finding an adequate replacement that does not fall more heavily on those less able to pay.

The problem with this measure is that there have been on occasions anomalies in succession duties legislation; in fact, the former Government moved to correct those anomalies on a number of occasions. As recently as the election campaign certain proposals were put forward by the then Government to amend the Succession Duties Act of raise the level of exemption and make some other improvements in it. There has been progressive examination of the succession duties legislation.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Not much action though!

Mr. BANNON: There has been considerable action as well over recent years, all aimed at trying to ensure that this measure is proper and equitable, and does not weigh too heavily upon those who cannot afford it. However, the essential fact remains that this is one of those few measures that is progressive and structures tax in the way that it should be structured in terms of equity, that is, a tax that will fall on those who are most able to afford it.

The figures in the case of succession duties are quite unequivocal and clear on this point. It is a tragedy that,

instead of the incoming Government's looking at the situation in terms of how this tax falls, looking at it in terms of where one might replace the revenue forgone or the services that have to be cut, it simply took a doctrinal attitude aimed at further increasing the benefits of those with already high financial privileges in this country.

For that reason the Opposition has mixed feelings about the Bill. Certainly, we feel obliged to allow the Government to carry it without opposing it at the second reading stage. Certainly, the Opposition concedes that some amendments were necessary and desirable to the succession duties legislation and that, in fact, progressively amendments should have been made to it. However, the Opposition cannot support this approach of total abolition in one stroke, however popular it may be. As I have stated, the Opposition believes that it is a popular measure, but it is popular because the principles behind it have not been properly aired and discussed in the community. We saw the most appalling treatment of succession duties earlier this year in the Norwood by-election, when certain sections of the media—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: I thought that was *sub judice*.

Mr. BANNON: I stress that it was in the Norwood by-election in March. The Minister forgets; they were different occasions.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: That's history, too.

Mr. BANNON: That is history, and we won it. In connection with the Norwood by-election, the media treated this issue of succession duty in quite a scandalous way by raising cases that on closer examination proved to be quite wrong and by generally attacking this tax in an extremely emotional and unsatisfactory manner.

Of course, people in the community do not like taxes; none of us likes paying taxes. One of the roles of Government is to ensure that it taxes fairly, that it gains the revenue it needs to provide essential services, and that those taxes are fair to the people on whom they are levied. There is a range of different taxes. Unfortunately, this unpopular tax is one that has the potential to be extremely fair and just, and it is a pity that at one stroke it is to be abolished.

It is interesting to note that, again, this was a tax in relation to which misleadingly low figures were given in the costing of the Government, suggesting that \$8 000 000 or \$9 000 000 only would be required for the abolition of succession duty in the full year. In fact, as the Budget document makes clear, the figure is about \$16 000 000 or \$17 000 000. A major error was made, based on wrong assumptions and wrong extrapolations from the situation in Queensland. One wonders whether members of the community, looking at that measure and others, realise the full implications of cost that the Opposition's revenue measures would yield.

Unfortunately, a State Budget cannot really afford major cutbacks of this kind on a continuing basis. The abolition of succession duty will inevitably lead to its substitution by some other more aggressive tax measure. There are certainly problems with succession duty, one being the way that the duty has been avoided by the wealthy in our community. Surely, that is not an argument for total abolition; rather, it is an argument to attempt to overcome the inadequacies and anomalies and ensure that the tax is levied properly. Unfortunately, the new Government is not prepared to tackle that difficult problem.

Succession duties have had a long history. They were founded on a fairly important principle, resulting largely from the pressures from small farmers and others in the community in the last century to attempt to break up large

estates. It was interesting to see what a wide range of support such measures had. The original Act, providing for proportional rates of duty, was introduced in 1876, over 100 years ago. The 1893 Act introduced progressive rates. It is interesting to note that the Premier of that day was Charles Cameron Kingston, the well known progressive and radical reformer. His Treasurer, who had carriage of the first progressive succession duties Bill, was the Hon. Thomas Playford, grandfather of a former well known Premier of this State. It was pointed out at that time that the House felt it desirable that a man should leave his property to several persons instead of to one person only, and accordingly it was decided that a duty should be levied on the individual amounts left to different legatees.

One of the speakers in support of the Bill was Sir John Downer, the scion of the conservative cause, later a member of the Federal Parliament, a former Premier and well known citizen of this State. I use this historical analogy to show how times have changed and how the present Government, supposedly the inheritor of the conservative mantle of those days, seems to have departed from those traditions. Sir John was of the view, as was recorded in the Parliamentary debates of 1893, that the Bill laid down the principle that no-one had any natural right to any property after the death of an owner; children had no natural right, and strangers had no natural right or any other right. Those pretty strong and clear-cut statements on this type of tax were made by a leading conservative of his day. Times have changed. Succession duties were introduced to counter the perpetuation of wealth and economic power by reducing the ability to transmit it simply from generation to generation by inheritance.

Death duties are really not so much a socialist measure as a (small "l") liberal measure. They are not so much about spreading and equalising society in a true socialist sense as being about equality of opportunity. They start from the premise that there can be no true equality of opportunity when the few start life with far greater advantages than the many, in terms of wealth and material goods. The Bureau of Statistics, using South Australian information, estimates that 4 per cent of all estates in South Australia account for 29 per cent of the value of all estates. This figure is after transfer of assets before death. The true figure would show an even greater aggregation of wealth among the few. That figure understates the situation. The United Kingdom Royal Commission on the distribution of income and wealth came out with some horrifying findings on the perpetuation of wealth. Although no comparable study has been done in South Australia, because of the structure of our economies, there are obviously a number of similarities.

That Royal Commission in Britain found that the top 1 per cent of adults owned 25 per cent of all private wealth, and of this 25 per cent, three-quarters was inherited, not based on the principle of someone working his way up through industry and application, what one would see as being part of the Liberal tradition; it was wealth that was inherited, simply passed on to a member of a family by reason of the fortune of being born into that family. The top 5 per cent of adults own half of the private wealth in Britain.

That Royal Commission was established perhaps because the British Government was aware of the relevance of the distribution of wealth to industrial affairs, including pay claims and strikes, and so on. It may well be timely that some such inquiry was held in Australia, or at least South Australia. Succession duty as a progressive tax is not one of those taxes that should be lightly done away

with; regrettably, it is. It focuses on persons with the greatest ability to pay, and in our society there are so few capital taxes that those we have should be retained. We are at pains not to be misrepresented on this issue; reforms are necessary, and flexibility is also necessary in this area, but we have not supported, and we cannot support now, the total abolition of the type contemplated in this Bill. Succession duty is not an inflationary tax, and there is a strong need for such taxation. It certainly does not reduce the incentive to work or the incentive to expand businesses, because it relates to inheritance. The Asprey Committee of Inquiry into Taxation established by the McMahon Government concluded that at the Federal level there was a necessary role for death duties to play in the overall Commonwealth tax structure. Death duties do not affect capital accumulation any more than does income tax. So, why is the abolition of death duties now advocated, and why are there so many moves towards this?

Let us look at the overall nature of our taxation system. I have referred previously to a study by Macquarie University economists on the structure of State taxation, which found that it was highly regressive. Lower and middle income families paid a much higher proportion of their income in State taxation than higher income families, and that is quite inequitable. With the abolition of Federal estate duty from the beginning of July, we now have, at the Commonwealth level, only a very limited and easily avoidable capital gains tax to supplement our income tax. Yet, in the United States and Western Europe, with the exception of Ireland—

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

Mr. BANNON:—there is, in addition to income tax, estate duties, plus either a net wealth tax or a capital gains tax. While Australia has cut taxes on capital, all these countries have two such taxes in addition to income tax, and some have three. Australia is the odd man out in this. If we could point to some greater prosperity or equality in terms of economic health in our community, there might be some evidence to suggest that wealth taxes are a bad thing. That evidence is just not forthcoming.

It is appalling that, while income tax payments by wage and salary earners continue to rise and tax avoidance continues to escalate, our few capital taxes are being abolished. Under the conservative thrust of the Fraser Government there has been a real shift of wealth to the rich from the less well off. Last year the Premier only wanted to phase out succession duties on assets passing between members of a family. So what is the justification for abolishing duties on estates passing between people other than blood relatives, and why does the entire duty have to be abolished in one go?

We must remember that we are protecting the estates not of persons who would inherit them through family or blood ties, but that we are also abolishing any duty on inheritance that goes to complete strangers, in the legal sense. These "strangers" could be friends, business partners or acquaintances, but perhaps they could be strangers in the strict sense of the word, too. Little justification or reason has been given for that.

Mr. Evans: You would prefer it to go to a rich relative rather than a poor stranger?

Mr. BANNON: No; the whole system obviously needs some flexibility and review built into it. There is more justification for flexibility in relation to relatives than there is in relation to a complete stranger. One important reason why so much noise has been made about succession duties is that Government members realise that there is very little public awareness of the underlying concentration of

wealth in the community; very little information has been published about it.

I am constantly surprised to hear ordinary people in the community complaining about the incidence of succession duties and their fears about what it might involve them in. When their actual assets and the value of their estate are examined it is found that those people are in the 64 per cent of the population with estates that would not be liable to any duty whatever. However, fears and misapprehensions have been spread that these people would be heavily taxed for their few possessions; that is just not true. The vast bulk of the revenue from succession duties and the vast bulk of those estates that are dutiable are in the very high income and high value bracket. The ordinary person is not affected by succession duties, and constant review and indexation would have ensured that that position remained. Unfortunately, the ordinary person is not aware of that situation.

The Premier links his assertions about the need to abolish succession duties with talk of stimulating economic development in South Australia. He justifies that by claiming that there is a retirement capital flow from this State. Of course, it is nonsense to link retirement capital with investment in this State. The figures quite clearly show that the vast majority of investment in modern economies is financed not by retirement capital but by public companies and retained profits. Clearly, the Premier's argument falls down in relation to succession duties.

The Government has referred to an outflow of the population as the reason for abolishing succession duties. It alleged that thousands of people were leaving this State with their estates intact to go to Queensland. Surely the Premier is aware of the much higher outflow from Victoria and Tasmania than from this State, as has been documented by the Bureau of Statistics. Could it be that this movement has nothing to do with succession duties but that some retired people simply leave this State because they prefer another climate. That is a rather horrendous suggestion, so I will not pursue it any further. The real fact is that there is absolutely no hard evidence of large amounts of capital leaving this State through fear of succession duties being levied.

The Premier also talks about hardship caused by succession duties, but collections of duties in recent years makes nonsense of that, because collections have not been rising at all. In 1975-76, \$19 100 000 was collected, and in 1978-79 only \$16 100 000 was collected. Those figures show the actual cuts in monetary terms, but when one adds the impact of inflationary forces it can be seen that in fact the cuts have been severe, indeed. Increased hardship is not at all likely in circumstances such as that. Therefore, we will forgo considerable income that is levied fairly and equitably on the community, and we will have to find it from some other source.

The Labor Party has amended this legislation consistently over the years, and has corrected anomalies it has found. In Mr. Corcoran's recent policy speech we promised to do even more. The Minister of Agriculture has asked what concessions were made. Over the past few years there have been substantial reductions in duties payable by unmarried brothers and sisters who inherit a shared house; there was complete abolition of duties between spouses; there was index for inflation of statutory rebates; there were flexible and generous concessions for rural estates; and there was exemption of bequests to benevolent, religious and other institutions. In 1976-77, the cost of abolition of duty between spouses alone cost between \$4 000 000 and \$5 000 000 so, clearly, major concessions have been made in this area.

The abolition of succession duties makes nonsense of Liberal rhetoric about enterprise and hard work being the keys to growth. What incentive is there for people who inherit large amounts of wealth to work hard and contribute to the development of the State. A study conducted by the former Government into all estates assessed for duty during the last quarter of 1978 clearly indicates who would benefit from the abolition of succession duties. That study indicated a number of estates valued at over \$250 000 and paying duty of \$80 000 to \$100 000 or more, and the beneficiaries from these estates will be the real winners, not the small man who is virtually untaxed at present. Members on this side will later deal in some greater detail with the actual incidence of succession duties in this State at the moment.

Obviously, there are alternatives to abolition. How is it to be financed? It is legitimate to ask where the money will come from. As has been said in earlier debates on tax measures, the crunch will come in 1980-81. While the Liberal policy document indicated that the full cost would only be \$8 000 000, in fact over \$16 000 000 to \$17 000 000 will have to be made up in that year and every subsequent financial year, and that is an extremely large slice of our State revenue. It is significant to note that other Premiers have not rushed in and promised total abolition of succession duties. The Premier of Victoria said that his Government would totally abolish probate duty as soon as possible; as yet, that moment has not arrived. It is still being phased out slowly because of the financial implications. The Premier of New South Wales, Mr. Wran, has deferred his original commitment to abolish succession duties, again because he was faced with the financial realities. I suggest that both those Premiers are well aware of the uncertain financial climate in which we operate.

As was said in an earlier debate, at the end of this year there is a vital Premier's Conference that will affect the share of Commonwealth tax revenue that this State receives. It has also under examination, and thereby under threat, the benefits of the railways agreement made by the Commonwealth, and that could have severe implications for the revenue of this State. We argue strongly that the Premier has put himself in an extremely difficult position in arguing with the Commonwealth for a greater share of those Federal resources for South Australia because, rather than show that South Australia is maintaining its revenue in a position of self-help, the Premier is in fact giving away large slabs of revenue, and most notably the \$16 000 000 or \$17 000 000 that is contained in this promise. Times are difficult, with major financial problems looming for this State, and unfortunately we are in a position in which taxes this year are being given away that we may well need next year, or face drastic cuts in Government services. The crunch is yet to come. It is interesting that Queensland is always cited as a prime example of the abolition of succession duties and the great benefits it brings. One has only to examine the health and education services in Queensland to realise what has happened as far as the revenue that is being given away is concerned.

According to the *Financial Review* of 15 August this year, a whole range of taxes and charges have been increased in Queensland since death duties were abolished. Those taxes and charges are regressive, not progressive as this tax is. In South Australia are we going to face a situation where fees will be introduced for a wide range of services? Will there be charges on the use of national parks, libraries, or a charge to enter the museum, and things of that nature? Obviously, those sorts of charges must be looked at if we are going to give away

large amounts of revenue in the way that we have. As I said on opening, the Opposition is prepared to allow the passage of this Bill without opposing it by division, but we are most unhappy that this measure is being introduced in this way, that is, trading on cheer-chasing and vote-catching which we believe did not do fair justice to the people of South Australia and their understanding of a fair and progressive tax system.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I wish to endorse the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition. It is certainly our intention to allow this Bill to go through without division, as the Leader said, at the second reading stage. I wish to make some comments on the principle in general of succession duties. I would most heartily concur with the Leader's statements about the need for wealth taxes in this country as being a fair and equitable form of taxing and redistributing wealth in the community. I shall deal with that in more detail shortly. First, I wish to comment on some of the points that were raised in the second reading speech by the Premier; in particular, one where he mentioned the Blackwood Report, which was tabled in the Tasmanian Parliament. In fact, it was interesting that he chose the Tasmanian Parliament to find evidence to support his contention.

I, a greenhorn member of Parliament, discovered that there is no such thing as a Tasmanian *Hansard* in which one can look at the debate that took place over the report that was tabled. Then I discovered, through researching the matter in the library, that the report he referred to is, quite surprisingly, one of four reports from 1978 that have not been received by this Parliament from Tasmania, and therefore are not on record. Given the fact that the Premier used it, as the one piece of external evidence for his speech, the best we could find was a press clipping from the *Mercury* of 13 September 1978. On reading that press clipping I see a couple of reasons why that report was used to support the Premier's speech. The reason is that the report was so obscure and so hard to get and find details about. But the press clipping did give some enlightening information. It states:

The Chairman of the board, Mr. Blackwood, in his report tabled yesterday to Parliament, suggested a tax on capital was an alternative revenue-raiser and needed to be looked at. Now, that never came out in the Premier's statement. In fact, I think that is perfectly fair, that a tax on capital may well be a better way of having an equitable distribution of income and wealth in this society and that succession duties may ultimately be replaced by such a tax. I hope that the Federal and State Parliaments of this country will look at that in the future and that succession duties may then, where they still exist, be replaced by such a tax. The following is the second thing that Mr. Blackwood raised in his report:

Because immediate withdrawal of State income from probate would be too disruptive, abolition of death duties should be progressive.

This heartily endorses the comments made by my Leader; the sudden withdrawal of these taxes will have a dramatic effect on State income. I will make some comments later on the way in which the Government proposes to abolish succession duties. I believe that abolition as from 1 January 1980 is an unfair method. I believe that the Government should have abolished them back from the start of this financial year and cut the rate for estates in probate so that unprincipled income cannot be received in the years to come in the same way that the Queensland Government has.

The main issue at stake here is the wealth tax. We are discussing whether in fact it is fair and equitable for a

Government to determine that it has a role to play in redistributing wealth and income in society; whether it is a fair assumption to make that all our children as far as possible should have an equal and reasonable start in life. We accept income tax as being one of the means by which this is done. Income tax is an attempt to redistribute income to give everyone in society a fair deal. The way it does that is to allow the expenditure of the money thereby raised on social welfare, community services, education, and the like, to provide a better community for all our children.

Apart from succession duties and gift duties, there is no comparable tax on the wealth that exists. It has been stated that the British Royal Commission found how much of the wealth of people was not income earned but inherited. Unless there is a wealth tax that can somehow get at that, there is a large volume of capital in society that is not subject to any attempt at redistribution to give a fairer deal to poorer members of society. The tax rates that existed for succession duties in this State were by no means heavy and arduous. The point has been made by numerous people on the Government benches (and it was included in the Premier's remarks) that it was a heavy, unfair and arduous tax. Let us look at what the situation really was. First, what are the tax rates that apply at income tax level? What are the tax rates that apply from the Federal Government on the work and application of citizens of this country? We all pay tax, to share the cost of Government.

The tax rates, as we know, between \$3 883 and \$16 608 are such that roughly one out of every three cents we earn goes on income tax. Why is that not unfair, and why is that not unprincipled? That is a 33.5 per cent tax rate that disappears in tax payments. Above \$16 604, it is 47.5c; that is nearly one out of every two cents. If we look at estate and succession duties, we see that the rate there is nowhere near as heavy or as harsh. For example, under the succession duties which existed prior to the last election, and which still exist at this moment, the rate up to \$20 000 of estate received was only 15 per cent. The rate up to \$40 000 was only 17½ per cent. It is interesting to note that one does not again reach that figure of 33.5c in the dollar that the average taxpayer is paying on his income until the estate exceeds \$140 000.

There is a further interesting aside. It seems to be a quirk of history that has resulted in a drop in the rate above \$220 000, when the rate drops to 27½ per cent. Never in the scales that were and are applicable now does the rate ever achieve 47.5 per cent that any person earning over \$16 000 in this country has to pay. Looking at this again, what we see is that the bulk of people in this nation through industry, application, sweat, hard work, and through providing the goods and services that we all need in this country pay heavy rates of tax, whereas those who by sheer fortune (not good fortune, perhaps sad fortune) are in the position of receiving bequests can receive them with marginal interest rates of taxation. Indeed, many receive them with nil rates of taxation. Can that be regarded as principled and fair? Can it be regarded as fair to the average family man who goes out each day to support his family to sustain a reasonable standard of living that we regard as the birthright of every Australian that this person pays tax rates varying upwards from 33.5c in the dollar, yet a person receiving a bequest never pays a rate higher than about 40c in the dollar on any figure?

With regard to the redistribution of wealth aspect, as I said before, income tax affects only income and salaries; it affects only one section of the capital generation of this society, and we know that there are needs for redistribution and that there are wants in our society.

Therefore, we have to look at all areas to see the fairest means of doing it. The Leader of the Opposition gave figures for the British Royal Commission, and one of its findings is that the situation in the United Kingdom has worsened in the last 10 years. The top 5 per cent of society in the United Kingdom, in fact, now own a greater proportion of wealth than they did 10 years ago.

This is because of the "social contract" which was entered into in that country and which kept wage and salary earners' incomes within tight constraints, whereas the owners of vast wealth in that society were under no such constraints. Share prices, real estate values, appreciation values of antiques and, so on, were under no such constraints. Therefore, their relative share of the wealth has been proved to increase more quickly than has that of the income and salary earners in that country.

I should like now to quote some figures relating to Australia in order to indicate how significant the matter of wealth is. Although these figures have been quoted previously, I will repeat them now, as it is relevant that they should be borne in mind in this debate. The figures, which have been produced in professional and scholarly studies, show that 10 per cent of Australians own 52 per cent of Australia's real estate and 60 per cent of the wealth. However, perhaps the most interesting aspect is that 10 per cent of Australians receive 92 per cent of the incomes payable from interest, dividends and rent.

Clearly, a small proportion of the population controls a vast proportion of the wealth of this society. It is one of the sad facts of the last election campaign that so many people were beguiled into believing that succession duties aimed at the average person. They did not: they aimed at this proportion of society that controlled an undue proportion of the wealth. Succession duties were not aiming to take that wealth from them. That was not the ambition or the intention. However, it was an attempt to say that, by virtue of that money's not being earned or worked for, it was not unreasonable that a part of that money, in the transition from one owner to another, should be taken away to help in the broader aims of a just society.

I now examine how succession duties affect the average person. I have taken out some figures on what it would mean to the average person who received a house. It tended to be put across in the press that the average person in this country would be crippled by succession duties: that he would be working for years after the death of a loved one to pay off the duties imposed by the Government. In fact, there were many provisions in the Succession Duties Act enabling one to have time to pay the amounts and for various appeals to be lodged against any assessments made. So, it was not the Draconian and Dickensian legislation that it was sometimes said to be.

Let us look, for example, at the situation where a family inherits an average family home. I should like to compare the result that applied before the State election with that which would have been applied had the Labor Government been re-elected, that is, given the promises and commitments, made by the then Leader of our Party, the member for Hartley. I will work on the assumption of an average home being worth \$40 000. That is a high figure given the values of houses in my district. Having done studies in this respect over many months, I find that the average sale price of houses in Salisbury is \$30 000, although over the whole State the mean figure may be \$38 000 to \$40 000.

A family bequeathing such a house to one child would, under the circumstances obtaining before the election, have the child paying \$5 100. In other words, a house worth \$40 000 would incur duty of only \$5 100, which is a relatively marginal rate of taxation. If there had been two

children in the family, the rate would have been \$1 650 each, so that a total of \$3 300 would have been paid. Had there been three children in the family, the rate would have been \$575 each, making a grand total of \$1 725. That was the situation that obtained before the commitments made by the former Leader of the Labor Party, the member for Hartley.

Had the Labor Government been re-elected to Government, it was its commitment justly to raise the rebate levels, because it has been pointed out that perhaps these levels have not kept pace with inflation and that some sections of the community were starting to be affected more seriously than necessary. Had those commitments been undertaken, the situation would have changed dramatically. A house of the same value passed on to one child would have incurred duty of only \$3 250, a drop of \$1 850. Had it been passed on to two or more children over the age of 18 years, it would have incurred no duty whatsoever. Of course, the situation would be much better for children under the age of 18 years.

Considering the vast number of people in our society (30 per cent of the population) who must live in rental accommodation because they have been unable to purchase a house of their own, and to whom the State has some sort of obligation to help find reasonably-priced accommodation (and to whom, therefore, the State has some sort of financial obligation), is it unfair to say that some people, many of whom may already be living in a house of their own, who receive a house which they may well use for rental income, should make some commitment to the State to help it meet its obligations to other people? I do not believe that a commitment of \$3 250 on a \$40 000 house in the case of one child being a beneficiary is unreasonable.

One of the other things that succession duties have been able to achieve in the attempt to gain equity and fairness is that it takes into account the differences in the way in which wealth accumulates for different people. It naturally happens as we grow older that we accumulate houses, cars, etc., but, by the mere quirk of the way in which all societies operate, some of those assets become worth more for no other reason than perhaps their geographical siting or because of some quirk of aesthetic taste. We know, for example, that land and house prices vary markedly between one suburb and another. We also know that those variations have differed greatly over the years. One can look at the daily press to see that many houses, although reasonably similar, attract vastly different prices. One can examine the situation of two families that purchased after the Second World War houses in which they could live and which could be an investment to pass on to their children. One family could have chosen to live in an area that did not appreciate very much over the years, whereas the other could have chosen to live in another area the values in which did appreciate. That information would not have been available to anyone, because no-one can foretell which areas will appreciate in the decades to come.

Is it not somewhat unfair that the person whose suburb does not appreciate very much misses out on the total capital gain that accrues purely as a result of whimsical fortune? In case people are questioning how that difference can occur, I have studied the way in which house prices have varied over the past 29 years. One can see how some estates today are automatically worth more just because of that whimsical twist of fortune to which I have referred, resulting in some suburbs being more highly priced than others.

It seems that the difference between the lower-priced and higher-priced houses has increased markedly over the past 29 years. My study involved my looking at house sale

advertisements in 1950 newspapers as well as those in the press this year. In case anyone wants to know the size of the sample, it involved 58 houses in 1950 and 120 houses in 1979. Some interesting results occur. In 1950, the average price of a median-priced house was \$7 241. In 1979, a median-priced house was fetching an average of \$48 622.

The mean figure changed from \$6 200 to \$38 000. More interesting, perhaps, is the differential between the top and the bottom. The average price for the bottom 10 houses in 1950 (and I took 10 houses to try to account for individual peculiarities) was \$4 068. The average price for the top 10 houses was \$13 096. In other words, the differential between the bottom and the top was something like this; the top price, on average, was 3.2 times more expensive than the bottom price.

In 1979, however, the situation had changed quite markedly. The bottom 10 houses had an average price of \$24 485, and the top 10 houses had an average price of \$104 875. That means the top figure was 4.28 times greater than the bottom figure—an upward change of 32.9 per cent.

The relative offerings of those houses had not changed; they were the same in 1950, relatively, from bottom to top as they were in 1979; yet those people with the good fortune and ability to buy in the areas that had more expensive houses in them found that their houses had appreciated markedly more than had other houses in the community. That resulted in a windfall gain. Is it unfair, therefore, that the Government should wish to tax part of that windfall gain and say that part of that gain should be used to help in alleviating the social conditions in the rest of society? I put to all members here present that it is not unfair and that succession duties do have an obligation to modify these disparate effects of inflation.

The other point made (and it was mentioned by the Premier in his second reading explanation) was that the Bill would put an end to the continuation of the many genuine cases of hardship. The promises made by the former Premier included attempts to ease the hardship that might genuinely have existed. He proposed the raising of the rebates substantially from \$9 000 to \$20 000 for adult children and from \$26 000 to \$50 000 for children under the age of 18 years.

Likewise, there were increases in the rebates for assets given to brothers and sisters, and increases from 50 per cent to 75 per cent in the rebates available for rural properties. It was suggested earlier in this session that the people who particularly felt the burden of succession duties were those inheriting rural properties. We offered a substantial increase to take account of these difficulties and combined that with the ability of people receiving estates to seek time payment for the amount owing and to extend that time payment at moderate rates of interest. I think that that was a fair and just way for the Government to have proceeded.

The other thing which tends to be implied by the Premier's comments is that here we had an arbitrary authority (the Commissioner of Succession Duties) who cruelly and harshly applied the rules without fairness to individuals who were caught within his net. In fact, the Succession Duties Act provided for two avenues of redress. First, those receiving estates had the right to object to assessments made and for that objection to be heard. Secondly, once that had been proceeded with and they had decided that they were not happy with that, there was then, likewise, the right of appeal to the Commissioner of Succession Duties. In fact, it was not the harsh and unconscionable law that was being suggested.

One of the things that surprises me is that it has been proposed that the changes be made from 1 January. I

referred to this matter earlier in my speech and also earlier during this session. Why, in fact, is it not being backdated either to the start of this Government on 15 September (given the fact that it was an election promise) or to the start of the financial year? If it is because of the revenue effect (because the Government is afraid of losing too much revenue in one year), I suggest that that is the point the Government should be making and that what perhaps it should have done was reduce the rate from 15 per cent or 17½ per cent to 10 per cent or 12½ per cent across the board so that all estates declared between now and the end of this financial year pay a reduced rate prior to 15 September, but in this financial year. I think that would have been the principled thing to do.

It has not been members on this side of the House who have called succession duties "immoral"; it has been members on the Government side, yet they are proposing to collect this "immoral" tax at least for six months of this year, and also for some years ahead, on estates that were in probate before the start of this financial year. There needs to be an answer from the Premier about why he does not propose to act on that. We know that the Premier can act, because he said earlier today that it is possible to make administrative decisions and that it does not require the immediate introduction or passing of this legislation for those administrative decisions to be made. I urge him to consider making such administrative decisions.

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. LYNN ARNOLD: I return to the matter of succession duties being a wealth tax. The Premier, on introducing this Bill and referring to succession duties being inequitable, said:

It will remove completely the inequities so often caused by the imposition of succession duty . . .

I contend that the very removal of succession duties is an inequity—that a greater inequity is being imposed for the correcting of slighter inequities. It may well have been the case that the limits proposed were not high. It may well have been the case that there were other aspects of the Succession Duties Act that may have needed to be amended. I believe that the long-term future of this country should be to look at a broader wealth tax that does not only apply itself to wealth at the point of transfer from one owner to another on the death of the owner, but applies as an on-going thing throughout the ownership of that wealth. That, perhaps, would be the fairest alternative, and that should be the direction in which we should be looking. We are on a midway point to that wealth tax, and that is the direction in which we should be looking. The abolition of the Succession Duties Act will only put further away the introduction of that wealth tax.

I notice that the Premier did not make any reference in his speech to another recommendation made by the Blackwood Committee, that the introduction of such a capital tax would have to be Australia-wide and that he hoped there would be negotiations between all the States and the Federal Government. That point was conspicuously absent from the comments made.

As the Leader said (and I said earlier) it is not our intention to oppose this Bill at the second reading stage, but I am strongly critical of the decision to abolish succession duties. I believe that the people of South Australia, who quite clearly gave a mandate to this action by their vote in the last election (because this matter was publicised significantly in the election campaign—unlike the uranium issue—and was a highlight of that campaign),

have been misguided and deluded by the people who pushed this campaign and that they have, in fact, acted to the detriment and well-being of society as a whole. The services that this Parliament will want to provide in the years ahead will require income. The Leader has mentioned what is happening in Queensland—how services are being further eroded in that State and how other unfair taxes are being imposed on the people. How is that money going to be made up in this State? I fear that one of the means may be the selling off of the farm: that such means that the State has at its disposal to sell, it will sell. It may be that we will find the sale of Monarto and places like that providing the shortfall that arises from the lack of receipts from succession duties. That would be a great pity for all people in this State, if that is the attitude of this Government.

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): I support the second reading, but with some reluctance and some misgivings. I have taken the opportunity to speak in the debate so that I can place on record exactly what the Bill means to the vast majority of decent South Australians. I do not question the Government's proceeding with the Bill. Quite correctly, it can claim a mandate for introducing such a measure. During a recent election it was an issue, and certainly it was a popular one. The only sad thing is that perhaps the lower and middle income groups could not grasp exactly what the abolition would mean to them—that the extremely wealthy would gain at the expense of the majority of the people in South Australia. Perhaps we as a Party were amiss in that we failed to explain what the wealth tax was all about and why it should be kept on. In my opinion and in the opinion of most members on this side of the House, the abolition of succession duties will result in increased taxes in future years. In his second reading speech, the Premier stated that this Bill was one of several measures proposed by the Government which were designed to stimulate the economic development of the State by reducing the incidence of State taxation. If the Government were fair dinkum in its attitude that succession duties were iniquitous, it would have abolished those duties straight away. The member for Salisbury has dwelt on this matter. According to the Premier, it will result in a saving of only \$2 000 000 in the 1979-80 Budget. What about those people (and I do not want to be facetious) who might die on 31 December? If succession duties are iniquitous, they should be abolished straight away. The only people who will gain after 1 January are the relatives, who will be pleased that the Government has abolished succession duties. The relatives of the people who die on 31 December will feel that they have been cheated by the Government.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HEMMINGS: If members opposite want to speak, they will have an opportunity. The abolition of succession duties will only serve to impose further taxation on South Australian people. I estimate that \$20 000 000 would have been raised if succession duties had been maintained—\$20 000 000 extracted from a small minority. The relatives of that small minority will retain that \$20 000 000 while the rest of the State will pick up the tab through other forms of taxation. We are yet to find out what the other forms of taxation will be. So much for stimulating the economy.

We have been told that an effect of this Bill will be to halt the massive flow of funds to Queensland. I would like to remind the House that members of the Government, when in Opposition, stated that there was a massive flow of funds going to Queensland, but they were never able to

give us facts about that. I look forward to a mass exodus out of Queensland but to this State.

In the *Advertiser* today, a speech made last evening by Sir Mark Oliphant to the annual meeting of the South Australian and Northern Territory Flying Doctor Service of Australia in Adelaide was reported as follows:

Australia's two-Party Parliamentary system is a rowdy dogfight, says former South Australian Governor Sir Mark Oliphant. Sir Mark said last night respect must be restored to government. Parliaments were voted in by the "haves" who voted Liberal and the "have-nots" who voted Labor.

"Almost always they look after the interests of the people who put them in power," he said. Australia had aspired to be, but had not yet become, a classless society. Wealth was still a class distinction. "Once acquired, wealth—even very moderate wealth—is more jealously guarded here than anywhere else in the world," Sir Mark said.

This Bill certainly bears out what Sir Mark Oliphant said. The haves, especially the wealthy, are certainly being very well looked after.

The member for Goyder, in his Budget speech, tried to convince this House with a very plausible argument that the abolition of succession duties affected most South Australians. He did not convince me or other members on this side of the House. The public of South Australia will gradually cotton on to what is taking place when this Bill goes through, as I am sure it will. They will realise how well they were conned.

Looking at the figures of who really has the wealth, I quote from the well received publication *Australia Ripped Off*, which clearly documents who has got the wealth, and how a small and elite minority maintains it. The figures show that the attempts of the member for Goyder to explain away succession duties are completely incorrect. Page 7 of that publication deals with wealth in Australia today and states:

In Australia—

- The wealthiest 1 per cent of population owns 22 p.c. of the total wealth;
- the wealthiest 5 p.c. of population owns 46 p.c. of the total wealth;
- the wealthiest 10 p.c. of population owns 60 p.c. of the total wealth;
- 50 p.c. of Australians own less than 8 p.c. of the total wealth;
- the richest 2 000 people in Australia own as much as the poorest 2 250 000 Australians.

Mr. Ashenden: Who calculated the figures?

Mr. HEMMINGS: They are all authenticated figures, comrade.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must address members according to the district that they represent.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I am sorry—the honourable comrade from Rocky River. Whenever we quote from this very good document, members on the other side tend to get very squeamish, as they realise that this is a series of facts that have been assembled by the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union, which exactly details the kind of arguments that we have been putting forward when we were on the Government side and now when we are in Opposition. They do not like this document. In fact, they have got the Institute of Public Affairs to put forward a counter document.

On page 8, under the heading "Most wealth is not earned", the publication states:

Wealth is passed on from parents to children within an incredibly small and elite minority. Once this minority have inherited it, they go on accumulating more and more.

About 80 per cent of the population are permanently

excluded. Any workers who cherish fantasies of making it into the "big league" of the wealthy by welding, grinding, cutting, toolmaking, typing, etc. at a snappy pace, had better sink a quiet ale and forget it. Even the manager hasn't got a real show.

Professionals and highly paid "fat cat" administrators don't have much chance either, but a few might just squeeze in. No-one gets wealth simply by saving either. For 70 per cent of the population, their spending is just about equal to their earnings over their lifetime. The only wealth most people have is a house and a car. The majority of people are still paying them off.

The source of that information is the respected Australian Bureau of Statistics survey of household expenditure, so I do not think members opposite will refute those details. On page 9, dealing with the income received from interest, rents and dividends paid on shares, we get this enlightening information:

1 per cent of adult Australians receive 45 per cent of all income received, 5 per cent of adult Australians receive 83 per cent, and 10 per cent of adult Australians receive 92 per cent.

I think that on page 11 succession duties, what we are really talking about, are dealt with. The member for Goyder tried to tell us that the estate of the humble dweller, in the city or on a small farm, or the small businessman who leaves a modest home, a car, etc., to his children, would have to pay an excessive amount. This part of the document deals with the wealthy, and not just the same level of wealth. The information comes from the wealth survey of Australia, and it states:

It's obvious that the total wealth of Australian society has increased enormously since the beginning of this century; yet, according to the study on wealth, distribution hasn't changed much in 60 years. Therefore, those with most of the wealth must also get most of the newly created wealth.

I will quote this, because you may say it is unparliamentary language, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The document states, "By hell they do," and I think we all agree. The wealthy are getting wealthier and the poor are getting poorer. The Bill before us will make the wealthy even wealthier still.

Members on this side have given facts tonight, and now I will quote figures received by the former Premier in February this year to deal with the question asked by a member on this side about net revenue from succession duties from 1971-72 to 1977-78. The net income to the Government in 1971-72 was \$10 694 744 and in 1977-78 it was \$17 166 001. The amount for 1977-78 is large, and the Premier must say where else he will get the money from.

The interesting figures are those regarding the number of estates lodged and the number where duty was paid. In 1971-72, 7 714 estates were lodged, and only then, when succession duties were paid also on estates left to spouses, duty was paid on only 3 033 estates. In 1972-73, 7 900 estates were lodged and duty was payable on only 3 114. For 1973-74 the number of estates lodged was 7 842 and duty was payable on only 3 549. In 1974-75, the last year for which statistics are kept, 8 408 estates were lodged and duty was payable on only 3 914. Regarding these statistics on dutiable estates for 1974-75, of estates within the \$20 000 to \$50 000 bracket, 1 226 were dutiable. In the \$50 000 to \$100 000 bracket, 389 estates were dutiable.

Now we get to the real wealthy category: for estates of more than \$100 000, only 169 were in the range of dutiable estates. The amount of duty levied in the \$20 000 to \$50 000 category (and bear those figures in mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I am sure you are agog listening) was \$3 263 335. That was levied from 1 226 estates. In the bracket from \$50 000 to \$100 000, an amount of \$3 218 372 was levied on a low 389 estates. In the over

\$100 000 category, the amount received was \$5 685 235, from only 169 estates. The member for Goyder, the Premier, and other members on the Government side, if they have the courage to support this legislation, will say that tax from succession duties is not a wealth tax. However, the figures I have given prove that it is.

To bring members up to date, I point out that, for the last quarter of 1978, the total number of estates lodged was 2 172 and no duty was paid on 1 387 of those. A total of 243 estates was in the category of less than \$500, 92 in the category from \$500 to \$1 000, 286 in the category from \$1 000 to \$5 000, and 146 in the category from \$5 000 to \$30 000. Duty on more than \$30 000 was paid on only 18 estates. The total duty paid was \$3 570 000 and almost 64 per cent of estates paid no duty, while another 11 per cent paid only small amounts of less than \$500. Therefore, the tax does not hit everyone as the Premier claims: it hits only the wealthy. A mere 18 estates out of a total of 2 172 (·8 per cent of all estates) paid \$720 000, or more than 20 per cent of all duty; that is, \$1 of every \$5 received by the Government came from the 18 largest estates alone. A total of 164, or 7·55 per cent, of all estates paid 67·3 per cent of all duty. Two-thirds of all duty was received from 164 estates.

We can say in retrospect (because this Bill will go through this House tonight) that succession duty, as it was before the election promises were made and when we were in Government, is clearly the most equitable tax. Clearly, the revenue is coming from those families with the greatest resources and the greatest ability to pay. Only 26 of the 164 estates paying more than \$5 000 were in the rural sector. Of these 26 estates, six had a net value after deduction of liabilities, including mortgages, in excess of \$200 000. That is very large wealth by Australian standards and certainly not that of struggling small family farms as has been put forward by the member for Goyder. I support the second reading with reluctance. The people of South Australia realise that the abolition of succession duties will benefit only a small elite minority in this State, and that, in the 1980-81 Budget, the Government must impose further taxation.

They will realise that the exercise that we are going through this afternoon and this evening is an exercise to protect those sections of the community who support the Liberal Party, which will be seen as supporting the have's, and the have-nots of South Australia will have to rely on this side of Parliament to protect their interests, because it is obvious that the Government has no intention, in line with this Bill, which we will pass tonight, and the other Bills which have been passed and which will be passed later tonight, that it has no regard for the working people of South Australia.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): It is with great pleasure that I support the passage of this Bill. In my 6½ years in Parliament it has been my desire and my wish that the abolition of succession duties be brought about with all haste. I have spoken from many public platforms requesting and pushing for the abolition of succession duties. I have fought four elections campaigns with the abolition of succession duties being one of the key issues. The recent election campaign was the first time that the Liberal Party has fought a similar basis, and I am grateful for that because it has actually now brought that policy to bear.

Mr. Olsen: The Liberals introduced the legislation.

Mr. BLACKER: I will reply to the member for Rocky River. I have fought this issue in four elections. For the elections contested in 1973, 1975 and 1977, I have had both Liberal Party and Labor Party candidates actively

campaigning against me for seeking to promote the abolition of succession duties. The Liberal Party candidates and the members of Parliament supporting them were actively speaking in public, claiming that the abolition of succession duties could not be brought about. Some candidates even attended my own political meetings and in front of the crowd, asked me, "Mr. Blacker, how can you advocate the abolition of succession duties? It cannot be done."

I am pleased to say that it can be done, and I have very reason to believe that it was the pressure of the National Country Party that had sufficient bearing to bring about the change of attitude of the Liberal Party. I am grateful for that change, because many of my constituents have been severely affected by succession duties in the past.

Tonight honourable members have heard three speeches from the Opposition, all ill-informed. The Opposition has mounted a campaign trying to portray the image of succession duties as a fair and equitable tax, but nothing could be further from the truth. Honourable members should analyse the statistics, especially the figures presented by the Opposition tonight which prove the inequity of the whole system. The key argument of the Leader of the Opposition was based on the premise of the original intention of succession duty when it was introduced about 103 or 104 years ago.

Circumstances have changed. The idea then was to break up the land barons. There was then good reason. The basic principle behind the introduction of the measure had sound backing and some merit. Today, the story is different. Obviously, from the three speeches that we have heard tonight, those Opposition members obviously do not live in rural areas where the tools of trade have to be the ownership of a farming property. That land, those farms, are actually the tools of trade.

For most Opposition members the tools of trade are provided by employers, but for a rural person, his tool of trade, his means of making an income, is that farm to which he has to commit himself and his family for a lifetime so that it can be paid for. When I hear the speeches made by members opposite, I shudder to think of the representation that their constituents must be getting if their representatives in this House cannot see the stark facts before them and their implications.

Obviously, Opposition members have not had a constituent come to them with a severe succession duties problem. They have not seen a mother, a widow, coming with a teenage son and a progression of young children saying that they are being hit for several thousand dollars, and in one case up to \$200 000, in succession duties. Honourable members can imagine what such a duty would do to a farm, especially in the case of a widow with six boys and one daughter where the duty was \$200 000. It devastated the family. It broke up the family, and that is one of the things than can happen.

The key argument in the debate tonight is that succession duty supposedly reaps the benefit from the high income areas or the big estates: nothing is further from the truth. The member for Napier presented figures and, although I was not quick enough to write them all down, he referred to 100 estates involving over \$100 000, which netted \$5 000 000 in succession duties. Although those are my approximate recollections of the honourable member's figures, it was suggested by the Opposition that only 100 estates involving \$100 000 or more were involved. That is laughable. There must be many times that number of estates and many times that figure must be involved.

I know of one transaction in the past 12 months involving the estate of a man and his three sons who had acquired and built up properties to a value of \$1 500 000,

yet not one cent of succession duties was involved, because those persons were able to use their family trusts or companies (I am not sure exactly how it was done), but there are trusts, companies and divisions between the three lads, and so it goes.

Certainly, it is not the big farmers or the big income property-owners who pay succession duties: they are able to pay their accountants and lawyers to get them out of such taxes. It is the middle-income earners and the point I make is this: it is not the person who lives his normal full span of life who is the subject of succession duties, because few people who live a normal life (it is hard to say what a normal life is, but, say, a life of 70 years), would live to the age of 70 and pay succession duties. This is because they are able to sell off the assets involved to their sons and relations or whatever the case may be.

Succession duties hit people who are taken in the prime of life, say, farmers in their 40's, a farmer of 45, who has not paid for his farm, who has a young family coming on. Those are the people who are hit. Those are the people from whom the Government has in the past been reaping the benefits of this tax.

The member for Napier suggested that there were 100 estates involving sums greater than \$100 000 that would attract \$5 000 000 to the State. He claimed that those are the estates that have been hit. I shudder when I listen to the Opposition talk as it has tonight. Obviously, members of the Opposition have not a clue what this system is all about.

The Leader of the Opposition said that there was no evidence of people leaving South Australia. As I have said in previous sessions, and as I will say again, there is ample evidence. Within four months of the Queensland Government's lifting succession duties (I cannot give a monetary figure, which has been asked for by the Opposition), in the Federal electorate of, I think, McPherson, adjacent to Brisbane and the New South Wales border, the enrolment at the electoral office was increasing by 1 000 people a week.

There may be a number of reasons why that took place. That is an enormous figure, and much of it is believed to be the result of the Queensland Government's lifting of succession duties. In my district for the month of February, 28 clearing sales were advertised in the *Port Lincoln Times*, indicating that farmers were leaving. Of those 28, 21 farmers went interstate. To me, it is a frightening situation that so many people in such a short space of time should pack up and leave. As I have said before, those people are not just taking themselves and their tractors, etc., out of the State: they are taking hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of assets and, more importantly, experience.

The average farming property, I said last session, was worth about \$250 000, but I have been corrected by a number of farmers, who say that the value of an average farming property and assets, including stock and plant, would be well in excess of that figure. If one looks at farming figures, one will understand what I am talking about. If a farmer leaves South Australia after selling out, he takes his \$250 000. In the majority of cases, the buyer is a neighbour; not many new farmers come to this State. The new owner borrows half of the money (in many cases more) from the bank, so \$250 000 is going out of the State and is replaced by a debt of at least \$120 000 or \$130 000. Those members who know the farming situation also know that I am being ultra-conservative in using these figures. South Australia is down the drain by \$370 000-odd because of one land transaction. On top of that, the expertise of the farmer has gone, and this is a grave concern.

The average age of farmers in South Australia is incredibly high, and the influx of young people into farming is low. There is no incentive. Young people do not want to go on to a farm to be belted around, particularly when they are faced with a situation in their teens of having to take over where Dad left off, to try to make a go of it. They have to try to handle capital involving about \$250 000, and many are put in the inenviable situation of having to sell up. That is what succession duties have done to South Australia. They have not, as the Opposition would have us believe, been an equaliser of wealth. Very much to the contrary: succession duties have been selective, affecting those people who have been unfortunate enough to lose the breadwinner while he is in the prime of life. The figures quoted by the member for Napier, which I wish I could have taken down more accurately, clearly outlined the fallacy of the Opposition's argument.

Obviously, the Opposition has absolutely no comprehension of what is involved in succession duties. The member for Salisbury referred to a bequest or inheritance as income. I guess in isolated situations we may be able to put that sort of interpretation on it, but I know from experience in my own district that an inheritance affords the opportunity to be able to continue as a farmer. If, say, a young person has to pay succession duties, he is denied that opportunity and may be forced off the land. How many times have we seen that happen? Time and time again. Succession duties have not been a wealth equaliser or a revenue earner aimed at the rich—very much to the contrary: the rich or the higher income people are able to avoid succession duties. This tax is not one that is aimed at the elderly because anyone who lives a normal lifespan usually disposes of his estate in such a way that no succession duty is payable. I previously gave an example of an estate worth in excess of \$1 000 000 which incurred not one cent in succession duties. I am sure every member who has had any connection with people on the land understands what is meant by that.

The member for Napier claimed to represent the majority of decent South Australians. I will not reflect on his constituents whatsoever, but I do say that he does not understand what succession duties are all about. He said that the wealthy were getting wealthier and the poor were getting poorer. Succession duties did not have that effect. His figures have proved the fallacy of the Opposition's argument on this measure. I support the Bill and hope we never see such a measure on the Statutes of South Australia again.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): With reluctance, I support the Bill, my reluctance being on the grounds expressed by my colleagues, although I acknowledge the Government's clear mandate in this respect. We see tonight the last part of the charade played out, that charade having been started by the Queensland National Country Party colleagues of the member for Flinders, although I do not put the member for Flinders in the same category as Joh Bjelke-Petersen, Russell Hinze, Mr. Lickiss, Mr. Porter or other luminaries in that depressed part of our country. That is where it all began, and I briefly trace the steps of all this. In 1974, delivering the Labor Party's national policy speech, the then Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, stated:

In September 1972 our predecessors appointed members of a committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Asprey to inquire into the structure and operation of the present Commonwealth taxation system and to formulate proposals for improving the system by making changes in it, abolishing any existing form of taxation or introducing new forms of

taxation. The committee was to have regard to the effects of the present system upon the social, economic and business organisation of the community and upon the economic and efficient use of the resources of Australia and to the desirability of a fair distribution of the burden of taxation and of a system of collection which was not unduly complex and did not involve the public or the administration in undue difficulty, inconvenience or expense.

Those were the key motivating factors behind the Asprey Commission. I agree partly with the member for Flinders: to the extent that succession or death duties have fallen on the middle income earner rather than the top income earner, that in itself is wrong. The double injury that we have perpetrated tonight is the removal of the only remaining form of wealth redistribution without a replacement in any other form. The Asprey Commission made some clear recommendations along these lines. In his 1972 policy speech, Mr. Whitlam promised to expand the terms of reference of the Asprey Committee to include State and local government taxation and collection methods.

At that stage, only three Premiers agreed with him. However, at the Constitutional Convention in March 1974 it was decided that Commonwealth and State officers should confer and report upon the respective occupancy by the Commonwealth, State and local governments in the fields of income taxation, excise duties, sales tax, vehicle and fuel taxes, death duties and land and property taxes. All of that was agreed upon but it never came to pass, so that when the election occurred in 1974 Queensland and one or two other States removed from the situation so as not to permit the Asprey Commission its full terms of reference. Mr. Whitlam had already announced a policy that would be dear to the heart of the member for Flinders, which was to establish a board of relief to hear applications for release from liability for duty in cases of serious hardship. He mentioned that the Estate Duty Board would be empowered to release an estate from all or part of the duty payable where payment would involve serious hardship on a beneficiary or beneficiaries and where relief granted would be for the benefit of beneficiaries so affected.

Mr. Gunn: Who was going to assess that?

Mr. McRAE: That was going to be done by a board of relief. It was not stated in the policy speech whether that would be a judicial board or not. If the member for Eyre will give me time I will come to these things in due course. That was the situation proposed in 1974, and in 1975 the Asprey Committee, which had been meeting from 1972, finally prepared and delivered its report to the then Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, before he was removed from office by the coalition. When the member for Flinders was speaking, I was frightened that I was beginning to see a reflection of Canberra here in Adelaide, because it is a noticeable feature of a coalition that you co-operate by biting and snarling at each other across the benches, and then hastily compromising behind locked doors. I gather that that is not the case here, because the honourable member ended up congratulating his colleagues on that side of the House.

The Asprey Report, which was delivered in January 1975, had a number of interesting comments to make. First, it made the point that in the international perspective Australia was quite lightly taxed, and it gave a number of figures to demonstrate that fact. The essential feature of what I am saying is that by whatever means you are going to do it, granting everything that the honourable member for Flinders has said (and I do not necessarily grant everything he has said), if you are going to provide social justice in our community, you cannot do it by

reducing taxes and not replacing them with other means of providing for essential methods of social welfare. It just cannot be done. It is callous to suggest, as I will put later, as this Liberal Government has done, that it can remove this form of taxation and still provide for unemployed people and others. Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having being formed:

Mr. McRAE: The first point was that in international terms we are very lightly taxed; that was the case then and it is still the case. The committee then went on to consider various forms of taxation. Substantially, the committee said that, while it was agreed that estate and gift duties taken separately produced quite a complicated tangle (and, this led to its basic proposition) nevertheless, as a supplement to income tax, estate duty ranks high for equity. In fact, of all the various taxes considered, estate duty was one of the taxes to which the Asprey Committee paid highest regard as a means of achieving some equity and fairness throughout the system.

Contrary to what the honourable member for Flinders said, it is a fact that in any taxation system you must make a key decision as to whether you want a progressive or regressive taxation system. Conservative Governments in this country are more and more leaning towards providing a regressive taxation system, which is not providing substantial justice or equity to the large community and is not providing anything like social justice. The honourable member referred to Queensland. Queensland acted as it did because of the statement made in the Asprey Report that, of the various options open, the very system that it saw as being capable of providing a fair, simple and effective taxation system, and at the same time providing a fair redistribution of wealth and a measure of social justice, was a combination of income tax, estate and gift duty to be levied at Commonwealth level and to be levied with the co-operation of the States, because under the terms of the Commonwealth Constitution it was essential that the States co-operate in this measure. So they provided in considerable detail a proposal of integration of gift duty with estate duty, and the integration of both those duties with income tax, together with other reforms, to provide a new tax package in this country.

As a result, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen went into a state of frenzy and suddenly saw the possibility for the wicked Commonwealth Government to be able to extend its powers once again, and he reacted by totally removing himself from the field. He was able to do that because his State, more than any other State, had access to a different kind of tax: a mineral tax. It was at that particular time, as a result of agreements that the Queensland Government had entered into with various mining ventures, that the Queensland Premier was able to make the stark decision to remove succession and estate duties *in toto* as from 1 January 1977.

That move had two invidious effects. First, it distorted the whole financial situation throughout the Commonwealth, both on a Commonwealth-State level and from the individual States' position, because you are looking at a non-representative State: you are looking at a State that had particular advantages in its capacity to collect revenue and was able to make this very striking gesture. It also led to the situation that other States, in particular New South Wales, by sheer process of competition, were forced into following the same line. Therefore, in New South Wales succession duties, death duties or whatever the term, have been gradually diminished in stages in that State, but their eventual abolition has now been deferred. In Victoria, succession duties still remain.

It is interesting to note, as Government members

including the member for Flinders mentioned during this debate, the continual reference to people leaving South Australia. I take it that those people are all going to Queensland; presumably they are not going to Victoria, because there they would still be faced with very considerable State tax difficulties. In New South Wales those people would be faced with considerable State tax difficulties. I am not sure of the situation in Tasmania. I understand that in Western Australia the abolition of succession duties is timed to start at the same time as provided for in this measure.

This came about because of the unilateral gesture that Queensland could afford to take which then threw pressure on the other component States of the Australian federation. That will come to a head upon the review of the Commonwealth-States' fiscal arrangements later this year; there can be nothing surer than that. I do not have access to the particular reference at the moment, but I have read it in the library; it was under the discussion of the Commonwealth-States situation and the new Federalism proposals of the present Prime Minister. He was observing the fact that Mr. Bjelke-Petersen's State had removed itself from this field of taxation. Specifically he said that, if that was the case, he hoped it was quite clear to the Queensland Government that there was no point in its coming to the Commonwealth Government at a later stage of review and asking the Commonwealth to pick up the difference. He said that was not on, and properly so; it should not be on. Of course, this situation will apply here. The standard States, namely, New South Wales and Victoria, to one degree or another have maintained this rate of taxation. Not only will we lose \$16 000 000 revenue in the one financial year but we also stand to lose an additional figure in the negotiation of that fiscal arrangement with the Commonwealth. I shall put that question to the Premier in due course.

In other words, in putting this measure forward to the people it must be clearly understood that, in addition to the jeopardy we are in because of the possible attitude of the Commonwealth to the railways transfer agreement and the effect that that might have on the fiscal arrangement between the States, we are also placing half of the State's share of income tax revenue in jeopardy as well as giving away this form of revenue. A number of people in this State mistakenly took the view that, through what was being offered to them in the Liberal Party's policy during the last election, they were actually going to gain a great deal. I know that you would not believe this personally, Mr. Speaker, but I assure you that a number of ordinary householders in my electorate said to me later that the Government promise over succession duties was a wonderful thing and that it really had influenced them. When I pointed out that they did not at any stage stand to pay a single cent in the event of their death, they were surprised. Obviously, the former Government did not succeed in getting across its remedy of the inequity that existed on the passing of property between spouses.

Again, you will not believe this, Mr. Speaker, but a number of people pointed out to me that they thought that the new Government's promise on land tax, for instance, was going to be a major thing to them. When I pointed out that in most cases people in my district were paying on average between \$15 and \$22 per year in land tax and that in fact those poor misled people were going to be the ones who would pick up in another form of taxation or reduced services the money that would be saved by 10 per cent of the population who did stand to pay succession duties or who for one reason or another stood to pay high land tax or gift duty, whatever the tax may be, my constituents were surprised. That is the fact of the matter, that the

people of this State were conned, but the reality is that they gave this Government the mandate. They will later regret it, because all the States at the end of this year (in addition to the other two matters I have referred to in the re-negotiation of the Commonwealth-States income tax revenue sharing agreement) are going to have to face up to the other very nasty threat that the Prime Minister will hold over the heads of all the State Governments; that is, to further vacate various fields of Commonwealth involvement in key areas unless the States are prepared to levy their own income tax as a double tax.

Most of us now as members of the Opposition can vividly recall many members of the present Government when they were in Opposition combining their cries for the abolition of succession duties, land taxes and gift taxes and all those other wealth taxes with the very suggestion that a State income tax be provided. One particularly strong proponent of that was for the former member for Mallee. He was not the only one; there were others, and I think you yourself, Mr. Speaker, may have made reference to it. However, I am not saying that you necessarily espoused it. Many members of the Liberal Party have made reference to the matter in the past and they had to make reference to it, because it is the policy of their Federal Party to see that a situation obtains in Australia whereby the Commonwealth can vacate many of these fields and the State Governments will move in with the double taxation situation. I will not be in the least bit surprised to see that situation obtain within the next three years. It may have been obtained anyway, if the Commonwealth had taken unilateral steps.

If any members are surprised (I notice the member for Eyre looks a bit surprised) they need only to look at the studies that have been made in Canberra by people like Professor Mathews who certainly occupy neutral territory and who have served under three Prime Ministers and who seriously put forward that suggestion as being a logical nexus between the change from one form of Federal policy to the new Fraser form of Federal policy. Whatever the rights or wrongs may be, Mathews puts that forward as a mechanism. The basic thing that annoys me about this is the promises that have been made by this Government and which now cannot be fulfilled. In one of my speeches recently I said that I was quite prepared as a politician to accept the brunt of tough criticism, and that that was the perfect right of people. However, I drew the line at certain tactics; one that I took exception to was the hoodlum advertisement paid for by that underhanded merchant whom I dealt with in a grievance debate a few nights ago. Another was in relation to the signs that were placed around my electorate, curiously enough, again authorised by the ubiquitous Mr. Buick. Well might the Minister of Agriculture shout, because that gentleman is very close to his electorate.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: He is a very respected citizen.

Mr. McRAE: He said this.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr. McRAE: He did not pay for all his advertisements in the News.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Who said he did?

Mr. McRAE: He gave that impression to the people of South Australia. In the Playford District he either did or did not (but in either case stands condemned) pay for the following signs which were put outside each of the polling booths in my electorate, which read "Vote Labor and we'll all be out of a job".

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will come back to the Bill which is the subject of this debate.

Mr. McRAE: I am linking my remarks by saying that it

is inevitable that the Government is going to renege on one of its promises; either it has got to have additional taxation or it is going to have to cut services. In any event, it is not going to be able to provide jobs for young people, hence the relevance of the boards outside the polling booths. Many young people in my electorate were quite stary-eyed, and many volunteered to work for the Liberal organisation because of incidents like that—because of the lies that Mr. Buick put around.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Do you realise that the first advertisement that bore his name, by its very wording, attracted donations in order to finance the subsequent advertisements?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Playford has the call.

Mr. McRAE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Buick is either a rogue or a fool. I hope he is a fool who was manipulated by some of the people I dealt with the other night. Alternatively, he has got to be a rogue. Those signs affected the young people. I am not worried about the politicians or members of sub-branches being upset, but I am worried about those stary-eyed young persons coming to the conclusion that they were meant to, namely "Vote Liberal and you will have a job," and then being cheated.

That is what has happened. Their parents will pay additional taxes or take additional cuts in services, because a few wealthy people will have these taxes removed from them. Those young people will not have the opportunity to take up that employment that they saw promised by those signs. That man Buick has much to answer for. He is either a fool or a rogue: I hope he is a fool.

Those boards were put up, and I do not intend to let that bone go. I intend to worry it for as long as I can. I asked a question of the Minister responsible, and the pitiful reply I got was that, on his inquiry, the returning officer had not noticed the boards. Of course he had not noticed them, because the returning officer was in Salisbury. However, I intend to put more questions on notice about that to see whether the Liberal Party authorised those signs. I should be pleased to know whether the Minister of Agriculture would say whether his Party agreed with those signs.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: We don't use signs.

Mr. McRAE: I gather, then, that the Liberal Party disavows itself from the people who put up those signs.

Mr. Payne: I've seen plenty.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: In my district? No way!

Mr. McRAE: I gather that the Liberal Party disavows itself from those signs. I hoped that it would, because it was a low, despicable and mean thing to do.

Mr. Gunn: What's this got to do with succession duties?

Mr. McRAE: I will take up the challenge made by the member for Eyre. This whole scenario reminds me of Sir Thomas Playford's days. Even in his days, when there were succession duties, we had the worst education system, the worst hospital system, and no community welfare system. We were in the worst mess of any State in the Commonwealth. I draw attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. McRAE: The plain fact of the matter is that fewer taxes will mean fewer services, and that is what will happen to the unfortunate young people who voted for the Liberal Party. That Party throughout this country has reached the stage of being so despicable that it is unbelievable. When the Catholic Commission for Social Justice reported recently in very positive terms about unemployment, it said, "It is about time that the people of this country were prepared to be responsible and to make sacrifices in order to get young people back to work." Do you know, Sir, what they were called by the members of

the Party to which you belong? They were called "Marxists", and their contributions were said to be absurd and without any foundation.

Mr. Whitten: Who said that?

Mr. McRAE: It was a prominent member in New South Wales. The fact of the matter is that the Vatican itself, having considered the matter, has praised Mr. Pollard, the Secretary of the Catholic Commission for Social Justice, saying that not only does it thoroughly approve what the report said but also that His Holiness would be very pleased to draw the attention of visiting bishops who had unemployment in their jurisdiction to the ideas expressed on the Australian statement.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member say how this is linked with the Bill?

Mr. McRAE: It is linked with the state of mind of the Government that proposes such trash and nonsense 100 years after Disraeli wrote his book. That is how it is linked. It is absolutely disgusting trash and nonsense. The only reason why the Premier, many other members and I have even got the opportunity to be here is that our parents made sacrifices through their taxes to give us an education. Should we now be so rotten and despicable that we will not help young people? That \$20 000 000, which has been thrown away, together with all the other advantages, could have been used to help young people. This is what makes me worried: not that it cannot be shown in expensive buildings and all the rest of it but that it could have been used to provide a lot of young people with a lot of jobs. Instead, these people were con-tricked by Mr. Buick's boards and the various fools and rogues around the business community who supported that man. They were as despicable and as low as they could get, and they were conned into supporting and working for the Liberal Party, only to find that they will be betrayed.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): It is with much pleasure that I support this Bill. Having been in this House for 9½ years and advocated the abolition of this tax ever since I have been here, I commend the Government and the Premier for having the foresight to introduce this Bill as one of its first legislative acts. This is a step not only in the right direction but also one that will benefit the people of South Australia. Members have seen the crocodile tears flowing from members opposite. If they had been prudent managers and looked after the affairs of the people of this State, we would not have had monuments like Monarto, the Land Commission, dial-a-bus, and many others.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: I know that it is embarrassing for members opposite, who have stood up in the House and quibbled about \$20 000 000 out of a \$1 377 000 000 Budget. If they had been good managers they would have been able, as we will do, to take effective steps to put into effect measures that would more than make up the \$20 000 000. It is not a matter of how much money can be collected. Members opposite have a mania about taxation, and they want to extract every dollar they can from the pockets of the people. They talk about looking after the under-privileged. However, when in Government members opposite always slip their hands into a person's hip pocket and relieve him of his hard-earned dollars.

It is not the Government's right to plunder people's savings. That is what succession duties have done. Members opposite have all stood up tonight and advocated the continuation of a tax that has plundered the hard-earned savings of the people. This Government and other Governments throughout Australia ought to be congratulated for getting rid of it. I ask the member for Salisbury, who went on with a lot of nonsense about

appealing to the Commissioner and other people, whether he has seen an estate where people have tried to appeal. Has anyone appealed? Has he seen people driven out of their homes because of this form of taxation? Of course he has not, and it is nonsense for the honourable member to say that.

I say to the member for Flinders that this legislation is before the House merely because the people elected a Liberal Government. There is no other way in which this measure would have been introduced had it not been for the good judgment and common sense of the people in electing to this Parliament a number of persons who were under the Liberal banner for the first time. That is the only way in which this and any other measure can come into effect in this State or in any other Parliament in Australia. Only the Liberal Party has the knowledge, expertise and ability to effect this type of legislation.

I am pleased that this Bill has been introduced. I point out to members opposite that succession duties have had the effect of denying jobs, because people who have been affected by them have not been able to reinvest their money or expand. Valuable capital has been soaked up, and these people have not been able to be effective managers or to operate their businesses prudently.

Enough has been said throughout the years by such organisations as United Farmers and Stockowners Association of South Australia Incorporated and others amply to justify this measure. The people of South Australia will appreciate for a long time this foresighted approach.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I will not keep the House long. I have heard tonight, as all members who have been present would have heard, the repetition of the same old scare tactics, myths and spurious figures brought up in defence of the attitude to succession duties of the socialists, the Labor Party.

I reject them all, just as the majority of people at the last South Australian election rejected them all in exactly the same way. They did that wholeheartedly. It is because they did that that we are sitting on this side of the House today. I am amazed that members opposite should have forgotten so quickly the lesson taught them on 15 September. I would have thought that the Opposition would be quiet indeed tonight, instead of going way on past the undertaken time for the completion of this legislation. I do not have to defend what the Government is doing. The people of South Australia have already endorsed what we are doing with this legislation. They have done that overwhelmingly, and it is a great day for South Australia to see this legislation come into this House. It will be a day that is surpassed only by that day when this legislation passes through the Parliament as a whole to come into operation on 1 January 1980.

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

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 25 October, Page 426.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill was described by the Premier in his second reading explanation as one designed to give a much-needed stimulus to the housing industry in this State and to assist those who are faced with the expense of acquiring and furnishing their first home. The Opposition view is that the Government has a mandate to introduce this legislation. I do not see

that there is anything contained in the Bill about which the Opposition could be particularly critical. It seems to be a reasonably sound measure. I feel, however, that the Premier's second reading explanation departed from the point of the Bill when he discussed the state of the housing industry in South Australia. Clearly, he wanted to make some political points. Regrettably, he has continued to make the political points as Premier that he was making as Leader of the Opposition. I have commented previously that this does not help to improve the South Australian economy. This is a time when we must take a positive view, look forward, and look for those indicators which show signs of improvement.

The Premier's second reading explanation was devoted to a sorry tabulation of statistics which suggested that the housing industry in South Australia was at an extraordinarily low ebb and could not really recover. In fact, the picture painted was so grim that one wonders whether even a measure such as this would have any effect in stimulating the industry. From the way the Premier described it, it seemed that the corpse just could not be revived. In fact, the picture is not so grim.

The building and construction industry was amongst the worst affected in the recession, but it has been showing signs of recovery for some months. We must remember that in South Australia we are starting from a good base. South Australia has the highest ownership of private dwellings per head of population in Australia. I turn now to the most up-to-date information on building approvals for new private, non-Government houses just issued by the Bureau of Statistics covering the period until August 1979. I point out that private sector houses will be most affected by the Government's cutting stamp duty, not other forms of housing such as flats, and so on.

In each of the past five months from April until August 1979 building approvals for new private houses in South Australia have been more than 10 per cent higher than in the corresponding months of 1978. These double-figure increases have been as follows: April, an 11.3 per cent increase on the previous 12 months; May, a 13 per cent increase; June, an 11.2 per cent increase; July, a 14.6 per cent increase; and, in August, a 26.7 per cent increase. That is showing an upward and encouraging trend. It suggests that private house-building activity is improving at an increasing rate, and is to be welcomed.

All of those figures predate the 15 September election. One would hope that the trend continues. I also hope that the Premier acknowledges that that trend had already started before his Government's coming to office. Total stamp duty collections forecast in the Budget confirm that economic recovery, in a broad sense, is under way. Collections from all forms of stamp duty are forecast to rise from \$83 100 000 to \$87 000 000. Like pay-roll tax, stamp duty collections are directly responsive to changes in the level of economic activity, so the assumption that there is to be improved economic activity during the current financial year is built into the stamp duty collection. It is certainly at odds with the points made by the Premier in his second reading explanation.

We should also get this problem of the building industry into perspective. This problem has not been confined to South Australia. If the Premier wishes to see a fundamental improvement in South Australian building activity he should approach the Federal Government, because success in submissions made to it would not only aid the South Australian building industry but also the building industry throughout Australia. First, he should be pressing the Prime Minister to allocate more funds for South Australian Housing Trust activities. Secondly, he should be pressing Mr. Fraser to cut interest rates, which

are the single most important determinant of the level of housing activity. Measures such as this can only really operate around the fringes of housing decisions. Interest rates are the key to housing activity. I would be interested to know whether the Premier has taken up the question of high interest rates with the Prime Minister.

This year, the Budget Speech tells us that funds for welfare housing will be cut for South Australia. In 1978-79, \$48 700 000 was made available to the State. In this current financial year \$35 800 000 is available, so in money terms the cut is \$12 900 000. After allowing for inflation, the loss of building work will be about \$17 000 000 to \$18 000 000, an extremely substantial cut-back in one financial year. That is the situation so far as funds for housing are concerned. We are suggesting that the Premier take this up with the Federal Treasurer as a matter of some urgency. Admittedly, there are no bright prospects for the lowering of interest rates in an inflationary situation. Inflation has been trending upwards. The increase in the consumer price index in the period for the 12 months ended March 1979 was 8.2 per cent; for the 12 months to June 1979, 8.9 per cent; and for the 12 months to September 1979, 9.2 per cent.

Clearly, inflation is moving upwards, and that has a bad effect on interest rates. The house building industry was operating at very high levels two or three years ago—in fact, in retrospect, overheated levels. That, in part, is the reason why we have gone through the current slump and are in the present difficult situation. The unprecedented level of building activity was well above trend levels and has resulted in a major dislocation or disruption of house building over recent years. A major reason for this seems to be that many people brought forward in time their house building activities. For this reason, many of last year's houses really were built in 1977. The reason for this earlier building is unknown, but it is clear that the levels of activity in earlier years were well above trend levels.

The Premier now argues that house building declined in 1978 for two reasons: first, rapidly rising home building costs and, secondly, low increases in incomes in South Australia which made home purchase more difficult. The Premier should detail which elements of cost rose rapidly. It cannot have been wages, because, according to the Premier, these grew slowly in this State, and they grew slowly in the building industry as much as they did in any other sector of industry. Perhaps the price rises are to be found largely in the dependence of South Australia on imported timber for house building.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Has this anything to do with standards?

Mr. BANNON: It has something to do with the Bill, which is designed to give a much needed stimulus to the housing industry in this State. If the Deputy Premier examines the Premier's speech, he will find that the bulk of it was devoted to an examination of the building industry. I am responding to some of the points made in that speech. Perhaps the price rises are to be found largely in the dependence of South Australia on imported timber for house building, a dependence which is greater than that in the other States. The rise for components of house building materials has been well above the average. For whatever reason, it is an undoubted fact that, in the period 1976-77, huge activity in house building in South Australia overheated the market and created a surplus of housing which we are still working out through the system. That has had a dramatic effect during the past two years. Certainly, the indicators have changed; there is a great improvement on the way and, to the extent that this Bill will assist (and I believe it can assist), the Opposition is happy to support it.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I speak briefly in support of this Bill to amend the Stamp Duties Act. It is one of the better taxation promises that the Liberal Party made prior to the State election, as it applies a little more equally to all sections of the community. The Bill provides, for persons purchasing a house as their principal place of residence for the first time, a remission of stamp duty on values up to \$30 000. As stated in the Premier's speech and as referred to by the Leader of the Opposition, the Bill is designed to give a stimulus to the building industry in this State. It will very marginally affect the building industry; it is a mild palliative rather than a cure for the ills of the building industry in this State.

In the past, and at the present time, South Australia has had the largest percentage of home ownership per head of population than has any other State. On this side of the House we believe that home ownership is an important part of our society in giving people a greater stake in the community. South Australians have shown a marked preference for home ownership. However, because most home purchases are financed by credit and because of the current high interest rates, a person's capacity to acquire a home is affected significantly. The high cost of finance is probably the most serious impediment facing prospective home purchasers. For instance, a young couple borrowing \$21 000 on a 40-year first mortgage at the current interest rate and \$5 700 on a second mortgage over 15 years will ultimately repay a total of \$77 000—about \$51 000 more than the original loan. Therefore, high interest rates on housing loans is the greatest problem facing prospective home purchasers, even though the maximum limit on concessional interest on housing loans offered by the State Bank is eased from time to time. Recently, it was raised to \$31 000 from \$27 000.

According to the Premier, the additional \$4 000 would be offered to most applicants at a second mortgage at 11 per cent. Even in that situation, repayments for the home purchaser would be, in total, an exceptional amount over and above the original loan.

The real problem facing the home building industry is not necessarily, as is claimed from time to time, the cost of wages or workmen's compensation or the provision of long service leave but rather the high cost of obtaining home finance. The last adjustment in interest rates, in June or July this year (maybe a little earlier), was .5 per cent. This added approximately \$5 000 in repayments to the average home owner, which is considerably more than the present wage component in building a home. Although under this Bill the purchaser will save up to \$580 in remission of stamp duties, I wonder whether the measure will materially assist the industry in times of high interest rates for home finance.

The Bill enacts new section 71c, which sets out the conditions that applicants must satisfy to qualify for the concession. I have no quarrel with the criteria. I agree that the health of the economy is dependent on the purchase of homes. I would like to see even greater concessions and assistance given to young home purchasers, particularly in relation to interest rates. I support the Bill even though I believe the remission of stamp duty will only very marginally assist people purchasing their first home. However, I still believe that it will do little or nothing to stimulate the building industry in this State.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Concessional rates of duty in respect of the purchase of a first home, etc."

Mr. SLATER: Will the Premier say whether the words "no party to the application has previously held either in

the State or elsewhere any relevant interest in a dwellinghouse or any interest in shares conferring upon him a right to occupy a dwellinghouse" in new section 71c (1) (b) refer to persons from interstate or overseas who have had an interest in a home in the United Kingdom, or wherever? It appears that they will not be eligible for a concession in this State.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It applies to those people coming from elsewhere in Australia, not from overseas.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

GIFT DUTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 October. Page 425.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): In his second reading explanation, the Premier referred to the fact that this Bill was consequential on the decision to abolish succession duties. I think the arguments and points to be made in relation to that decision apply equally to this Bill. Gift duty, as he has said, is consequential, in that this Bill is an attempt to ensure that persons do not avoid the impact of succession duties by means of gifts. As such, I do not think that further comment is called for. We are sceptical of the statement that this Bill will enhance still further the attraction and retention of private capital funds in South Australia. Be that as it may, we support the measure.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

In Committee.

(Continued from 25 October. Page 443.)

Schedule.

Mines and Energy, \$8 300 000.

Mr. PAYNE: I think that, when last we dealt with the measure, we devoted some time to the line "Director, Engineering and Scientific Staff" under the heading "Energy Division". I think it fair to say that our side received some answers from the Minister, which we appreciated. We elicited from the Minister that 10 extra positions had been provided for and that he proposed to vet those positions individually. He was kind enough to say that he did not have information then as to what level was involved in those 10 positions. I think I suggested that there seemed to be about 10 salaries but that they would all be on the same level. I do not know whether the Minister now has the information. It seemed that he agreed with the submissions from this side and that what he hoped would result from the extra funding on that line would depend to a large degree on the calibre and levels of the persons that it was proposed to appoint.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The usual procedure is that that sort of information is relayed to members by letter, and that will be done in due course.

Mr. PAYNE: I think that until now there has not been much coverage of the matter of alternative sources of energy. I have a paper from the Australian Society for Microbiology Incorporated, which is a policy paper on microbes and energy conversion and conservation. Has the Minister any knowledge or information as to what degree of research and interest is being maintained in the departmental division concerned on this highly important aspect of energy, bearing in mind the problems with the

provision of energy from hydrocarbon sources, and so on?

I understand from reading the paper that a proposal that is developed in it has much merit. In simple terms, the proposal is that the ideal thing that should be happening is that a diverse energy structure will evolve in the next few years, based on a variety of energy-yielding processes. Some are physical and they are easily called to mind, such as solar heating. There will be physio-chemical processes, and that is the photo-voltaic production of hydrogen, which is related to the fuel cell.

The clue that gave me the trigger to ask this question of the Minister was that either he referred to, or I have read about, the Energy Division instituting a study. I think it was something that the Minister gave earlier in outlining the Government's energy policy. It was a study to assess the potential for energy recovery from domestic, industrial and other wastes in the Adelaide metropolitan area.

Is the division concerned with looking outside that area? A recent publication to which I have referred, dated July 1979, indicated that a study into solid waste, which is a product of the fruit canning industry in Shepparton, Victoria, showed that the equivalent energy production from a tonnage of waste which is now difficult to dispose of is a significant amount of energy.

South Australia has parallel situations where waste is presently a problem, say, in the Riverland, where in getting rid of not only the liquid wastes through canning and other industries but also getting rid of solid wastes, if this situation applied, it would be most attractive, especially as the study is costed to a degree warranting further investigation. Because of the recent date of publication indicating the increasing cost of hydrocarbon energy production, this type of energy production seems more feasible. Can the Minister say whether any work is being done, even on an exploratory nature in this area?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: A range of topics was covered by the honourable member. SENRAC is doing work in relation to solar energy and the photo-electric cell. There is a committee in the department doing work in relation to the use of waste. I will obtain any further information that the honourable member requires.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: As Amdel's allocation has fallen to \$740 000, does that reduction indicate a scaling-down of the use of the services by Amdel? If not, why is there a reduction in this amount?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Reduced provision for the current financial year reflects an internal reallocation of funds, and provision for 1979-80 allows \$508 000 for Department of Mines and Energy work, \$232 000 for other Government departments. It is an internal reallocation of funds.

Mr. KENEALLY: I had the greatest of difficulty hearing the Minister give that answer. I am sure that my colleagues, whose hearing may be somewhat more acute than mine, might have been able to pick it up. If the Minister would be so kind, I would ask him to articulate his answers a little more clearly. They are difficult to pick up if he is going to answer in that blase sort of fashion that he has apparently adopted this evening.

Mr. DUNCAN: Has the Department of Mines and Energy a mining economist on its staff? If it has, for how long has that mining economist been employed and, if it has not (which I understand to be the case), from what source does the department obtain information on mining economics? If it is from a consultant, which consultant, and for how long has the department been using that consultant?

I seek this information because mining economics has become an important issue recently, particularly as various mines have become more viable as the result of changes in

the general economic climate of Western society. Because the price of oil has increased so dramatically, some mines that previously were not a viable economic proposition have now become viable. This is an important issue, and I understand that the department is light on for such advice. I seek this information in the hope that in the future the department will be better advised on mining economics.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The information that I have in relation to that line does not cover what the honourable member seeks. I will get a report.

Mr. PAYNE: I refer to the line "Underground water investigations—test boring", etc. Has the Minister any information about what that line involves? Has it anything to do with the present rehabilitation programme of artesian and deep gas wells throughout the arid areas of the North? When I was Minister of Water Resources, I recall that that programme obtained some funding from the National Water Resources programme, but activities mainly were carried out by the Mines Department on behalf of the Engineering and Water Supply Department's responsibility in that area. The increase in the proposed funds is not large. Is only State funding involved or is there a Commonwealth component?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not think that there is any Commonwealth involvement. The provision in 1979-80 includes \$40 000 reallocated from geological and geophysical survey for urgent remedial work on old gas exploration wells in the Cooper Basin section of the great artesian basin. This work is additional to the ongoing rehabilitation programme. That is the information that I have.

Mr. HEMMINGS: My general question is tied to the line "Contingencies—General, Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries."

The CHAIRMAN: It is important that the honourable member should link up his remarks.

Mr. HEMMINGS: In all the information given to us under "Minister of Mines and Energy", there is no allocation for the purchase or exchange of motor vehicles, except possibly under "Contingencies—Drilling and Mechanical Engineering Branch". Motor vehicles, expenses and sundries are dealt with under this vote. Is there any allocation for purchase of new motor vehicles in the Minister's department?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: There is certainly no proposal to buy motor cars under that line. I will obtain information for the honourable member.

Mr. PAYNE: The line "Chief Drilling and Mechanical Engineer, Engineers, Draftsmen, Technical, Drilling, Supply, Clerical and Other Staff" is obviously a reference to salaries and wages of people involved in the drilling and mechanical engineering area. Will the Minister say, regarding the announced programme for South Australian Oil and Gas to explore and to have increased funding, which is part of the Government's policy and which the Minister took from A.L.P. policy, which I now quote—

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That's not true.

Mr. PAYNE: The honourable member would probably do well to listen and then he can make a better judgment. I intend to quote from the policy of the A.L.P. at the time of the elections, in relation to drilling, etc. This policy was issued by the former Minister, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, regarding Cooper Basin needs and the exploration programme. He stated:

This must now be expanded, and the necessary steps will be taken for South Australian Oil and Gas to explore at the rate of \$10 000 000 per annum, commencing from the beginning of 1980. This rate will continue for at least three years and will enable that programme to make full use of a drilling rig throughout the area.

We have been treated to statements from the Minister that \$31 000 000 would go into a programme of the same nature, as he worked out the other night. In answer to an interjection from me at the time, he stated that the former Minister did not know anything about how to finance that. It is my understanding that, on a similar occasion, when the Minister now occupying the office was asked about the same matter, the report stated:

The Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Goldsworthy, said yesterday—

under a date line of 7 October 1979, after the election—that he could not comment on funding for South Australian Oil and Gas or a liquids pipeline at present. He went on to say the matters were subject to Cabinet consideration.

It would seem that, after the elections, when he became the Minister, he was not able to comment on how the \$31 000 000 would be funded. It did not seem to me, on reflection, to be a valid criticism of the former Minister, who was no doubt prepared to go to Cabinet with similar proposals. It seemed strange that the amounts concerned came to the same sort of sums, give or take \$1 000 000.

The earlier answers received from the Minister on those topics (I hope he has had the opportunity to reflect over the few days that have passed) indicated that there is nothing wrong with allocating credit and responsibility where they properly lie. If anyone (and I will not attempt to read this into the record) looks at the Labor energy policy for the 1980's, it reads almost word-for-word with what was subsequently dished out in this House by the Minister opposite as the Liberal energy policy for the 1980's. I do not criticise that policy; it is a good policy. It is the policy we followed. It is probably the one thing I will agree with that the Minister has done so far. He has had the good sense to endorse the policy of the Labor Party and reissue it as his own. He would lose nothing by pointing out that the vast bulk of the policy had already been introduced before he became the Minister. The Minister certainly would have had no quarrel from our side. I seek information on the drilling and engineering programme. Will the Minister say whether the moneys committed on the line are in any way involved with back-up or assistance to the drilling programme proposed by South Australian Oil and Gas in the Cooper Basin area?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the honourable member looks at last week's *Hansard*, he will see details of the way in which the drilling programme is to be funded. If he has any queries about that, certainly it is my belief that the arrangements in relation to funding were achieved during the life of this Administration. The information that I have does not, I think, completely answer the honourable member's query as to the drilling programme in the Cooper Basin. Provision has been made for the total cost of salaries of existing staff as at 30 July 1979 and estimated payments of wages to weekly paid employees of the Drilling and Mechanical Engineering Branch. Some drilling is done in response to outside requests, and money is recouped. I will obtain information, as was the habit of the former Minister.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I want to ask a follow-up question to my first question. I concur with the member for Stuart; I had difficulty hearing the Minister's answer. Was the Minister implying that there has been an improvement in the cost efficiency of Amdel and that therefore the same product will be provided at less cost, or was the Minister saying there would be a cut-down in the services?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will give my reply again. The reduced provision for the current financial year reflects an internal reallocation of funds. The provision for 1979-80 allows \$508 000 for Department of Mines and

Energy work and \$232 000 for other Government departments.

Mr. McRAE: Regarding the line "Prospecting and control of mining, operating expenses, minor equipment and sundries", the basis of my question obviously goes to the activities of Western Mining and B.P. in the controversial area we have been discussing. Will the Minister inform the Committee whether there is now in existence either an agreement or working heads of agreement between the new Government and either or both of those companies concerning their activities in those areas and, if that is the case, was that agreement entered into by the former Government or is it a new agreement? If the agreement has been amended, in what way has it been amended? Is it proposed that there will be a further agreement between either or both of those companies and the Government later this year?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That line really has nothing to do with the honourable member's question. There was some sort of agreement, details of which are not familiar to me at the moment, between the previous Government and Western Mining in relation to mining at Roxby Downs. Some discussion is going on with the Government in relation to this matter. I would expect that the same sort of undertaking as that given by the previous Administration will probably be given by this Government.

[Midnight]

Mr. DUNCAN: I seek information on the line "Salaries and wages and related payments—Administration". Can the Minister tell me the number and names of all the E.O. and A.O. range officers employed under that line, and also the names of those officers who previously worked for private mining companies and the names of the companies for which they worked?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will have to obtain that information and bring down a report for the honourable member.

Mr. DUNCAN: Seeing that the Committee is being technical and will not permit me to ask a question about a series of lines, I now ask the same question in relation to the line "Salaries and wages and related payments—Technical".

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I give the same answer.

Mr. PAYNE: I refer to the line "Administration—terminal leave payments", and if it were not illegal in here I would be willing to wager that the Minister has this information. I notice that \$40 000 was voted last year, \$58 433 was paid out, and a further \$58 000 is voted for the 1979-80 financial year. Members on both sides have agreed that this section of the department will be faced with quite a lot of important and heavy work in future with respect to finding enough energy for the needs of the State. Does that indicate that there is an age group within the administration section who will need to be continually replaced? Has a replacement programme been going on in relation to people retiring?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The increase in last year's terminal leave payments was due to unexpected resignations. The provision for 1979-80 allows for the known retirements of officers who have accumulated long service leave entitlements. I do not envisage that there will be a decrease in the number of people employed in the Mines Department and, as I pointed out when we were discussing the increase by 10 in the energy division, they will be replaced.

Mr. DUNCAN: I now seek, in relation to the line

"Geological and geophysical survey", the same information that I sought previously.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. DUNCAN: I now seek the same information in relation to "Salaries and wages and related payments—Energy Division". So there will be no mistake, I am only asking for information relating to A.O. and E.O. range officers, there being only one or two in relation to each line. I am not seeking a whole list of the department's personnel.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I give the same answer.

Mr. PAYNE: I refer to the line, under "Mining Branch", relating to "Prospecting and control of mining, operating expenses, minor equipment and sundries", and to the proposed development and mining of Roxby Downs. Has the Minister had an opportunity to read the relatively short paper "Mineral Processing at Roxby Downs" which is available in the Parliamentary Library? That paper, which I understand was obtained from the Parliamentary Library in the Australian Parliament in Canberra, was actually prepared by the Defence, Science and Technology Group of that library. Page 2, referring to Roxby Downs, states:

For example, Mr. Shierlaw considers that Roxby Downs could be economic simply as a copper mine. If true, this is an important point which has not been publicised.

Mr. Shierlaw, of course, is well known, with mining interests, and so on. The article then goes on to give technical information about the ore bodies currently known and still to be proved.

Logically, it follows that a process for separating copper and uranium ores must therefore be relied on. Further in the article methods are proposed. The Minister has referred consistently to the current feasibility study, which all members know was really a \$50 000 000 programme approved by the previous Government in relation to arrangements between Western Mining Corporation and B.P. Can the Minister say whether any aspect, other than simply going ahead and mining uranium is being considered? Is any work being done on another approach to the matter which might allow for copper mining or mining of other minerals in the area on an economic basis without the complication of uranium?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have done a fair bit of reading since I have taken on my present responsibilities. I have not read that particular publication, but the inquiries which I have made on the question of mining minerals other than uranium from the Mines Department and from the company indicate that it is not feasible.

Mr. KENEALLY: Referring to the line "Administrative Accounting, Supply and Clerical Staff", I understood the Minister to say that he has the administrative responsibility for the Redcliff development. Will the Minister provide for me a report on each of the committees that are established in his department which deal with Redcliff (I know that there is a proliferation of these committees), the membership of these committees, and the purposes for which the committees have been instituted?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I shall obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr. DUNCAN: I seek similar information to that which I sought before in relation to surveying and drafting, and also similar information relating to drilling and mechanical engineering.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I seek information with regard to the

line "Purchase of office machines and equipment". I note that the amount voted in 1978-79 was \$9 954, the actual payments were \$16 776, and the proposed sum for 1979-80 is \$18 000. My question is prompted by a question in the House on 26 October by the member for Elizabeth concerning the taping of a speech he made at Flinders University. I quote from the *Advertiser* what the Minister said in the House:

I know nothing at all of the incident, and it would appear to me that a lengthy explanation is based on hearsay. I was looking at the Minister when he made that statement, and there was a look of shock on his face.

Perhaps I am being unfair to the Deputy Premier, who could have been shocked either because he was found out or because he knew nothing about it. However, I will give the Deputy Premier his due, as later, outside the House, he said that his department had recorded the speech made by the member for Elizabeth. It seems that, because \$16 776 was spent last year and \$18 000 is proposed for this year, this could become the norm for the Department of Mines and Energy, with field officers recording speeches that relate to mines and energy matters. Does the increased allocation this year for the purchase of office machines and equipment mean that more tape recorders and other devices will be purchased so that the net will be spread even wider?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: There is no net and no spy system. The 1978-79 result was due primarily to the purchase of two photocopiers funded from savings and other lines. The provision for 1979-80 allows for the addition and replacement of necessary machines and equipment. I doubt very much whether it includes tape recorders.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I refer to the line relating to underground water investigations, including test boring, etc. What liaison exists between the Department of Mines and Energy and the Department of Agriculture in relation to this line? I understand that it is contended that changed cropping in the Adelaide Plains area could alter substantially the water level in the underground basin. It is therefore important that the two departments have contact on this matter so that market gardeners can be consulted and advised regarding the best crops to plant and the amount of water they can draw in decades to come.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I understand that the Engineering and Water Supply Department, as well as the two departments to which the honourable member referred, is heavily involved in this area. I will ascertain what liaison, if any, exists between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Mines and Energy. I am sure that the Engineering and Water Supply Department is the prime mover in monitoring this situation.

Mr. KENEALLY: I refer to the line relating to buildings at the Thebarton depot of the Drilling and Mechanical Engineering Branch. The Deputy Premier will recall that, when he and I were members of the Public Accounts Committee some years ago, that committee brought down a comprehensive report dealing with the establishment of depots in places such as Thebarton. This related mainly to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The Public Accounts Committee report recommended a rationalisation of depots in Adelaide, and that those on or near park lands should be moved. I think that the depot at Thebarton was to be moved to Ottoway. Now that the Minister is in charge of this department, which has buildings at Thebarton, I expect that he will be keen to implement the recommendations made by the Public Accounts Committee regarding depots and that he will want to move the establishment to Ottoway.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That investigation, if my memory serves me correctly, was in relation to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The whole rationalisation for undertaking that investigation was an economic one. I do not think that it impinges on this line, but if there is any information the member seeks I will get it for him. If my memory serves me correctly, the decisions made by the Public Accounts Committee were made on economic grounds.

Mr. DUNCAN: Are any of the repairs or renovations to be undertaken to buildings at the Thebarton depot to be undertaken in relation to that part of that depot used to store nuclear waste and, if so, what repairs and renovations are proposed? How much nuclear or uranium waste is at present stored there in the middle of metropolitan Adelaide? Is the Thebarton depot of the Department of Mines and Energy the same as the facility in Thebarton used by Amdel for storage of nuclear or uranium wastes?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The 1979-80 provision allows for normal on-going repairs and maintenance. In addition, there is a special allocation of \$6 000 to upgrade the Thebarton depot general yard area. I will get the information that the honourable member requires relating to nuclear wastes. Amdel stores nuclear waste on its own property at present. I gave some information to the House relating to the nature of that low-level waste. I will get further details for the honourable member.

Mr. PAYNE: When the Minister answered my previous question about the Mining Branch he said that he had had the opportunity to do some reading. I am glad that he has had that opportunity, because I appreciate the difficulty he is having in taking over a portfolio cold. Apparently, he has learned some things already. I recommend to him the article I mentioned because it explains a way in which (at least, according to the article and authorities quoted, including Dr. R. Woods of the C.S.I.R.O. Division of Mineral Chemistry) a mining operation could perhaps be carried on at Roxby Downs outside the recovery of uranium. It has the advantage, according to the process listed, of recovering gold at the same time, and that would be a useful fillip to the general return from the mine.

I believe the Minister told us earlier that, because of the programme, the effort and the additional money being used in pursuit of energy by the present Government, a bonanza at Roxby Downs was not far away. Does the Minister still maintain that opinion in view of the article that appeared in the *News* on 17 September (not long after the election) headed "W.M.C.'s Roxby plans unchanged", as follows:

The Liberal Party win will have no impact on the rate of development of Western Mining Corporation's massive copper, uranium and gold deposits at Roxby Downs. "Before Roxby Downs can be developed an extensive drilling programme has to be completed and this is expected to take a couple of years," Mr. H. O. Clark, a W.M.C. director, said today.

Estimates are it will be 1986 before actual mining work on the project will begin.

I would be interested to hear from the Minister, in view of that sort of statement from people directly involved in the consortium tackling the problem, how the funds allegedly injected into mining will cause any change in what would have been the rate of development that was apparent before the change of Government.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The change of policy would have some impact on the final result. It seems that W.M.C. and B.P. would not be prepared to spend

\$50 000 000 unless there was an expectation that mining would go ahead.

Mr. Payne: That was there, anyway.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. As a result of the change of Government the programme is to be accelerated.

Mr. Payne: In what way?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: They will drill more holes more quickly.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I refer to the action of the recording of a member's speech at Flinders University. The Minister made the comment outside the House that the meeting was a public one and that it was common on such occasions for tape recordings to be made. If we understand that it is common for tape recordings to be made at these meetings (and we all know of the increase in public interest in the debate of whether this State should mine uranium). I wonder whether the proposed vote for 1979-80 of \$348 000 as opposed to last year's actual payments of \$297 151 for the "Chief Inspector of Mines and State Mining Engineer, Inspectors and Technical Staff" is sufficient to take on the extra staff to go around to these meetings and record the speeches being made. There could be a situation in which the Government will have to employ more and more officers to record these speeches, and this vote for 1979-80 may be insufficient.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: This line has nothing to do whatever with the suggestions made by the honourable member.

Vote passed.

Minister of Mines and Energy, Miscellaneous, \$626 000.

Mr. KENEALLY: I raise a matter of extreme importance to the district I represent. I am pleased to see that the allocation for the "Redcliff Urban Project Group" has been increased from \$20 508 to \$117 000. I applaud the Government for this. What makes up that \$117 000, and what work will the project group be able to do with that vote?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The line covers salaries and contingencies for persons involved in the forward planning of urban requirements for the Redcliff project. It probably indicates an increased momentum in that area.

Mr. KENEALLY: I take this opportunity to impress on the responsible Minister the absolute importance of the State Government's being prepared to provide front-end financing to the cities of Port Augusta and Port Pirie to allow them to be able to provide all the facilities needed to accommodate the explosion in population that will occur, particularly at Port Augusta.

The Minister would be aware of the study report by Mr. Richards, Town Clerk of Port Augusta, who was given the first Keith Hockridge scholarship and who studied the rapid growth of cities such as Port Augusta. He studied at Rock Springs, Arizona, and at Gladstone in Queensland. In all these instances where disasters have occurred in towns of the size of Port Augusta, they occurred because not enough work was done before work on the project started.

I would have spoken at greater length on this matter because it is a critical importance to my district. We in Port Augusta and Port Pirie are concerned. We were concerned with the previous Government, as we are with this Government, to see that everyone able to make any decision that may influence proceedings in those cities is aware of the need to ensure that the problems that have occurred elsewhere do not occur here.

I ask the Minister to visit the area at the earliest opportunity and discuss with the councils of both cities the problems that will accrue from growth in that area. I also

seek the Minister's assurance that he will, at the earliest possible time, visit the Redcliff site, which is not so exciting, but more particularly visit the cities of Port Augusta and Port Pirie, which will give him a good reception, particularly if he is prepared to continue the sort of increase in funding that is obvious on this line.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am aware of the major problems relating to housing, particularly in the construction stage, and I am aware, even at this early stage, of the massive problems in housing the work force if Redcliff goes ahead, particularly at the construction stage. The planning group is well aware of the problem, and its thinking in relation to this is well advanced. As to a specific commitment about when I will go there, I cannot give that tonight. I shall be going to Port Pirie soon. I am well aware of the problem and will acquaint myself with it in more detail in the fullness of time.

Mr. LEWIS: Does the Minister, like the member for Stuart, believe that Redcliff is the only and most satisfactory site for this development, and does he believe that the investigation of the geomorphological sub-strata on which the footings have to be established is the most appropriate available? Does he believe that it is possible to spend the money necessary to build a pier 4½ kilometres long, as does the member for Stuart, instead of on the site itself? Does he also believe that there are no risks of pollution, either atmospherically or aquatically, and does he also believe that the prawn fishery and the other scale fisheries in that area, and the hatching grounds to which he has referred as being fairly unsightly (that was in his reference to the Redcliff site) are utterly beside the point and unnecessary in the consideration?

Mr. PAYNE: In referring to "Energy research" under the heading "Miscellaneous", I draw attention to an error that has occurred, because the Budget papers state that \$300 000 has been allocated, when \$299 888 is the amount on the line. Has the Minister any information on the line "Ex gratia payment to City of Marion". I am a ratepayer of the City of Marion. No sum was voted or actually paid in 1978-79, yet \$7 192 is provided for 1979-80.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The *ex gratia* payment to the City of Marion golf park of \$7 192. The Government agreed to reimburse to council moneys paid to Linwood Quarries in respect of land tax for the golf park for 1978-79, and to make similar arrangements for future years.

Mr. DUNCAN: Regarding the allocations for the Australian Mineral Industries Research Association, the National Energy Conservation Campaign, the National School of Drilling, the Energy Council, Energy Research, Redcliff Urban Project Group and the Uranium Enrichment Study Committee, what consultants have been used by those organisations and studies of a technical nature or otherwise? Which private firms of solicitors are employed by those organisations, which accountants are employed by those organisations or studies and, if any, which private advertising agents are employed by those organisations or studies?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I suggest that the honourable member put that sort of question on notice, but I am prepared to get the information for him.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Regarding the line "Contribution to National Energy Conservation Campaign", I seek information about how it is proposed that the money will be spent? How much of that sum will be directed towards household conservation of energy, and what proportion will be directed to industrial conservation of energy? Earlier this year I saw details coming out of the national consultants between the State Governments and the Commonwealth Government as to the need for such a

campaign to take place, and it is most heartening that an allowance of \$109 000 has been made available in the Budget. The major thrust will have to be convincing the public at large of the ways in which it is possible to conserve energy.

There are lots of apparently good media ways to save energy that make good press yet they do not save much energy, and there are lots of more humdrum ways to conserve energy that achieve real benefits, and it is important that this money be spent not just in paying money into the hands of advertising agents but in ensuring that it does get through, first, to the householders and, secondly, to the industrial premises. I would appreciate any information that we can have on that.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will comment before I read my briefing note. I attended the briefing in relation to this conservation programme in Canberra, I think last Monday week. The whole thrust of the campaign is aimed basically at saving liquid fuels. It is aimed at the motorist. My briefing note in effect indicates that. It does not have the wider implication that the honourable member suggests. The programme is funded on a per capita basis State by State, the Federal Government putting in a contribution. It is a national programme involving television, press and radio. We were privy to it. At that conference there was a range of speakers. At the end of the day we were given a briefing on this programme.

The \$109 000 was committed by the previous Government as South Australia's share of the funds required for the national publicity campaign for the conservation of liquid fuels. The sum is a per capita share of the total campaign cost of \$2 000 000, less the matching grant from the Commonwealth. The campaign through television, radio, press and outdoor poster media is primarily aimed at demonstrating to Australian motorists how to save petrol. That campaign runs (I forget exactly the limits) into next year.

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister say whether the Redcliff Urban Project Group's findings and personnel are as available to me for discussion as they were under the previous Government?

I have found that availability of these officers of considerable use in my dealings with local community groups. I appreciate that there is information which the group would probably be privy to and which the Minister might not want to provide to me. I hope that that is not the case. I would like the Minister's assurance that the previous arrangements between me, as local member for the area, and the group will remain.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will investigate the previous arrangements, I will discuss the matter with the head of the department, and I will let the honourable member know the answer to his question in due course.

Vote passed.

Law, \$9 814 000; Supreme Court, \$1 082 000—passed. Attorney-General, Miscellaneous, \$729 000.

Mr. McRAE: I have queries regarding almost every line. Regarding "Compensation for injuries resulting from criminal acts", \$141 000 was voted in 1978-79; actual payments for that year were \$107 242 and the proposed sum for 1979-80 is \$150 000. Does the Minister representing the Attorney have available information regarding the number of claims involved in the actual payment of \$107 242?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The maximum compensation payable prior to 1 July 1978 was \$2 000. That sum has been increased since then to \$10 000. During 1978-79, there were only three relatively small claims paid out under the new legislation. The new legislation had no

impact on the 1978-79 Budget. Actual expenditure in 1978-79 was a good deal less than that estimated, because fewer claims than anticipated were approved for payment. The provision for 1979-80 (this is probably information relevant to the member for Playford's question) has been increased to \$150 000 to meet a good many claims made under the old legislation that are currently being processed, as well as known pending claims under the new legislation and provisions for new claims during the year. Details of the cases heard and pay-outs over the past few years are attached on a separate appendix, and have been supplied to me, but I do not think that the member for Playford requested this information. The question he raised related to the additional sum proposed for expenditure in 1979-80.

Mr. McRAE: I am happy with the undertaking made by the Minister that he will supply the information in due course. What was the number of claims comprising that sum of \$107 242 actually paid out, and, in relation to each of those claims, what was the sum of money paid and what was the nature of the victim's claim in each case?

I stress that I am not seeking this information just to be unreasonable, nor do I expect it to be supplied now. I seek an undertaking from the Minister that in due course he will supply me with the information in relation to the sum of \$107 242, the number of claimants, the amounts of the claims approved in each case, and the nature of injuries in each case.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: It will be more appropriate if that information, which is quite comprehensive, is sent from the department direct to the member for Playford.

Mr. BECKER: I refer first to the line "Contribution towards legal aid". I notice that there has been a drop in the proposed allocation for this year from \$645 000 to \$484 000, and that worries me. Following the number of referrals I receive each year from people seeking legal aid and support, I want to know whether the previous level and standard available to the community will be maintained on that figure. I would also be grateful if the Minister would provide details of damages as a result of the termination of employment.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: During 1978-79 the new Legal Services Commission commenced full operations, amalgamating the services provided by the Commonwealth Australian Legal Aid Office and the South Australian Legal Assistance Scheme, which was administered by the Law Society of South Australia. The grant being made by the South Australian Government has been fixed on the basis that the State will pay 35 per cent of the administrative costs and the contribution towards the cost of briefing counsel calculated on the number of assignments made to assist in State matters. The Commonwealth will contribute 65 per cent of the administration costs and will pay for Commonwealth assignments. Again, there is a considerable amount of detail available that refers specifically to those costs, and I will be happy to forward that detailed information to the member for Hanson, as was earlier agreed in relation to the request of the member for Playford.

Mr. DUNCAN: I am entirely unhappy with the answer that we have just received from the Minister. It seems extraordinary to me that he should stand up, no doubt on the briefing that he has received, and not on his own initiative—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Are you reflecting on the officers in my colleague's department?

Mr. DUNCAN: I am suggesting that the Minister, or the Attorney-General in another place, is putting up a complete smokescreen. The former Government never

intended to reduce the legal aid vote to \$484 000. As I recall the situation, we were intending to increase that vote. It is clear that the decision to reduce this vote has been made on purely ideological grounds, because the Attorney-General does not like the way in which the Legal Services Commission has been providing quite excellent legal aid services to the poorer section of this community. The Attorney-General wants to try and force a significantly greater proportion of the community to scrimp and save in an attempt to pay for private legal services. That can be the only reason why this vote has been so drastically cut. When we look at it, it is clear that the Government has tried to reduce the amount available to the Legal Services Commission from the State of South Australia by roughly a third. That cut will have a very dramatic impact on the amount of legal aid available to people who need it for so-called State matters. That will have a tremendous impact in social and personal terms on the people who seek this service and who in the past have been able to obtain the benefits of it.

I think this is a quite outrageous reduction, that the legal aid line should be decreased by a third is something that every single member opposite (except for members representing seats such as Davenport, which would hardly have a person qualifying for legal aid) should be very concerned about. It should particularly interest the member for Todd, who appears to be asleep on the benches.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are too many interjections. The member for Elizabeth will relate his remarks to the vote under discussion; otherwise, he will have to resume his seat.

Mr. DUNCAN: A reduction of this sort is the sort of thing that should very much concern those members opposite who represent areas where there are poorer, more disadvantaged people who will need this type of service. I believe that it is a real indication of the direction that this State will be taking over the next three years. The Government has been callous over the mere amount of about \$200 000 in denying poor people in the community the legal aid that they will be seeking. Legal aid is not something people seek merely through some whim or fancy but something that they seek because they have a right that they wish to exercise. I think it is an extremely poor show that the Government has chosen to cut back on this line. There can be no reason for it, except for the Attorney-General's ideological preference to force poorer members of the community who need legal advice to pay for private legal practitioners. It is a wholly undesirable tendency that these people are now going to be denied the right to legal aid, simply to pander to the ideological preference of the Attorney-General. I think the Government ought to be roundly condemned for the penny-pinching and unreasonable reduction of this line.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I note the comment made by the former Attorney-General that the line has been reduced by 30 per cent or, indeed, to use his terms, one-third. This is quite incorrect, as the line has been reduced by 25 per cent.

Mr. Duncan: A quarter less legal aid.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I am not so sure that the reduction of the line by 25 per cent in monetary terms necessarily means a reduction in services of the type that the honourable member has referred to. However, he has made quite serious allegations about the work of my colleague in the other place. All I can do is undertake to draw his remarks to the attention of the Attorney-General and await a reply, which I can assure the honourable member will be passed on.

Mr. DUNCAN: I seek information as to whether the reduction in this line was brought to the specific attention of Cabinet Ministers, because it seems to me that certainly the Minister who answered the question obviously was not aware of the seriousness of this matter. I doubt, in the light of that, whether other Ministers are aware of just what is being put forward here.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Again, the former Attorney-General would be well aware that I am unable to say what may or may not have gone before Cabinet in this regard. Although I have pointed out carefully the details of the proportionate division of responsibility in relation to this line, the honourable member continues to make allegations about the Attorney-General. As I said earlier, it will be the Attorney-General's responsibility to justify the reduction in this line, and he will do that in due course, when the member for Elizabeth will receive a reply.

Mr. McRAE: I join with the member for Elizabeth in expressing very grave concern over this reduction of expenditure on legal aid. Whether it is 25 per cent or 30 per cent does not concern me.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Indeed, it's the former.

Mr. McRAE: I accept that. That is one of the largest reductions that I can ever recall on a serious matter that affects so many people in this State. In earlier contributions this evening Opposition members were laughed at, scorned and mocked when they said that one of the prices that would have to be paid by the community for electing this Government would be a reduction in services. Here, we have immediate proof of that statement. For the information of the honourable gentleman and his colleagues, it is not an aberration on the part of the member for Elizabeth, the member for Playford, or the Australian Labor Party: it is a view that is widely held in the community and, it may surprise honourable members, in the Law Society. Only this morning, I spoke to an executive of the Law Society who was appalled by what had happened. I understand that some derogatory remarks that might or might not be correct had been made about the conduct of business by the legal aid agency.

However, the substance of the matter, as I understood it from the point of view of many members of the Law Society, was that this was an outrageous situation. I have only one slight difference with the mode in which the member for Elizabeth expressed it: it is not so much a transfer of money from one section of the legal profession to another but that money must be paid at all that is in question. Every member of the Government Party must have had constituents come to him over recent months and complain again and again about the difficulties being experienced even on the previous allocation of \$645 000. Imagine what difficulties will be experienced in future with a reduced allocation.

I will now give the Committee an example of the sort of thing to which I am referring. One might say that these people do not deserve too much consideration and that we are trying to help some of the dregs of society. However, one of my constituents was dealing with a Rachmann-like landlord, who had deliberately let this small business man run over the time of a written lease, thus putting him in a difficult legal situation. Having done that, he then tendered to that man by way of a substitute lease the most onerous document which I have ever seen and which would literally have bankrupted him. This business man came to me in great distress. I sent him immediately to a solicitor, who telephoned and advised me that, on his dealing with the legal aid people, it would be impossible to get this man any legal aid.

I said that that was just absurd. The man's whole business was at stake. In fact, a going concern which could have been sold for \$50 000 was going to go down the drain for nothing, all for the benefit of a Rachmann landlord. I prepared a lengthy memorandum for the legal aid people who said, "As an exception to the rule and because your constituent's whole livelihood is at stake—all the work he has done over the years to build up that small business is at stake—we will grant you a limited exemption to go into the Supreme Court and represent that man." When we did get there, Mr. Justice Legoe was appalled to hear what had been going on.

The man my constituent was dealing with is a wellknown South Australian businessman, who I have no doubt was a donor to the Liberal Party's evil campaign during the last election, but I will still steer clear of that, Mr. Chairman, in view of your earlier rebuke. My constituent was prepared to go to any lengths to get any decent arbitration or conciliation and to try to force the matter ahead. If he had all that difficulty in getting assistance, can honourable members imagine what is going to happen now that the line has been reduced by 25 per cent? Is this a sign of things to come? Are we returning to the situation where a person gets no legal aid at all, except in a lottery sort of situation? That is just not good enough. I have heard members of the Government, when in Opposition, criticise Ministers because they never had information. This is the most dramatic change in the whole Budget to date, and the information given about it is just not good enough. I am not blaming the Minister for that, but it is not good enough for the Attorney-General not to have supplied appropriate information to the Committee.

What has been read out is a lot of nonsense. It does not answer anybody's questions. It merely states that the line has been reduced by 25 per cent and does not attempt to justify that reduction in any way. What is worse, it does not say what the member for Elizabeth said, namely, that the previous Government had intended to increase the line. These are the very real evils that we are dealing with, and it is incumbent on the Minister to spell out what the policy of this Government is. Is it fair dinkum about legal aid, or is this the first of the cuts that we have seen coming?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I felt that I had explained to both the member for Playford and the member for Elizabeth that there is other material available, some of which is of a statistical nature, spelling out the details and areas in which expenditure was to occur. I did not expect to have to take an unnecessarily lengthy period during this debate to provide that detail, having undertaken to both honourable members that the information would be forwarded to them as requested. I have some material which explains the line and which was provided to me by my colleague and, I suppose, by his department.

Mr. Keneally: He was extremely poorly briefed.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: That is not the case. I told the honourable member earlier that I have additional material. If honourable members want me to provide that information in the detail provided, I will do so, but it would have been more appropriate, in these circumstances, if I had provided the information through my colleague directly to the honourable member. In the meantime, in order to allay the sort of concern that has been expressed by the member for Playford in his second attempt in this matter, I point out to him that provisions have been made in State funding for a reserve of a further \$129 000 to be kept to meet any unforeseen circumstances (circumstances he seems able to envisage). Added to that, I draw members' attention to some details that have led up to the period when the Commonwealth and State

Governments are to share the legal services costs incurred by the commission.

Presently the Commonwealth Government is meeting 65 per cent of these costs and the State Government 35 per cent. This proportion was agreed on before the commission's establishment. However, there is no agreement that it is to be maintained; it is the subject of review by either Government. The funding of the commission for 1979-80 by both Governments is set out in

the schedule which is very much of a statistical nature and which I am happy to incorporate in the Committee's records without further reference.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable member seek leave?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Yes, I do seek leave to have that done.

Leave granted.

FUNDING 1979-80

Item	Commonwealth	Per cent	State	Per cent	Total
	\$		\$		\$
Salaries, Wages	605 000	65	326 000	35	931 000
Administration	221 800	65	119 000	35	340 800
Superannuation	126 700	65	68 000	35	194 700
Commitments presented for payment	1 162 000	86	192 000	14	1 354 000
Total	2 115 500		705 000		2 820 500
<i>Less Receipts</i>					
Payments from Clients—Interest	222 000		80 000		302 000
	1 893 500		625 000		2 518 500
Interest earned on money deposited by Legal Practitioners in their Trust Accounts			270 000		270 000
	1 893 500		355 000		2 248 500
Reserve fund—To meet unforeseen circumstances			129 000		129 000
Total Funding	1 893 500		484 000		2 377 500
Commitment Level	1 184 000		480 000		1 664 000

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Regarding the respective financial responsibilities of the Commonwealth and the State, the information in the schedule will enable legal assistance to be provided by legal officers employed by the commission and by the commitment of cases to private practitioners. The Commonwealth has operated a system whereby cases up to a predetermined value may be committed to private practitioners in a financial year. It is estimated that 40 per cent of these cases will be paid within 12 months and 50 per cent in the following 12 months. The amount of \$1 162 000 provided by the Commonwealth represents assignments made in 1979-80 plus those made in previous years that will be presented for payment in the current financial year. I repeat that, unless members opposite take the time to study the schedule of details which I have undertaken to provide for them and which will be recorded in *Hansard*, it is unreasonable and a waste of time to pursue the attitude that they have already expressed.

The State scheme will control commitments on the same basis as the Commonwealth for the first time this financial year. For this reason the State allocation of \$192 000 is solely for commitments made and paid in the current financial year. Funds to meet commitments made by the commission last financial year have been advanced to it and held for this purpose. The commitment level for Commonwealth legal assistance is \$1 184 000 and represents 4 400 commitments at an average value of \$269. These funds will provide legal assistance in the areas of family law, other Commonwealth law, and State criminal and civil law to persons in receipt of Commonwealth payments in the form of social services, to members of the defence forces, etc.

The commitment level for the State has been set at \$480 000. Provision has been made in the State funding for a reserves of \$129 000 to be kept to meet any unforeseen circumstances. These funds will be released on the

approval of the Treasurer only if, for reasons beyond the commission's control, it is not possible to operate within the State's financial allocation of \$355 000. I think that broadly explains the respective areas of responsibility that prevail between the State and the Commonwealth.

I ask members opposite before asking further questions, to note details of the schedule which I have had inserted for the purposes of providing itemised expenditure and details of the programme set down for the funding of the Legal Services Commission for the current financial period.

Mr. DUNCAN: The information that the Minister has provided has merely indicated that the fears that the member for Playford and I had originally were fully justified. I base that statement on the information provided by the Minister that the State allocation and legal aid available from the State vote will, for the first time, be available on the same basis as from the Commonwealth. It is well known that the Commonwealth has made legal aid available on a penny-pinching and very restricted basis that has precluded many people who have a legitimate right and need of legal aid from obtaining it. I believe that this is the very basis of why the vote has been cut. It is clearly a case of changing the means test.

Obviously, the new State Government has decided to change the means test so that people in this State will not be able to obtain legal aid next year on the same terms as those on which they have been able to obtain it in the previous year. That will mean that 25 per cent of the people who previously have been able to obtain legal aid will no longer be able to do so. Not only that, but it is also an example of penalising an organisation because of efficiency. The Legal Services Commission in South Australia has been one of the most efficient arms of Government and has been able to offer services on a very competitive basis compared to the private legal profession,

and that has been of considerable concern to the private legal profession.

I have no doubt that the reason why we are seeing a reduced vote this year compared to last year is a desire to ensure that fewer people are able to obtain their just and needed legal aid services from the Legal Services Commission, to ensure that they are forced to go to the private legal profession, where they will pay full tote odds. I make one point for the Minister dealing with this matter. I think that every member on this side has sympathy for him, because he has been thrust into this debate without any prior warning from the Attorney-General that he would run into this problem, and he has no legal background or understanding of the issues involved.

The 35-65 per cent split between the Commonwealth and the State simply relates to the question of the administrative cost, not to the question of the actual cost of the provision of legal aid in each individual case. That is determined by the need and the demand. I seek information from the Minister as to just what is this Government's policy in relation to the means test to be applied for the provision of State legal aid. It seems that tonight we are seeing this Government getting stuck into the poor. It is reducing the means test so that it will be more difficult than ever for people to obtain legal aid where their matters are South Australian matters. I am seeking important information, and the Minister ought to make it available in the debate tonight.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I will request my colleague that that information be provided for the honourable member. Before he and his colleagues pursue this subject of the responsibilities of the Legal Services Commission further, they should take note of my reference to the \$129 000 that has been provided by the State Government in a reserve fund to cover unforeseen circumstances during the period. If one adds that amount to the \$484 000, one is as near as damn it to the figure allocated last year.

On that basis, I cannot see the justification for the hopping around that has been demonstrated by one or two members on the other side up to date. I hope that the member for Elizabeth recognises the simple sum that might be done with the line that has been provided and the reserve fund to which I have already referred.

Mr. McRAE: Having listened to that reply, I am more puzzled than ever. Why is there an allocation of \$484 000 if there is a secret fund of \$129 000 located somewhere in this document (I do not know where it is) on which people can fall back? The Minister is correct because, if one does add on the \$129 000, one is not getting the full 25 per cent reduction, but one is going a long way towards picking up the differential. That is a most extraordinary way for any Government to act. I can only assume that really what is intended is that strict guidelines have been handed down to the commission but, to cater for quite unforeseen circumstances, such as a large number of protracted criminal trials or some unforeseen contingency of that nature, that sum is provided. I suspect one of two things: either such a reserve has always been provided—and the member for Elizabeth may be able to help me.

Mr. Duncan: That is not the case.

Mr. McRAE: I gather from my colleague that that is not so and, in the absence of precedent, I am all the more puzzled. I hope that the Minister will try to get the message through to his colleague in another place that his attitude at the moment is just not good enough. The Minister in another place is misleading Parliament, handing us a load of tripe and giving misleading information, secret funds are being hidden away, and we would never have got to know about that unless we put this question, and suddenly, when we did ask the question,

out pops \$129 000 from somewhere, although I do not know where the line is that approves it. I do not know what is the explanation for all this, but I hope that the Minister will try to get the Attorney to work a little more efficiently and better in the future, because this is not good enough for the House of Assembly.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I do not think there is any point in repeating the replies I have already given the honourable member. No question that he raised during his remarks a while ago demanded any more attention than the assurance I had given him in reply to his previous question. I said, in relation to this line, that the Attorney-General would provide all of the information that was relevant to the subjects that he had raised, and he simply raised them for the second time when he was last on his feet.

Mr. McRAE: Will the Minister obtain from his colleague the information which I have just been seeking and the explanation for the reserve fund of \$129 000?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Chairman, I draw your attention and seek your ruling on Standing Order 422, which provides:

In Committee (except when an Appropriation Bill, a Public Purposes Loan Bill, or a Supply Bill is being considered) no member, other than the member in charge of a Bill or motion, shall speak more than three times on any one question nor for more than fifteen minutes . . .

Does this apply to members opposite?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mathwin): It does not apply to this debate.

Mr. McRAE: After that somewhat inept point of order I will try to get back to my question.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Will the member for Playford be seated? I remind the committee that on many previous occasions a former Chairman, perhaps even the honourable member, pointed out the repetition of questions and stated that honourable members should not turn this debate into a second reading debate. In the Committee stage, the Minister is to be questioned.

Mr. McRAE: The trouble was that there was no point of order at all. Will the Minister obtain a reply from the Attorney-General, in particular relating to the reserve fund of \$129 000, and report to the House today?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I am not in a position to give an assurance that the information sought by the honourable member, other than the information I have given relating to this line, will be available today. I can assure the honourable member (for the third time) that the information will be made available by the Attorney-General as quickly as possible. In a further attempt to conclude the questioning on this line, I remind the member for Playford that the commitment level of the State has been set at \$484 000. Provision has been made in the State's funding for a reserve of \$129 000 to be kept to meet any unforeseen circumstances. These funds will be released only on the approval of the Treasurer, if, for reasons beyond the commission's control, it is not possible to operate within the State's financial allocation of \$355 000. I am not personally aware of the details of expenditure that may be applicable to cases yet to come; I am not even aware of the detailed expenditure applicable to those specific cases that incurred costs since 30 June 1979, and I am doubtful that any member here or the Attorney-General himself would, off the cuff, be able to give that detail. I assure the member for Playford that every effort will be made to obtain the information that he and members on his side seek from the Attorney-General and I undertake to make that request on behalf of this Committee.

Mr. McRAE: Now I am more worried than ever.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: That is the second time it has been relayed to the Committee.

Mr. McRAE: I know now that the figure of \$484 000 that appears is not correct. According to the Minister's own explanation, the figure should be \$355 000. A sum of \$355 000 has actually been made available, with the potentiality of another \$129 000; in other words, the legal aid funding has been cut by not 25 per cent but by nearer to 45 per cent. The Minister is swearing and cursing; I can hear him. He is generally not displaying himself in a very good light. Is it a fact that under the proper allocation of moneys to the State, not subject to the special dispensation of the Treasurer, the allocation for legal aid is \$355 000?

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: I think the honourable member knows as well as I do that the total of \$484 000 is shown adjacent to this line for legal aid services. That is the State's contribution to legal aid. Of that sum, \$129 000 is available at the Treasurer's discretion for release as the result of unforeseen circumstances.

Mr. McRae: It took us a long time to find that out.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: If the honourable member had read the line and the adjacent figure in the first instance, and listened carefully to the explanation I gave earlier in this debate, he would have understood what had occurred.

Earlier, I said there was a considerable amount of statistical detail relating to these figures that I was prepared to insert into *Hansard*. I sought leave to have that information inserted without being read. I thought that honourable members opposite would have the courtesy to accept that, and in turn it would have been available to them. Obviously, they were not satisfied with that and wanted to press on. I am pleased to note the nod of assent from the member for Playford; he has got what he wanted, although he has taken a long and tedious route to obtain it and taken up much time, unnecessarily, I think. If any further detail is required in relation to this line by any honourable member I give them the same assurance; my colleague the Attorney-General in another place is a reasonable and co-operative fellow and he will provide that information.

Vote passed.

Corporate Affairs Commission, \$1 167 000.

Mr. DUNCAN: I seek information in relation to the line "Contingencies—Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries". The proposed allocation has risen to \$225 000 from an actual payment of \$139 912. What is the reason for that increase?

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: There was a saving of \$13 000 on the amount voted for 1978-79. The proposed increase for 1979-80 is to meet the administrative costs of the spending activities of the Corporate Affairs Department, including some provision for the introduction of a micro-film system for company documents, increased travelling expenses, and other company expenses in respect to the establishment of the National Companies and Securities Commission. It is also to cover the costs of hiring and using telex equipment that is to be installed as a link-up between the States and Territories when the national commission commences operation.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I seek information on the line "Deputy Commissioner, Assistant Commissioner, Manager Registration, inspectors, legal officers and clerical staff". Proposed expenditure is \$797 352, which is an increase on actual payments last year of about \$200 000. What does that increase imply in regard to any proposed regionalisation of services by the Corporate Affairs Department? Is it proposed to set up regional offices? I

believe there is a demand in outer areas and in some major country areas. People in South Australia will then have more ready access to redress matters coming to the attention of the Minister of Corporate Affairs.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: That increase is caused by the employment of two additional legal officers for 1979-80. I am not aware of any specific provision for the setting up of any additional regional offices of this department. I will obtain details of the Attorney-General's programme and make them available to the honourable member.

Mr. KENEALLY: Did I understand the Minister to say in answer to the query raised by the member for Salisbury that the additional \$200 000 for that line was to be used for the employment of two additional solicitors? Is that in fact what the Minister is informing the Committee?

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: No, not entirely. Indeed, as a result of employing people (as the member for Stuart would well know) there is equipment and facilities that have been acquired in order for them to function effectively. I shall spell out in detail what has been provided. The increase in the provision for salaries and wages for 1979-80 has been caused by the employment of two additional legal officers, securities industrial officer, two office assistants employed in the micro-film project, and four other officers whose positions have been transferred from the South Australian Health Commission with the approval of the Public Service Board. The back-up staff and the additional clerical staff required in connection with those two additional legal officers account for the increase. These appointments have been made collectively pursuant to the Government initiatives and policies approved last year.

Mr. KENEALLY: I thank the Minister for the additional information. I would suggest that if he gave a full answer to queries when they were raised it would not require members to—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! What line is the honourable member referring to?

Mr. KENEALLY: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Chairman. The line I am referring to is "Deputy Commissioner, Assistant Commissioner, Manager Registration, Inspectors, Legal Officers and Clerical Staff" which has a vote of \$797 352 for 1979-80 as opposed to \$583 978, which was the amount of actual payments for 1978-79. I was replying to a statement by the Minister. I hope that I am in order proceeding with this. We asked the Minister what the increase of \$200 000 accounted for, and he informed us that it accounted for two additional solicitors. Then, as a result of additional questions, we found out that it was for seven other officers as well. My suggestion was that, if the Minister supplied us with all the information when it was asked for, there would be no need for additional questions. I believe that that was completely in order. I wonder why I was called to order.

Mr. PAYNE: I refer to the line "Commissioner," with an amount voted for 1978-79 of \$31 662, which presumably is the salary of the Commissioner and related payments. The amount paid in the previous year was \$35 131, and I am rather surprised that the Minister has not proffered some sort of explanation. The amount proposed for 1979-80 is only \$33 982. Presumably it is proposed to rip some of his salary off him. I do not see why.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: The information that I have indicates that the salary payable is in accordance with the main classification for the Commissioner. I would like to take this opportunity to say that I recognise the point made by the member for Stuart when he last rose. I accept the comments that he made in relation to my reply to the member for Salisbury. Indeed, had I completely outlined

the ancillary staff and additional services that were on record other than the two legal officers, it would have avoided a further question from the member for Stuart. However, members now have all the information that I have available to me on that particular line.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I seek information under "Contingencies—Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries." The proposed vote has increased by a considerable amount on the actual payments for 1978-79. I accept the fact that obviously one must group certain minor expenses, but under this particular line we have an increase of a fairly considerable amount. I ask the Minister to supply information as to exactly where the increase in expenditure is going to take place.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I answered that question, when the honourable member's colleague raised it in exactly the same way. That reply is on record.

Mr. DUNCAN: That is not correct. The Minister is confused. Previously, he answered questions relating to administration expenses under the "Contingencies" heading.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: That is the one: "Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries". That question was raised by the member for Napier and another colleague, and was answered earlier.

Mr. Duncan: Then one of us is confused.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: It must be you.

Mr. DUNCAN: To avoid confusion, I will seek information regarding the purchase of office machines and equipment.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: A saving was effected in 1978-79 because of the non-purchase of some equipment. The 1979-80 provision is to meet the cost of purchasing microfilm equipment, to which I referred earlier.

Mr. PAYNE: I realise the difficulties in confronting the Minister when he is not the Minister concerned. He may therefore appreciate the following information. I understand from the member for Elizabeth that the sum paid last year, as distinct from that which is proposed this year, might well involve sums that were paid to the Commissioner in relation to an overseas visit.

Mr. DUNCAN: I seek information regarding the number of matters under investigation at 30 June 1979; the number of persons prosecuted in the year ended on that date; the number of companies that had ceased to operate up until 30 June 1979; the number of new companies registered to that date; the number of investigations that were under way at 30 June 1979; the number of investigations which were under way as at 30 June 1978 and which were still under way at 30 June 1979; and the number of investigations that were under way at 30 June 1977 and were still under way at 30 June 1979.

Those are important statistics, as they will demonstrate the important work being done by this department. It will be useful to have those figures on record so that in future it will be possible for members to compare the statistics for previous years with those of ensuing years, thereby getting some idea of the work being done. All members will realise that, regrettably, there has been a continuing increase in the number of corporate and white collar crimes.

Unless these statistics are produced, members cannot get a fair picture of exactly how important the work of this department is.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I will ask the Attorney-General to consider providing the material being sought by the member for Elizabeth. I point out that I cannot guarantee that that material will be provided to the extent requested. I am amazed that the honourable member, who was Attorney-General for a number of the years about

which he seeks information, did not see fit to obtain that information while having access to it as Minister. It is rather incredible that he should be setting out to cause the sort of tremendous expense involving the material that he requires. I do not wish to reflect any further on the honourable member, but it is no wonder that he was sacked eight months ago from that job if he failed to keep abreast of the information that he now states is so important.

Mr. DUNCAN: I was simply seeking to put on record information that would be interesting to honourable members. I am pleased to see that the sleeper for Todd is awake again, paying attention and doing his job in the Chamber for the constituents he seeks to represent. The point I make is that the information I seek is basically available in the department. Surely, the Minister does not suggest that I should have left the department with the files containing this information. I think it is information that ought to be made public. It is not information of a confidential nature. I have not asked for the names of the companies being investigated at present; I have simply asked for statistical information as to the workings of the department.

As the information already exists, my request to have it made public is not irresponsible as the Minister suggested. I think it is desirable that that information should be made available to all members. I point out to the Minister that this information, once provided, should be kept up to date and supplied to the office of crime statistics so that this information about white collar and corporate crime can be incorporated into those quite valuable reports produced by the office of crime statistics, which I have no doubt every member has seen and which I believe are the best criminal statistics available in any State of Australia.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mathwin): Order! I think the honourable member is straying from the line.

Mr. DUNCAN: I am happy to leave the matter at that, if the Minister will seek that information for me and have the office of crime statistics undertake this work for me.

Vote passed.

Industrial Affairs and Employment, \$5 188 000.

Mr. WRIGHT: I refer to the line "Motor Fuel Licensing Board—Members' fees", under the heading, "Administration and Research Division": \$21 220 was actually spent last year, \$27 000 having been voted, and \$23 000 is now proposed. Can the Minister explain the increase on the sum spent? More importantly, I am concerned about the attitude that the new Government will adopt towards the Motor Fuel Licensing Board itself. Having had experience in my short term as Minister in dealing with this board, I was aware of the tremendous task that it had to perform and of the magnificent manner in which it performed. It had the responsibility of allocating licences, and the like, but more importantly the board acted as a buffer between the oil companies and the agents who were working for those companies. On some occasions I asked the board to arbitrate on disputes between those companies and the agents. Sometimes it was successful and sometimes not quite so successful. Nevertheless, I see value in having the board continue, and I seek information on the Government's attitude to the future of the board.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: On the first point the member has raised concerning fees for this year, there has been an increase from about \$21 000 to \$23 000. To my knowledge there has been no actual increase in the overall amount paid. Members should appreciate the basis on which the three members of the board are paid. The members are Mr. Quick (Chairman), Mr. Crimes (a former member of this House), and Mr. Nyland. The Chairman of the board receives an annual fee of \$3 500 and the two members,

\$2 750. In addition, the Chairman receives \$140 a day and the members \$110 for public hearings. Quite obviously we do not know at this stage how many public hearings there will be during the current financial year. Some allowance has been made in working out the lines, bearing in mind that last year those public hearings were fairly minimal. I believe that perhaps some allowance has been made for a marginal leeway in those public hearings.

The Government has made no decision on the role that this board should play. I would like to have a look at some information about it. There is a question on the Notice Paper, and the information being supplied in answer to that question is interesting.

It shows that the number of service stations in the metropolitan area (I think it relates to the metropolitan area) is fairly static. At any rate, the number of service stations is now fairly static. I assure the honourable member that obviously he will know if there is a change in policy: I will inform him.

Mr. WRIGHT: Can the Minister tell the Committee whether he has at this stage received any documentation by way of a report from the department, recommending the future of the Motor Fuel Licensing Board?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I think what is circulating around the department is, frankly, for the department's information. I think it is beyond the Minister's ability to start disclosing to this place all the information that goes through and all the various Government recommendations and dockets. The important thing is when something is decided on those matters and, of course, the member will be informed of that.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I seek information regarding the provision for the Deputy Director, Industrial Registrar, Deputy Industrial Registrar, investigation officers, project officers and clerical staff in the Industrial Relations Division. The vote for this financial year has been increased by about \$200 000. I take it that there will be an increase in the number of staff in that area. Where will the staff be going, and will they be investigation officers and project officers, or mainly clerical staff?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I tend to agree with the honourable member that it appears to be a fairly substantial increase in salaries. The amount provided is for salaries of Mr. M. C. Johnson, Deputy Director of the department responsible for that area, 37 administrative and clerical positions at the Industrial Court and Commission, 27 investigation officers, seven project officers, and associated clerical staff. There is no provision for any increase in staff, but some officers are entitled to an annual incremental payment.

Mr. O'NEILL: Regarding the provision under the Administration and Research Division for administrative, clerical and general staff, there seems to be a reduction from the actual payment last year of about \$233 000. Does that indicate a reduction in staff and, if so, how many and in what classifications?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I would need to get the relevant information, but I will give the information that I have here. I suspect that one reason may be that some persons have transferred from one section of the department to another in some of the minor adjustments that have taken place. That may account for the increase in staff in the previous case and the decrease here. I assure the honourable member that the department operates under the strict freeze on growth applied by the former Government, and the former Minister would know that the number in the department was assessed at, I think, 1 July this year. It will be assessed again at 30 June next year and, in the period between, there can be no increase in staff numbers.

The amount provided is for the salaries of 57 administrative, research, general and clerical staff, the number employed at 30 June 1979. That is the staffing limit placed on that area. Many of the staff are entitled to an annual incremental payment during the financial year. The substantial reduction in the amount provided for the year, compared to expenditure in 1978-79, is due to the transfer for administrative purposes of 42 clerical staff to other divisions of the department. This reduction is partly offset by the transfer to this division of 12 staff from the Research Branch.

That highlights what I have speculated one earlier, that there has been an adjustment from one department to another of staff members. According to my notes, it occurred before 30 June, 1979. Presumably, it occurred under the previous Minister, who might like to explain it to his colleague outside the Chamber.

Mr. WRIGHT: As \$771 618 was voted for 1978-79 and \$812 469 was the actual payment for administrative, clerical and general staff, and as there was a pay-roll tax allocation of \$180 830, why is there a reduction of over \$200 000 in the allocation, especially as there is an increase of about \$21 000 in pay-roll tax? Can the Minister say why there has been an increase in respect of a pay-roll tax when there has been a reduction in that situation?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: No, I cannot answer that. The pay-roll tax should be lower if the pay-roll is lower, especially in the light of the Bill that was passed earlier today. I will try to obtain an explanation on that line. The adjustment of staff from one section, that is, from the Administrative and Research Division to the Industrial Relations Division occurred under the previous Minister, and he would know the details.

Mr. BANNON: I should like to pursue the matter in relation to the missing staff. The member for Florey raised this matter under the administrative clerical and general staff line and suggested that a reduction of staff must have occurred, having regard to a reduction from an actual payment of \$812 000 last year to \$549 000 proposed this year. The Minister suggested that this may be due to the transfer of staff to other divisions, but I refer the Minister to the Industrial Democracy and Research Division, where there is an allocation of about \$335 000 spent last year, yet no allocation is made for 1979-80, the notation stating that that allocation is now provided under other divisions.

On looking around one can find a possible other division in the Employment Division, where a sum of \$216 000 is provided for the Assistant Director, Project Officers and Clerical Staff. Significantly, this is \$119 000 less than the provision under the Industrial Democracy and Research Division and, if one couples that with the \$263 000 difference in the administrative, clerical and general staff area, one has a total of over \$382 814 less in the wages bill, which suggests a lot of staff, particularly when inflation has to be accounted for. Am I right?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Leader should look at some of the other divisions as well.

Mr. Bannon: In other departments?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: In this department. The staff of the Unit for Industrial Democracy was transferred to a number of other divisions. Some were transferred to the Employment Division, and there is an adjustment there relating to the Assistant Director. There is likely to be an adjustment because of the allocation of a specific director in that area. Some were also transferred to the Industrial Relations Division. This perhaps answers the earlier question I was asked about why there had been a \$200 000 increase.

I cannot give the exact allocation for each division, but a

substantial number of people, including Mr. Connelly (who is now in charge of the Employee Participation Branch), went from the Unit for Industrial Democracy to the Industrial Relations Division. That increase must be taken into account. I can assure honourable members that staff numbers of the entire department at this stage are being held according to the freeze imposed by the previous Government on 1 July or 30 June. At this stage, no instructions have been issued otherwise.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am trying to elicit from the Minister exactly to where the staff have been transferred and from where they came. This is rather difficult to pick up, and I do not expect the Minister to know where all the bodies are now. Is it possible for the Minister to say what has taken place in the department regarding transfers? Is it also possible for the Minister to provide a detailed list of names, positions, previous classifications, new classifications, the department involved and the duties?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I will certainly obtain that information for the honourable member. I can give a rough approximation at the moment (and I ask not to be held to these figures—I am sure the honourable member would not do that). About seven or eight people went from the Unit for Industrial Democracy to the Industrial Relations Division. A number of people went to the Employment Division—in fact, the balance of people went there. I understand that three people have been lost to other departments. An answer to a Question on Notice, which, I think, might have been given today (or it will certainly be given next week) indicates where those transfers occurred. I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked the question to which I refer. The answer indicates that two of the staff members have been transferred to the staff of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rann, who was formerly a press secretary to the previous Government, still held a position within the Unit for Industrial Democracy. Theoretically, there were 27 positions within the unit, but a substantial number of those positions were either vacant or temporarily vacant because people had been seconded elsewhere within the previous Government's administration. I will obtain the information for which the honourable member has asked. I cannot give detailed information at the moment.

Mr. WRIGHT: I thank the Minister for that information; I did not expect him to be able to provide more information tonight, but I am grateful that it will be provided in the future. Regarding "Deputy Director, Industrial Registrar, Deputy Industrial Registrars, Investigation Officers, Project Officers and Clerical Staff", \$741 250 was voted in 1978-79; actual expenditure amounted to \$773 715. A sum of \$972 000 is proposed for this year, which represents a fairly substantial increase of about \$200 000. Has the Minister considered increasing the judiciary by one or more judges? If so, could he tell us what the decision has been?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is fair to say that the former Minister is just as well aware of the problems that are occurring in the Industrial Court as I am at this stage. There is a backlog, and it has caused considerable concern. In fact, shortly after taking over the position of Minister, it was drawn to my attention that there was a delay in hearing workers compensation cases that extended up until March of next year. The former Minister would be aware of that entirely unsatisfactory delay. An amendment was put through under the Workers Compensation Act that allowed a magistrate to hear certain compensation cases; that provision was not implemented by the previous Government. I was surprised that was not done, particularly in view of the backlog that has occurred. Being fully aware of the problem that exists,

in an attempt to alleviate the problem I sought and obtained Cabinet approval to appoint an acting magistrate to the Industrial Commission. That person has not yet been appointed but, when he is, his appointment should start to remove some of the backlog of workers compensation claims. At this stage I have not appointed an additional judge, and I hope that, by appointing an additional magistrate, who will take some of the workers compensation claim work load off the existing judges, the workload of those judges will be lessened and the need for an additional judge may not exist. I have made this initial move in the very short time we have been in Government. I am certainly aware of the problem, and I will certainly keep monitoring it to ensure that the backlog is not increased or that it does not stay where it is at present.

Mr. WRIGHT: I thank the Minister for that information, and add that it was my intention to make recommendations to Cabinet just prior to the election. As the Minister knows, there was a backlog, and the President had given me information based on the matter. I seek further information under this line in relation to commissioners. As the Minister would be aware, the position with commissioners for quite some time has been that they have been evenly divided between employee and employer organisations. That ratio has been honoured and adhered to over the last nine years of Labor Government. Does the Minister intend to appoint any more commissioners at this time, and does he see a need for any more commissioners? Secondly, is the Government contemplating in any way changing the ratio, which allowed even representation from those people who enjoyed some industrial skills as representatives of either employees or employers? The system has been an absolutely fair approach in the appointment of commissioners, and I believe that the appointment of commissioners has been extremely good. I do not believe there has been a failure of commissioners, because care and consideration have been given in choosing commissioners over the years. I would be concerned if the Government intended to change the routine that has been accepted not only by the Government but also by employer and employee organisations, which from time to time have heaped praise on the practice.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The honourable member's remarks somewhat astound me, because there has been a balance between commissioners coming from the employer and the employee sides, yet it was the honourable member, when Minister, who introduced a Bill into this House which tried to break that nexus. It was he who introduced a Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act earlier this year. The Bill raised a great deal of public debate during the election campaign. That Bill allowed the Minister to appoint only one additional industrial commissioner and therefore break that even balance between the two sides. In view of what the former Minister has said, I wonder whether he has reversed his earlier decision that that nexus could be broken. Certainly, I give an assurance to the former Minister that I have not considered a proposal to increase the number of commissioners at this stage, and I certainly cannot break that nexus without amending the original Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

Mr. WRIGHT: There needs to be an answer given to the allegation by the Minister that I was trying to break the nexus. What I was trying to do with the introduction of that Bill was to be in a position to appoint one commissioner at a time and not to break any nexus by playing favourites in appointing people from one side or another willy-nilly. The situation at the moment is quite simply that a problem occurs when an extra commissioner

may be needed. The way the Act is termed at the moment one needs to appoint two commissioners, otherwise one is not in a position to appoint any. There were going to be unqualified guarantees that the commissioners would still be drawn in the manner I have described. There was no attempt to set up a situation whereby the Labor Government would have been appointing them from one side of the political fence. I would not like the House to take any notice of the statement by the Minister implying that I was trying to break the nexus and play favourites in this particular regard.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I refer to the Industrial Relations Division. I am in no way trying to trip the Minister up, but I seem to be getting rather conflicting answers with regard to the increase of \$200 000 proposed for 1979-80. Originally I asked the Minister whether this would mean any increase in staff and, if so, in what area would the increase be. The Minister replied that there would be no increase in staff and that the increase would be taken up by incremental increases. Then the Leader asked a question dealing with the Industrial Democracy and Research Division, where it is indicated under the double asterisk that it is "Now provided under other divisions". The Minister said that this could explain the increase of \$200 000 where staff would be allocated from the Industrial Democracy and Research Division into the Industrial Relations Division. So we have had two conflicting answers tonight, and I am sure that the Minister may be able to clarify this. Again I ask the question, "Will there be any increase in that particular line in the staff of the Industrial Relations Division?"

The difference between the \$773 715 actually paid and the \$741 250 voted in 1978-79 would take into account incremental increases. How many additional people will be coming into the Industrial Relations Division under this line, and how much of the \$972 000 proposed for 1979-80 involves incremental increases?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: As I said earlier, there will be no further staff increases from this point on. Certainly that is indicated in the background notes with which I have been supplied. However, a transfer of people from the Unit for Industrial Democracy into this division has already occurred, and that accounts for at least a part of this year's increased allocation. If the honourable member so desires, I will obtain full details of staff numbers as at 30 June and as at this date, so that he can make a comparison on this basis. As I told the member for Adelaide, I understand that about four or five officers have been transferred to this division from the Unit for Industrial Democracy.

Mr. WRIGHT: What legislation, if any, is necessary for the appointment of an industrial ombudsman? How far advanced is such legislation, and does the Government intend to honour its election promise by appointing an industrial ombudsman?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Government has just initiated (one can imagine why, as it takes at least four or five weeks to set up the appropriate machinery) an examination of the policies announced by the Liberal Party during the recent election campaign and of what changes, if any, will be needed to legislation. The honourable member will realise that such changes take time to prepare. It was indicated clearly in His Excellency's Speech that this will be a brief session, and that certainly nothing will be introduced before Christmas.

Mr. HAMILTON: Will the Minister say whether the \$400 000 increase in the vote for the Industrial Safety Division indicates an increase in the number of officers employed in that division and, if it does not, what the amount represents?

Mr. WRIGHT: Does the Government intend to retain the Apprenticeship Commission? If not, what does it intend to do regarding apprenticeships generally in South Australia? Does it intend to reduce the period of apprenticeships? Will apprenticeships still be in existence, or will the Government move to a situation of training rather than of apprenticeships?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: In answer to the question asked by the member for Albert Park, the figure provides for the salary of Mr. Broughton, Assistant Director of the department, engineers, technical officers, safety officers, and all technical inspectors in the department. That includes chief inspectors, district inspectors, inspectors, industrial safety, boilers, lifts, shearers accommodation and clerical staff attached to the division. As at 30 June 1979, 107 officers were employed in the department. There is no provision for any increase in that number.

Turning to the Deputy Leader's question, it has been necessary to appoint an Acting Chairman of the Apprenticeship Commission because Mr. Hayes is, unfortunately, on extended sick leave. Mr. Hayes has provided excellent service as Chairman of the Apprenticeship Commission, and we all wish him a speedy recovery. As I understand, the previous administration was looking at merging the Apprenticeship Commission with the Training Committee. The present Government has decided to continue with that merger, so the Apprenticeship Commission may eventually take on a different role and be merged with the Training Committee. I point out that, as Minister, I cannot by an administrative decision alter the length of an apprenticeship course. The length of apprenticeships is laid down in industrial awards or under the Act, which would need to be altered before any change could occur.

Mr. O'NEILL: As the Minister indicated that there is going to be a freeze on employment growth, will he explain the 150 per cent increase in the allocation for the purchase of motor vehicles and what those vehicles are?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: This involves replacement vehicles. There is no increase in the number of vehicles. Replacement of vehicles does not occur on a regular annual basis. In some years there is an increase and in others a decrease. A standard procedure is adopted. I assure the honourable member that no additional vehicles are being purchased; these are simply replacements. Most, if not all, are four-cylinder vehicles. If I have any further information I will let the member know.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am not satisfied with the reply that I received from the Minister in relation to the future of the Apprenticeship Commission. First, I join with him in wishing Mr. Crawford Hayes a speedy recovery. I was not aware that he was still sick, although I knew that he was having some time off at the time of the election. I join with the Minister in saying that not only is he the only Apprenticeship Commonwealth Chairman in this State but also he has set a standard that ensuing Chairmen will find hard to surpass. I hope that he returns to good health quickly so that he can get back to the job.

Will the Minister give a guarantee that the Apprenticeship Commission will have its same role that it has had in the past, that it will have the opportunity to do the work that it has done in the past without any encumbrance, and that apprenticeships will remain as we have known them in the past?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I have not reviewed this area of the department as yet. I know that there is an advisory committee which has made recommendations to the previous Labor Administration. Until I have had a chance to see those recommendations and make some decision based on them, I am afraid that I cannot give the sort of

guarantee that the honourable member has asked for. I simply ask him to be reasonable in this and give me time to examine those recommendations.

I understood that the committee had made a recommendation that the Training Council and the Apprenticeship Commission be merged and that one board or commission carry on the existing role and functions of both. I do not see anything sinister in that and, as I understand it, the previous Government was looking at such a change. The honourable member must give me at least some time to look at the recommendations and report made under the previous Government.

Mr. WRIGHT: It is now necessary to remind the Minister about his Party's own policy. This is why I have been so concerned about the matter. The Apprenticeship Commission and its attitudes towards apprenticeships are vital for industry to maintain that very high standard of apprentices and excellent tradesmen that it has been possible to supervise over the years. I still have no guarantee from the Minister that that is going to be the policy. As I understand the policy of the Liberal Party at the last election, it was as follows:

A committee review of the indentured apprentice scheme will be instituted. The Apprenticeship Act will be replaced by an Industrial and Commercial Training Act, and the Apprenticeship Commission by an Industrial and Commercial Training Commission. The standard of industrial and commercial training within schools will be improved. A new training scheme will be introduced of one, two or three years according to the level of skill desired.

We have a situation at the moment where apprenticeships are for four years, but that policy does not refer to apprenticeships: it refers to training schemes. Those people who are interested in apprenticeships, particularly the trade unions, which are vitally interested, are entitled to receive from the Minister details of his Party's policy on the future of the Apprenticeship Commission.

Will training schemes operate under the Industrial and Commercial Training Act and the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission? It is obvious to me from those statements that the Apprenticeship Commission will not operate as it has operated in the past if the Government carries out its intended policy.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The honourable member should look at the broader policy statement on this rather than take a very abridged version. It is clearly stated in the policy statement that the Liberal Party intends to keep apprenticeships going. The Minister need have no fears at all on that. Apprenticeships will continue but I think the honourable member should be more definitive in his question. We are going to keep apprenticeships going but the role of the Apprenticeship Commission may change. I think the former Minister was considering changes for the Commission. In its policy statement, the present Government indicated that it would review the whole area. Despite that review, apprenticeships will continue.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I refer again to the provision of an additional \$200 000 for the Deputy Director, Industrial Registrar and other officers. I understand from the Minister's reply that this will provide another Commissioner to catch up on the backlog of industrial compensation cases. I welcome that situation but, in my experience of industrial compensation cases, in the past there has been a sad lack of these sorts of people to deal with cases. In some instances, there could have been at least a part payment of industrial compensation, based on a health or medical situation. Has the Government given this matter any thought? In the final analysis of a compensation case, there could be payment for a 30 per cent disability. However, before the matter is finally dealt

with, surely consideration should be given to, say, a 10 per cent payment in lieu.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: We have appointed an additional Industrial Magistrate, not an additional Commissioner. He sits on the workers compensation claims. Regarding the honourable member's question about the operation of compensation, I made a Ministerial statement here and released copies of it. All members should have copies but, if they have not, I ask them to tell me.

It was a discussion paper of the committee looking into the rehabilitation of injured people. I would ask the honourable member to look at that paper. The point he has raised could be a pertinent submission to the committee. The Government has adopted a policy and, until that committee finally reports, no substantial change will be made to workers' compensation. It would be quite inappropriate to do so. The committee is presently on tour. I suspect that certain members may be back in New Zealand and other members are in Canada. The committee recently spent a three-week period in Canada looking at the Canadian system of rehabilitation, and two members were to visit New Zealand on the way back to Australia to look at the 1974 amendments to the New Zealand Act, and to examine particularly how those amendments were introduced.

One of the key questions that needs to be answered now is whether we should throw out entirely the old Act and introduce a new one, or whether we should try to amend the existing Act. The Supreme Court of South Australia has been extremely severe in its criticism of the existing Act and the anomalies and loopholes within it. Members opposite might like to give some thought to making submissions to the inquiry. I would welcome such submissions.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I refer to the Industrial Safety Division and the line "Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board—Members' fees". I hope that the Minister will not say that the \$1 000 voted in 1978-79 is allocated again merely because that was the sum voted for the last financial year. Having spent much of my working life on the factory floor, I am concerned that insufficient care and training is given to workers about industrial safety. This is reflected in the many claims under workers' compensation provisions. Australia is paying lip service to industrial safety, especially as only \$420 was spent on board members' fees in comparison with the \$1 411 000 provided for "Assistant Director, Chief Inspector, engineers, scientific and Technical Officers, etc." Can the Minister give some assurance that more emphasis will be placed on the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board? This need not perhaps be in terms of members' fees. But the end result should be to achieve fewer claims under workers compensation, and less time off due to accidents. General safety of workers on the factory floor is what is needed.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I wholeheartedly endorse what the honourable member has said, that industrial safety is extremely important. Currently in South Australia, claims for workers compensation are costing the State more than \$1 000 000 a week. That is a substantial cost to industry in this State, and one can imagine the outcry that would ensue from industry if a new tax was imposed to collect more than \$1 000 000 a week from employers. That is what the Government is paying out in actual claims under workers compensation. The quicker safety standards can be improved, the better for the State and certainly for the viability of industry. Unfortunately, many employers and employees do not appreciate the importance of safety. Some employees blatantly breach

safety standards. Many employers do not insist on safety standards being upheld.

The secret to safety is to involve all the people in the work place in safety programmes. The responsibility for safety should not be given to only one person; all those doing the work should be involved. As new Minister of Industrial Affairs, I have certainly given considerable attention to this matter already. One of my early duties was to attend the National Safety Council to open a safety course. I was delighted that a number of Government employees participated in that course. In addition, I attended the presentation of safety awards launched by the member for Adelaide last June or July, and presented awards. Again, one or two Government departments participated. To my disappointment, only 16 entries, I think, were received for the whole of the State. It is abysmal that only 16 companies were prepared to submit some sort of presentation for a safety award. I endorse what the honourable member has said. In answer to his question, members of the committee receive \$30 a meeting and the sum for the entire year depends on how often the committee meets.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The Minister's answer to my question was not sufficient. There are two distinct questions in relation to the issue of a doctor's opinion; the Minister's answer raises one question and I raised another. Rehabilitation of the worker is involved. I remind the Minister that I have already read the document he cited in relation to this matter and I have said previously what I think of that document. Where a worker has, in fact, sustained a workers compensation injury, and is waiting for a medical opinion as to loss of function, if the doctor will not give a medical opinion as to the percentage of loss until he is absolutely sure, has the Government considered a *pro rata* payment before a final decision is given? A doctor could easily say that it would be anticipated that a workman might have lost, say, 30 per cent of the use of an arm or leg. In that case, the workman could be paid a *pro rata* settlement of 20 per cent. The employer and the insurance company would not lose because an additional payment would have to be made.

This in fact would ease the financial burden that is obviously placed on the worker. Has the Government given any consideration to that matter, or would it be prepared to do so?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Again, I thank the honourable member for his suggestion. I fully understood what he was saying the first time. The Government has a committee of inquiry looking into all aspects of workers compensation, and the appropriate place for the honourable member to make his suggestion is to that committee of inquiry. The Government will rely on that committee of inquiry making the first suggestion as to what changes should be made. I ask the honourable member not to ask the Government at this stage but to put his case to that inquiry. If his suggestion is accepted, the Government will then look at it. The procedure I have outlined is the correct one.

Mr. O'NEILL: I draw the Minister's attention to the line "Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries" and the following line "Apprenticeship subsidies—accommodation" which carries the notation that it was previously provided under Administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries. I refer to the problems that confront young people now—the high incidence of unemployment, and the necessity for young people to move away from their homes in pursuit of apprenticeships. As there is an increase of about \$33 000 this year, is that amount, or part of it, in relation to the apprenticeship subsidy for accommodation? If so, has

there been an increase or a decrease, and can the Minister inform me of the actual differential and whether it is up or down?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Are you looking at the differential between \$824 255 and the addition of \$695 000 plus \$162 500?

Mr. O'Neill: Yes, the sum of those two figures.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Before answering that question, I will give the honourable member the information he requested about motor vehicles. In fact, 50 motor vehicles will be replaced out of the total departmental fleet of 82; and the remainder of the motor vehicles are mainly four-cylinder. In relation to the subsidy, there is an increase—was it \$15 000?

Mr. O'Neill: I make a difference between the sum total of the two figures and last years allocation of \$33 000 upwards.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Some of that increase in allocation may be due to printing activities and other sundries in the first line. The bureau has been brought under the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, and certainly in the first line there is an allocation of \$15 000 for printing for the Youth Bureau. It would not have appeared before, and it would account for some of that increase. The subsidy for accommodation expenses of country apprentices attending block release training and technical colleges in Adelaide has previously been incorporated in the departments administration expenses under line 1. The estimate for this is now a separate line.

Certain decisions have been made in relation to this. First, the previous Government looked at abolishing the travel allowance from the place of accommodation in Adelaide to the place of training; that recommendation has been carried on by the new Government. However, with the savings from that, the Government has been able to provide finance to allow those apprentices who need to go interstate to receive their training to receive financial assistance in travelling interstate; previously, that has not been available.

I am pleased to be able (almost to the day within the 12 months that I took it up and within some three or four weeks of taking office) to make an announcement that the Government has now amended the policy, and employers, on behalf of apprentices who are required to travel interstate to get their block training, can now apply for travelling assistance. But certainly it still applies within the State. There is a travel allowance for the apprentice who, for example, needs to come to live at the Pennington Hostel to finish his block release course.

Mr. WRIGHT: I was not responsible for introducing workmen's compensation into this debate but, as it has come into the discussion, I will say something about it.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the matter raised by the honourable member strictly relates to the vote before the Committee.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am sure that you will tell me if I am not, Sir. The Minister and other members have been talking about workmen's compensation. Therefore I think I have some right to discuss that matter as well. I notice that the Minister made the point that the Government would take no action whatsoever with regard to amending the Workmen's Compensation Act until the report is made available by the inquiry committee. That seems to be a reasonable statement until one examines two or three aspects of the Workmen's Compensation Act. I refer to lump sum payment settlements, settlements for loss of limbs, and the like, and death, and so forth. This inquiry has now been going almost 18 months. I make no criticism whatsoever of the committee. I think the members of the

committee have been doing a very fine job, and I think they are approaching the subject in the right way. I have every confidence that when the committee reports it will give us all something to examine and see what is the best in the long term. I make no criticism of the committee or of the delay or any matter pertaining to the committee. What I am concerned about, and what I intended to do as Minister, was to move some amendments (they probably would have been moved by now, if not for the election)—

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Quite a few things would have changed.

Mr. WRIGHT: It is a pity that they were not; the State would have been much better for those things we intended to do. We do not break promises.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. WRIGHT: I had written to the Chairman of that committee, Mr. Burns, asking him certain questions in relation to the procedures and whether there were any objections, and also to clear the way to be able to move, with agreement of the committee and not to have to wait until the committee reported to amend these serious anomalies. I think the Minister (in one of his fairer moods) would agree that there is now a drastic anomaly in those areas that I have mentioned between other States. I am not sure that "drastic" is a strong enough word: there is a very big discrepancy. I do not see why injured workers in this State ought to be placed at a disadvantage for any longer period than they have. Will the Minister consider checking that correspondence that passed between me and Mr. Burns (and no doubt the rest of the committee) and will the Minister examine whether or not he can see his way clear to introduce amendments to overcome the anomalies which are explained in those letters?

Secondly, if the Minister is in trouble regarding the Government's policy in this area until the report is finalised, will he provide me with copies of my letter to the Chairman of the committee and of his reply to me as Minister?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The honourable member should examine on the Notice Paper a Question on Notice, asked I think by the member for Playford, which relates specifically to this matter. The honourable member should wait for the official reply to that question.

Mr. Wright: Not in relation to legislation. I am asking about legislation.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The member for Playford has asked about legislation on lump sum payments, and the honourable member should wait for that reply, which will probably be given next Tuesday. Regarding the other matters that the honourable member has raised, I will see whether the correspondence can be found.

Mr. HEMMINGS: This year's allocation of \$200 000 for the purchase of motor vehicles and equipment seems to be high, the vote for 1978-79 having been \$127 000, \$101 134 having been spent. One is tempted to think that every employee in the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment is driving a Government motor car.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Having twice answered this question, I suggest that the honourable member examine the reply I gave to the member for Florey.

Mr. WRIGHT: The Minister said that he would check to see whether the correspondence to which I referred earlier could be found. Although that correspondence is the property of the Department of Labour and Industry and the Government, I was responsible for initiating it, and I therefore consider that I should be entitled to copies thereof. Surely the present incumbent will not run such a tight ship that the former Minister cannot be provided with copies of such correspondence.

It is important that I refresh my memory regarding what

Mr. Burns said and, although I have a general, hazy idea of what he said to me, it is some months since I received that gentleman's reply. I should therefore like to ascertain what he said to me and I to him. So, will the Minister not only try to locate the correspondence but also give me a guarantee that he will provide me with copies thereof?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: As a matter of principle, I do not think it is good that general persons can ask Government departments to release correspondence. However, in the light of the honourable member's request, and because of the position that he formerly held, I will examine it.

I think that has implications. I would like to discuss the matter with Mr. Vernon and at least get his approval. I think that is reasonable. I am not going to be finicky about this matter, and I think the honourable member should be reasonable about it.

Mr. O'NEILL: There is no allowance for payment to consultants for services. Does that indicate that the Government does not intend to use the services of consultants in the coming year?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I will have to get an answer for the honourable member, as I cannot find that information at the moment.

Mr. WRIGHT: The Minister has made public statements relating to day labour in Government departments and about what is to happen to what he described as surplus staff being seconded to private contractors. We all know that, philosophically, this Government—

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, that has nothing to do with the Employment Division line.

Mr. Wright: I am talking about employment.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold the point of order, but I suggest to the member that he restricts his remarks to the matter under discussion.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: With due respect, Mr. Chairman, the matter raised by the member for Adelaide has absolutely nothing to do with the Employment Division of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. It is not a policy matter concerning that department. It does not involve the staff of that department or the research of that department.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the Deputy Leader repeat his question so that the Chair can give it proper consideration?

Mr. WRIGHT: I will ask the question under the line "Industrial Relations". I do not care which line I ask it under. I think that my question has to do with employment and with industrial relations. The Minister has made public statements about his intentions regarding the seconding of day labour to private contractors where there is surplus labour in a department. We are well aware that, philosophically, the Government—

The CHAIRMAN: I think that the Deputy Leader is out of order. He ought to raise this particular matter under the vote for Public Works.

Mr. WRIGHT: I think that it is an industrial relations matter. The Minister is on record as saying that the Trades and Labor Council ought to give him a further opportunity to tell it what is going on. He is flying a kite, at this stage. If he is going to deal with the Trades and Labor Council, surely it is an industrial relations matter. I put that to the Minister.

The CHAIRMAN: I remind the deputy leader that the information he seeks can be obtained under a different vote, and I suggest that he seeks the information at that stage. It can be obtained under the Public Works vote.

Mr. WRIGHT: I will be given the opportunity to pursue it then?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT: Can the Minister say whether or not the sum of \$7 062 for payments to consultants for services was paid to Mr. Tostevin for advising in relation to the dispute at Torrens Island. Is it a final amount?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The answer is "No". I can also answer the member for Florey now. The line mentioned covered expenditure for 1978-79 on account of consultants in connection with accounting and legal matters pertaining to industrial democracy, and no provision has been made in the current financial year. Mr. Tostevin's consultancy fee did not come out of that, and I think his fee will be paid out of this year's allocation and not out of last year's allocation.

Mr. WRIGHT: Is the Minister in a position to tell the committee the amount of Mr. Tostevin's consultant fees?

If he is not at this stage (and I make no allegations about whether he should or should not have it with him), could he obtain it for me, as I have an interest in it?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I do not have the costs, but I will get the information for the honourable member when it is finalised. I suspect that it is not yet finalised and therefore he may have to wait. A decision was handed down about four weeks ago. Professional fees for that consulting work may take a couple of months to be forwarded to the Government.

Vote passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.5 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 31 October at 2 p.m.