

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Thursday 25 September 1980

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

**PETITIONS: ENVIRONMENTAL UNIT**

A petition signed by 28 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to re-establish the Environmental Mutagen Testing Unit at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science was presented by the Hon. Jennifer Adamson.

A petition signed by 141 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to re-establish the Environmental Mutagen Testing Unit, to reinstate Dr. J. Coulter to his previous position and instigate an inquiry into the administration of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science was presented by Mr. O'Neill.

Petitions received.

**PETITIONS: RETAIL MEAT SALES**

Petitions signed by 164 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to oppose any changes to extend the trading hours for the retail sale of meat were presented by Messrs Glazbrook and Mathwin.

Petitions received.

**PETITION: WOMEN'S ADVISER**

A petition signed by 35 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to immediately appoint a women's adviser for education programmes was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: REDCLIFF PROJECT**

**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 wish to advise the House of the outcome of the Premier's visit to the United States to discuss the future of the proposed Redcliff petrochemical plant. Officials of the Dow Chemical Company have now informed the Premier that the company is unlikely to make a decision on the project for another two years. In these circumstances, and after lengthy discussions with top executives of the Dow company in Michigan, the Premier has expressed his bitter disappointment at the lack of a positive decision, although it has not been totally unexpected. Now, at least the people of South Australia know where they stand.

That is what the Premier went to the United States to establish. For the first time, we have a realistic picture of the situation after nine years of confusion and false hopes. The Premier has told Dow's President, Mr. Paul F. Orrefici, that the delay leaves the South Australian Government no alternative but to open the project to other developers as well as Dow. The Premier has informed me that Dow recognises and accepts this situation, although the company still hopes to be the

ultimate developer.

It still wants to be at Redcliff and regrets the delay which the company says has been caused by the current world-wide recession. Dow's senior staff have shown the Premier studies which indicate that, while demand for caustic soda by the Australian aluminium industry will be very strong, the recent recession in the United States has left the company with an excess of the associated chlorinated hydrocarbons. At the same time, the Premier has expressed his appreciation to the company that it will continue its detailed environmental impact and marine studies in Spencer Gulf at a cost of more than \$1 000 000. This will save time in the long run should the company eventually become the developer and will be of great assistance to the project.

Dow executives see the company's decision to continue with environmental studies as a tangible demonstration of the company's goodwill and determination to maintain a strong interest in the project. The Premier was not asked for, nor did he offer, any further Government incentives in relation to Redcliff. On the contrary, Dow was well aware that the current incentives offered would have to be renegotiated in the future. In all of the circumstances, the Government regrets this further delay in the project.

On the Government's coming to office last September, some significant matters in relation to Redcliff remained outstanding, such as the environmental assessment process and negotiation of feedstock prices. Such matters will continue to receive our attention, as will the future of the project generally. In this context, the Premier will fly to Tokyo tomorrow with Dr. Malcolm Messenger, Director of the Energy Division in my department, to have discussions with Japanese interests.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION'S INVITATIONS**

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Recreation and Sport):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The Government deplores the action and intentions of the Leader of the Opposition in sending invitations for a party at his home to members of the Public Service currently employed by the Department of Local Government, Department of Art Gallery, and Department of Recreation and Sport, all of which departments were grouped under Mr. Bannon's portfolio in the former Government. The party is to be held this Saturday evening, 27 September.

The invitations were individually addressed and forwarded to persons at their respective departments. The invitations feature copies of two proclamation notices: the first, dated 5 October 1978, proclaiming the bringing into existence of a new department and naming that department the Department of Community Development; and the second, dated 20 September 1979, proclaiming the discontinuance of that Department of Community Development. The first proclamation deals with the establishment of the new department, when the Leader of the Opposition became its Minister, and the second proclamation was issued immediately the new Liberal Government took office.

Members will recall that, at the same time, a new Department of Local Government was established, generally replacing the former Department of Community Development. On the invitation, between those two copies of proclamations are the words:

Is there life after death?

You are invited to explore the possibility at a party on

Saturday 27 September at John Bannon's place, 27 Olive Street, Prospect, from 8.30 p.m.

An RSVP is required by 25 September 1980, the telephone number being Mr. Bannon's electorate office. The clear implications conveyed by the invitation are that the Leader of the Opposition would like to discuss plans for the future resurrection of a Department of Community Development, to involve his former officers in the new department, and generally develop his Party's policy in conjunction with such officers. It can be seen, therefore, that this invitation poses a cruel dilemma to the individual public servant. If he, or she, accepts, the accusation can be made that they are sympathetic to the Opposition and, if they decline, they could fear being branded supporters of the Government.

A public servant, particularly a junior public servant, should never be placed in a position of having to make a judgment of this nature. The Leader of the Opposition should write personally to those to whom he has sent invitations, regretting that he has placed them in this most embarrassing and difficult position. The Government condemns the Leader of the Opposition in regard to this whole affair. He has placed conscientious public servants, who are respected by this Government for their high ethical standards, in a most invidious and embarrassing position, which adversely affects their morale—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:**—their morale, and may adversely affect their careers. He seeks to develop his own policy, with the aid of his former officers within the Public Service. From this it is not unreasonable to assume that he infers that those who come forward to his home and co-operate with him now, and tell him all that has happened within the Local Government Department and the other departments involved within the past 12 months, will gain their rewards in the unlikely event of a change of Government. He shows scant regard for the non-partisan and non-political principles of the Public Service generally—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:**—and disregards totally—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:**—the principle so vigorously and properly upheld by his own Party when in office—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Hartley.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:**—that, if an Opposition member wishes to contact a public servant in regard to a political matter, that contact should be made through the responsible Minister.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** On 13 November 1979, in a statement to this House, I indicated that I believed that Parliament was not being provided with sufficiently detailed information to enable informed debate on the health budget to take place, and that I intended to take steps to see that additional information was available to Parliament in the future.

In line with that intention, on 16 September 1980, I tabled certain financial and statistical information on

hospitals and health units. In order to provide Parliament with further information, I intend to table at the end of my statement a document entitled "Minister of Health—South Australian Health Commission: Information supporting 1980-81 Estimates of Expenditure".

The document includes preliminary allocations for health units for 1980-81. I emphasise that these allocations are preliminary at this time and have not necessarily been agreed with all health units. Also included in the document is the 1979-80 Budget statement, showing 1979-80 expenditure against budget for recognised hospitals and nursing homes and mental health services.

The manner in which the information in this document is presented highlights the accountability and responsibility of individual health units in regard to their share of the total health budget.

This information, in addition to that which has already been provided and will be made available to the Estimates Committee, is without doubt the most comprehensive and meaningful information that has been provided by any Government in respect of this State's health budget.

I now table the document entitled "Minister of Health—South Australian Health Commission: Information supporting 1980-81 Estimates of Expenditure".

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION'S INVITATIONS

**Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr. BANNON:** I think we have come to a pretty sorry state when the social contacts and social and private dealings of a member of Parliament are subject to a Ministerial statement and censure in this place. I would like to make quite clear that the invitation referred to in the statement just made by the Minister of Transport is purely social. It refers to the fact that, for a period of some 12 months, I was a Minister of the Crown involved in forming a new department, which no longer exists in Government, and in the course of the formation of that department I dealt personally and directly with a number of individuals who were working colleagues during that time. Now, on the anniversary of two years since the establishment of that department and 12 months since its dissolution by the new Government, I have arranged a purely social function to which I have invited members of my staff and others who were personally and directly involved with me in the work that was undertaken at that time.

There is absolutely no ulterior motive involved; in fact, the response has been extremely gratifying. I have stressed at all times that this is not an occasion to discuss the policies of the Government; it will be a private function in my own home. I am not at all disturbed that the Minister has a copy of the invitation. Indeed, if I had been involved with the Minister in relation to the department, I would have been happy to extend an invitation to him, as was done when we held a reception for the Olympic Games athletes, who were so poorly treated by the present Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. BANNON:** I mention that because I think it is relevant to indicate that, just as that function did not have a political purpose but was a recognition of those sportsmen, as a result I quite properly invited—

**Mr. GUNN:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In view of your previous rulings in relation to personal

explanations, I ask you to rule that the Leader of the Opposition is going far beyond a personal explanation.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. I am listening carefully to the statement being made by the honourable Leader of the Opposition, and the moment he strays from his personal report I will draw his attention to that fact. I am having some difficulty maintaining a keen interest in what the honourable Leader is saying because of the amount of audible comment from both my right and my left.

**Mr. BANNON:** On that occasion, a number of persons in Government, who were involved in sporting activities, and the Minister himself, were invited to the function. The Minister chose to not even reply one way or the other, and that is his prerogative. On this occasion, again in a purely social context in my own home, I have simply invited a number of people, not members of specific departments but individuals with whom I had a close, strong working contact for a short time and with whom I simply wished to renew contact.

It seems completely outrageous and a slur to suggest that that is in some way improper, and I would like to place on record, because I think it is relevant, that there is absolutely no question (and my personal integrity is on the record in relation to this) that an attendance or refusal would in any way constitute a political statement by those individuals. I am behaving as a private individual, and I believe that this right should be respected. This is quite extraordinary.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader is now starting to debate the issue. I ask him to desist, and to stay within the bounds of a personal explanation.

**Mr. BANNON:** I simply say that this is a social occasion, with no political content. If the Minister believes otherwise, I invite him or any other members of the Government to submit lists of who attends parties, dinner parties or any other private social functions at their home. I believe it is not a matter of either public interest or public political controversy but, if that is how the Minister wishes to treat this matter, well and good—we will remember it.

#### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier (The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy) for the Treasurer (The Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—  
*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Lotteries Commission of South Australia—Auditor-General's Report, 1979-80.
- ii. State Government Insurance Commission—Auditor-General's Report, 1979-80.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy)—  
*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Pipelines Authority of South Australia—Report, 1979-80.
- ii. Auditor-General's Report, 1979-80.

By the Minister of Environment (The Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—Report, 1979-80.
- ii. Auditor-General's Report, 1979-80.
- iii. Libraries Board of South Australia—Report, 1979-80.
- iv. South Australian Local Government Grants Commission—Report, 1980.
- v. South-East Regional Cultural Centre Trust—Auditor-General's Report, 1979-80.
- vi. Pirie Regional Cultural Centre Trust—Auditor-

General's Report, 1979-80.

vii. Whyalla Regional Cultural Centre Trust—Auditor-General's Report, 1979-80.

viii. State Theatre Company of South Australia—Auditor-General's Report, 1979-80.

ix. West Beach Trust—Auditor-General's Report, 1979-80.

By the Minister of Health (The Hon. Jennifer Adamson)—

*By Command—*

- i. South Australian Health Commission—Information Supporting 1980-81 Estimate of Expenditure.

#### QUESTION TIME

##### REDCLIFF PROJECT

**Mr. BANNON:** Let us now turn from trivia to matters that concern the State, instead of wasting the time of the House.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader will come to the question.

**Mr. Lewis:** Question!

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Mallee will remain silent.

**Mr. BANNON:** My question to the Deputy Premier concerns the statement he made in relation to the question of Redcliff. Who did the Premier meet in the course of his discussions at Dow, at what level of employment and decision making were they in the company, and did he meet the full board of Dow? Further, will the Deputy Premier assure the House that, on the Premier's return, time will be made available to debate fully the Premier's statement on what arose out of his trip?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Premier met senior members of the board of Dow, including the Chairman, and had discussions with these people who are obviously in a position to give a decision for the company. That is the answer to the first part of the Leader's question. I am not prepared to make time available in the House to debate the Premier's statement. There is plenty of opportunity for the Leader to put a motion on notice for private members' time, if he desires to debate the matter. If we were to debate every statement made by Premiers and Leaders of the Opposition on matters even as important as this one is, there would be little else that we would do in this place. The Premier's statement, to which I have referred, is perfectly clear. If there is anything that the Leader does not understand, I suggest that he ask me a question.

##### NUCLEAR WARHEADS

**Mr. RANDALL:** My question relates to an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on 24 September. Can the Deputy Premier say whether a South Australian convoy carried nuclear warheads? Has he any further information about the question asked last Tuesday by the member for Mitchell, during which he stated that he had been told that a cargo containing nuclear warheads had been carried by a convoy of semi-trailers through South Australia? A scare has gone up in the community because of the publication on Wednesday of the reply to this question. This has been coupled with items and articles in the press. The *News* has been carrying a comprehensive series about nuclear warfare. One article in that series pertains to what would happen if a nuclear warhead hit the city of Adelaide. A detailed account, including a map, is given of the problems it would cause to this community and the danger of nuclear fall-out. I believe that, in view of this concern throughout

the community, and of the scare that the Opposition has caused, the Deputy Premier should outline to the House any further information he has.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I was not surprised that the question was asked in the House, because one would realise that this matter could find its way into the newspapers. The simple way to find out would have been for the honourable member to contact the relevant federal authorities, as I suggested in my reply. As a result of the publicity he was successful in generating in the press, a representative of the defence forces contacted my office and, as a result, I have some information from that officer. I can assure the House that the convoy did not carry any nuclear warheads. It was a convoy of 14 semi-trailers carrying 160 tonnes of conventional bombs, rockets and ammunition from Sydney to Learmonth, in Western Australia. The purpose of the convoy was to supply an exercise to be carried out next month by Royal Australian Airforce Mirages.

**An honourable member:** At Nookanbah?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The honourable member was not too sure where the convoy was travelling. He knew that it was in Western Australia, but he was not too sure whether it had gone through South Australia. What was put forward was fairly vague. Let me continue with the facts. The convoy passed through Broken Hill, Port Augusta and Ceduna on its way to Western Australia. There was no danger at all to the public. The convoy travelled at 60 km/h the whole way; there was a 75 metre space between each trailer; and none of the material carried contained fuses.

#### SOUTHERN AREA BOAT RAMP

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Can the Minister of Marine say why the Government is commissioning consultants to report on a suitable site for a boat launching ramp on the coastline south of Adelaide, and what information does the Minister believe that the expenditure of some thousands of dollars on this exercise will give him over and above what he could have received from a round-table conference consisting of the Director of his department, someone from the Coast Protection Board, the Mayor of Noarlunga and me? The member for Mawson can come along if he wants to. I am in the Minister's debt for his courtesy to me in, first, allowing me to bring a deputation to him earlier in the year to discuss this matter and then, secondly, prereleasing to me a statement which appeared in the press today. I thank the Minister for his courtesy. That statement makes clear that the Minister has commended MacDonald, Wagner and Priddle to conduct a study of the associated community and environmental factors and to detail a site for a protected boat launching facility. It has been put to me that in fact very thorough studies were made on this matter at the time of the previous Government, and that the city of Noarlunga had reached an advanced stage of negotiations for land acquisition last August and a proposal for presentation to Cabinet was at that time near completion. It is put to me that this letting of a contract to consultants could be nothing more than a further example of the high cost of small Government.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** The kind offer of the member for Baudin to make himself freely available is a munificent gesture to South Australia and to the small boat owners in the State. The best information that I was able to obtain from officers of the Department of Marine and Harbours is that this is a dangerous area, as I am sure the honourable member appreciates. It is one of the most dangerous areas

of coastline in the State, if not in Australia for small craft, which, when they are out in the gulf, are susceptible to storms and have nowhere to go. I have had numerous requests from small boat owners for such a boat haven south of Adelaide. It is quite true that much relevant information is already available, but the difficulty is in relation to the site. The site about which the honourable member speaks is alongside a cliff, and it would cost a considerable sum to provide access to the water's edge. The water in the area is deep and will necessitate a large breakwater. If we are to have a facility, it should not be a short, sheltered breakwater that will provide a facility for only a few boats. I am sure the honourable member is also not insensible to the attitudes of some of the residents in that area in relation to the setting up of a boat haven that will attract many visitors and tourists to the area.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** But nobody lives north of the refinery.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** We are not only looking north of the refinery; we are looking at a considerable length of coastline in that area. After deep consultation with experts in the Department of Marine and Harbours, it was decided that we should have a broad look at the options available, something not yet done. That is why we have engaged MacDonald, Wagner and Priddle as consultants. I believe they have the best marine engineer in Australia on their staff. It is not an inconsiderable price to pay, since this facility could cost more than \$1 000 000.

I hope that it will be constructed in such a way that it can be extended, and that a parking space will be built that will cater for a large number of motor cars of visitors and people who use the facility. This is a very big industry, and a few dollars, comparatively speaking, spent at the outset will be of benefit to the community and to the people whom the honourable member represents, because this project will affect people who have no interest in boating whatsoever. The consultants will look at the social effects of the project, and consider the effect on the environment. There will be an in-depth study of what will be required to provide a highly beneficial amenity to the people who practise this very recreative pastime. I am sure that the consultants will produce a report that even the honourable member, with his expertise, will appreciate. I certainly appreciate the attitude and generosity displayed by the Port Noarlunga council, because it has offered a considerable amount of money. This will depend, of course, on where the facility is sited. The Government is looking to do something for the small boat industry in this State. I take on board the generous offer of the honourable member. I hope that when the consultants know about it they will have consultations with him. I can assure him that the Government is sincere in its efforts to ensure that the people south of Adelaide have a facility that is worthy of the recreative pastime that they do so much for.

#### LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION'S INVITATIONS

**Mr. OLSEN:** Can the Deputy Premier inform the House of the previous State Government's attitude to Opposition members' inviting public servants to meetings arranged by those Opposition members?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Indeed I can. I was quite amazed at the attempted defence of the Leader of the Opposition of what is obviously, from the very nature of his invitation, a blatant political exercise. In the invitation there is apparently a *Gazette* notice indicating the closure of the Department of Community Development, and another notice of its creation, and in between

those two *Gazette* notices is the invitation to officers from the former department to come to his home. For him to suggest that there is no political motive and then to send it to officers serving in that department—

**Mr. Bannon:** To individuals.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It embarrassed some people, because it was drawn to our attention by an embarrassed officer.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Are you—

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** No, I am not, but I do not believe that the Leader should put them in that position. Let me refresh the Leader's memory. I remember when the former Minister of Environment, the Hon. J. D. Corcoran, stood up in this House in February 1978 and in top flight literally blasted, verbally and otherwise, the member for Murray and the Hon. Martin Cameron, in another place, for inviting two officers to talk to them, with far less—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** I'd blast him again if he tried it, too.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** In his usual colourful fashion, which we all enjoyed at that stage, the honourable member laid it on the line. I will not take the time of the House to read what he said, but it is in black and white, on 16 February 1978, when the then Deputy Premier and Minister of Environment (because the former Minister could not handle it, and he took it up) made those comments. One of the features of his regime was that he kept close tabs on his officers. He really blasted the member for Murray for having the temerity to invite one officer down for a conversation.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** It wasn't a social occasion.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** This is the sort of language the honourable member used:

I am absolutely astounded that members of the Opposition should stoop to this sort of tactic.

That was a Ministerial statement. The evidence of any pressure being put on public servants, or tying this to any political exercise (and this is obviously blatantly apparent in this invitation) is not there. What is the difference? It is quite obvious that, when in Government, the present members of the Opposition were especially sensitive to any contact with their public servants; even a social conversation was barred by the former Deputy Premier. What could be more blatantly political than the invitation to which the Minister of Transport has referred? It makes all the more amusing and all the less credible the protestations of the Leader of the Opposition on this occasion.

## URANIUM

**Mr. TRAINER:** Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say what representations have been made by his Government to the South Korean Government of General Chun Doo Hwan in protest at the pending execution of the country's leading democratic spokesman, Mr. Kim Dae Jung, and whether we still intend to negotiate uranium deals with a regime that has affronted civil liberties? In asking this question, I am fully aware that Australia's foreign relations are in the hands of the current Federal Government. I raise the matter by way of a question because this State Government has been enthusiastic about deals to be done with Korea. In April, the Premier visited South Korea and returned full of optimism about prospects for sales of enriched uranium to that regime. He

expressed himself as being particularly pleased about the speed with which two Korean officials had flown to Adelaide immediately after his visit in order to follow up contacts. Unfortunately, the Premier is not here today, but any uranium deals would involve the Minister of Mines and Energy, who must, we would assume, be fully involved and informed.

World observers in recent months have been attentive and uneasy about developments in this new favoured market for our uranium. The English magazine *The Economist* has noted that the military regime has "Put freedom in cold storage". The most recent development has been the sentencing to death, by a rigged military tribunal, of Mr. Kim. Around the world, countries have been angered, including the Indonesians, the Americans, and the Japanese. The Japanese are threatening to cut off aid to South Korea if the execution goes ahead. That has been the response of one group of people in this world. They are so appalled by the attitude of the South Koreans that they are threatening to cut off aid. However, we have our State Government interested in trading with that same regime. It is important to know the position in this matter of the Government of South Australia. Do we stay silent, looking not at the morality of the regime, but only at the colour of its money?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is now starting to debate the issue.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Peacock, is the official spokesman for this country in relation to matters of this kind, and I understand that he has had something to say on this matter.

The answer to the honourable member's question is "None, nor am I aware of any of his confreres in New South Wales or Tasmania, nor would I expect to, in view of the place where the responsibility lies in this matter."

## UNIVERSITIES

**Mr. GLAZBROOK:** Will the Minister of Education state the extent of his authority of power in South Australia over courses, intakes and control of universities as compared with other South Australian tertiary centres? As honourable members would be well aware, considerable concern has been mounting about the future of certain colleges of advanced education, and some arguments have been put forward in correspondence to me regarding the extent of the power of the Minister and the Government's control of universities. It is believed that public clarification is needed to put this matter straight, and I look to the Minister to do this.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** I thank the honourable member for his question. This issue has not been drawn to my notice previously as a matter of concern to the university fraternity, but obviously, while the South Australian State Government is responsible for legislation establishing the two universities in this State, the funding for the universities, with very small exceptions (by way of research grants, for example, which come from the State), is a Commonwealth priority. Each of the institutions in South Australia is autonomous in its own right by Statute.

The institutions have their own councils, make their own decisions regarding the establishment and accreditation of courses with reference, of course, in the latter case to a Federal accreditation body, and they determine the standards that they will accept for entrance. They also determine the number of students who will be accepted to various courses and they make decisions relevant to courses. In brief, the Minister of Education in South

Australia has very little authority, other than to pass the initial legislation and to exercise slight control over the Statutes which would be introduced to the House and which would lay on the table for some time before they become part of the legislation.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** Usually to do with the parking of motor cars.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** As the member for Baudin says, this is generally of a minor nature, and it is certainly nothing that would seriously affect the academic lives of the students or the faculties.

#### BLOOD LEAD LEVELS

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Will the Acting Premier ask the Minister of Health to direct her officers to undertake a survey of the blood lead levels of a sample of people living in Port Pirie, and will the results of that survey, along with the current survey of pregnant women and of children, be made public? The Acting Premier will be aware of the need to be constantly vigilant about the level of lead in the blood of people working in and living near lead smelters. Recent United States medical evidence has determined that concentrations of lead can cause nerve, brain and kidney damage. The Acting Premier should be aware that, in 1978, the United States Environmental Protection Agency found that a blood lead level over 30 micrograms per decilitre could cause hidden damage to a child's nervous system.

The Acting Premier will also be aware, no doubt, that a major 1974 study by the United States Centre for Disease Control found that more than 400 children living near Idaho's Bunker Hill lead smelter had blood lead levels over 40 micrograms and some children had levels as high as 175 micrograms per decilitre—way above the danger level. B.H.A.S. has an excellent record of concern for workers in its Port Pirie lead smelter. However, I am sure the Acting Premier would be happy to arrange for the Health Commission to undertake a study of blood lead levels of people living near the smelter.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am prepared to ask the Minister of Health to examine the feasibility of undertaking such a study. I believe that it would be less than sensible, as the honourable member must admit, to say that I would direct the Minister of Health to do this when there has been no assessment of the feasibility, the necessity, the likely results or the extent of a study other than the honourable member's explanation. What I will do is ask the Minister to have a look at the question to see whether the suggestion is feasible or desirable.

This new interest in studies by the Opposition comes fairly strange to us because, as we all know, Opposition members were in Government for 10 years in this State and did precious little of it themselves. To highlight that point about their new-found interest in monitoring radiation levels (which is akin to the sort of exercise to which the honourable member has referred), I point out that, when in Government, they introduced a Bill to set up Amdel, which we all supported, and they have suddenly become interested in monitoring its activities. This Government is doing far more monitoring on its own initiatives in relation to health questions than occurred during the life of the honourable member's Government. He will excuse me from being puzzled from time to time by the Opposition's new-found interest in matters outlined in such questions, because, when in Government, it did little about occupational health. I am happy to refer this question to the Minister and see whether this sort of study is feasible.

#### TEACHER RELEASE TIME

**Mr. BECKER:** Will the Minister of Education reconsider the Education Department's decision not to grant special leave to teachers seeking leave without pay to compete in nationally organised sporting tournaments? Late last evening I delivered to the Minister a handwritten letter as a result of information I had received from several teachers who have been selected to represent district women's basketball teams and who have been invited to compete in the nationally organised basketball club championships in Sydney, from 2 to 6 October. I understand that the national event has attracted 24 teams from all over Australia, is an annual competition, and that South Australia will be sending seven teams at this stage. Of the teams representing South Australia, eight teachers will be involved in at least four of those teams. I understand that, if special leave is not granted to members of the Glenelg and Sturt Women's Basketball Clubs, those teams will be forced to withdraw, thus throwing the national competition into chaos, and will result in financial difficulties for those clubs because of the loss of deposits on airline tickets and accommodation.

Whilst I appreciate that it is a late plea to the Minister in respect of special leave to be granted to these teachers, I point out that the question of the prowess of women's basketball in this State is at stake and that some years ago the Glenelg women's basketball team won this national competition. At the conclusion of this championship in Sydney, the Australian women's team squad will be chosen. The women's team was eligible last year to qualify for the Olympic Games, and chose not to go. I stress on the Minister the urgency of a decision from the department to reconsider previous decision so that women of this State will have the opportunity to compete in this national event.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** This is the second time during Question Time this afternoon that the matter of release time for athletes has been raised. It was first mentioned fleetingly (and to my annoyance) by the Leader, when he said that the State Government had grossly neglected athletes who were to represent Australia in the Olympic Games. I will deal with that issue while dealing with the honourable member's request, because they are certainly inextricably bound together.

The present Government acted quietly (not noisily) and responsibly as far as South Australia's Olympic athletes were concerned. In fact, there were several from the Education Department and possibly one from another Government department. It was the previous Government's policy (and it was the policy of this Government at the time, because it has not been changed) that, where people were selected for international representation, leave would be granted, and the Government made no changes to that policy.

**Mr. Slater:** With pay?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Certainly, yes, so that the people who were employed by the Education Department simply made a request, which was quietly acceded to, and at least one of the members of the Education Department went to Moscow with the shooting team. Another branch of the Olympic shooting contest declined to attend that international competition and members were therefore not able to go, but that was not a decision of the South Australian Government; it was simply an internal decision made by the relevant association. Another example was the Hockey Association, which withdrew because only two of the world's international hockey teams decided to go to

Moscow and it was a non-event.

That is really what the South Australian Government was about. People who were eligible to go to Moscow did have their leave granted, and they went along, with pay. Since that time, Cabinet has come down with further recommendations regarding leave for international representation, and I do not propose to recite those to the House. Suffice to say that they are slightly more clearly defined than they were, and a certain amount of leave will be given in any two-year period.

The question today is about leave from Government departments for sport at club level. The five young women who are seeking leave from the Education Department (I was earlier informed that there might be as many as eight requests) are part of several requests made to me by other associations over the last few weeks for almost identical leave conditions. It has been a long-standing condition of the Education Department that leave without pay be granted, provided that there is no substantial disruption to school routines and to classes. It is not a decision that has been arrived at recently by the present Government. I notice that in today's newspaper it is stated that the Education Department has clamped down on teachers taking leave without pay. That is not the case. It has been a long-standing rule within the Education Department.

There are, after all, more than 20 000 employees and literally hundreds of teachers who might be chosen to represent clubs. The ruling factor has been that people who were selected at State and national level to represent South Australia or Australia would be considered not simply for leave but for leave with pay.

I have been approached not only by the honourable member, who has this matter very much at heart, but also by the Secretary of the association in question, Mr. Anderson, who spoke to me this morning. I have agreed that he should send a small deputation to consider the matter further with the Director-General of Education, Mr. John Steinle. The matter has not been resolved finally, and while I cannot guarantee that there will be a change of heart, because of the great potential number involved, I understand that in this case there are special circumstances, as the basketballers are really representing their clubs, but by virtue of that they will be eligible for national selection. There may be a grey area which has not been clearly defined in any of the preceding regulations. We will give it further consideration. I cannot give a firm commitment at this stage, but I will undertake to have a reply back quickly to the honourable member, who has expressed an interest in the matter.

### BUILDING ACTIVITY

**Mr. SLATER:** Can the Deputy Premier say whether the Government will make a public statement on the current position and outlook for the building and construction industry? Can the Minister state what action the Government is taking to stimulate this vital sector of the economy?

Recently, the Australian Bureau of Statistics released information which showed a decline of 5 per cent in South Australian approvals for new private housing. That is for the June quarter of 1980 compared to the June quarter of 1979. In addition, this week the Australian *Financial Review* quoted the national survey of construction economists, Jackson and Associates Proprietary Limited, which recorded growth rates in total planned work between June 1979 and June 1980 as follows: Queensland, plus 110 per cent; Western Australia, plus 91 per cent; Tasmania, plus 85 per cent; New South Wales, plus 64 per

cent; Victoria, plus 38 per cent; and South Australia, minus 13 per cent. In view of these figures, will the Acting Premier tell the House whether the Government will take any measures to stimulate the building and construction industry in this State and make the State great again?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** This Government has set aside substantially increased funds for housing. Let me just refresh the honourable member's memory as to the current situation in relation to housing and construction and that which pertained during the time when he was a member of the governing Party. The latest figures available to the Government show that in the 10 months from September 1979 to June 1980 inclusive, the total dwelling approvals in both the private and Government sectors amounted to 6 691. This is identical to the number in the corresponding period last year.

There is, however, a much more encouraging aspect in the latest figures in relation to building costs. When the former Government left office, South Australia's house building costs were rising 45 per cent faster than the national average and were substantially higher than the costs in every other State, so we were certainly the inflation State in relation to housing costs. If that trend had continued, there would have been nothing surer than that the rate of house building in this State would have declined even more dramatically than it did during the life of his Government.

As at July of this year, the annual increase in South Australian building costs had moderated to 15.5 per cent, which was 5 per cent lower than the national average. In only 10 months this Government has brought the movement in house building costs from 45 per cent ahead to 5 per cent behind the national average. Those trends must be highly significant if we are talking about what is likely to happen in relation to house building in this State. That is a significant achievement in anyone's language.

Of course, it must be remembered as well that the three years 1976 to 1979 witnessed the greatest decline in the South Australian construction industry for decades. In private dwelling construction, the number of building commencements fell from 3 887, in the September quarter of 1976, to 1 376 in the March quarter 1979, a fall of 65 per cent in less than three years. In the total dwelling area (that is, both private and Government), the South Australian share of national building commencements fell from 11.6 per cent in the September quarter 1976 to 5.76 per cent in the March quarter of 1979. It was an all-time low since the Australia-wide figures, including those for the Northern Territory, were first compiled in 1954.

That is the background on which this Government has had to build, and I suggest that we are being quite successful in relation to the escalation of costs of housing in this State. That will certainly give a fillip to the industry. I think also that it is pertinent to point out to the honourable member that this Government has successfully been able to negotiate and see the start of the building of the much-vaunted international hotel which was announced frequently, as was the wont of the previous Administration. That will give a fillip to the construction industry. Also, the Commonwealth Bank is about to start building. I went this morning to the announcement that a new \$22 000 000 Commonwealth centre is to be built in South Australia.

There is in fact an upsurge in the construction industry in this State, so I find it surprising that the honourable member should ask such a question when one views the lamentable record in office of his Government. The trends are quite encouraging.

### UNEMPLOYMENT SCHEME

**Mr. OSWALD:** Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs say whether he has had an opportunity to examine the effectiveness of unemployment schemes, such as the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, and, if so, what are some of his conclusions?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Yes, I have examined various unemployment schemes, such as the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. As Minister responsible for that area, I keep a very close scrutiny on the effectiveness of these schemes, and I should like to give to the House some of the conclusions that I have been able to draw from figures obtained from the Auditor-General's Reports for 1977, 1978, 1979 and 1980. They indicate that, in 1977-78, under SURS, although the Labor Government put some \$18 120 000 into the scheme, it created only 1 918 full-time equivalent jobs.

**An honourable member:** Is that all?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** That is all; \$18 000 000 created 1 900 full-time equivalent jobs on a temporary basis. Of the people who participated in the scheme, only 1 489, or 19 per cent, got permanent jobs. In 1978-79, expenditure was \$7 800 000, creating the equivalent of only 730 full-time jobs, and, of the people who participated, only 360, or 12 per cent, got permanent jobs. In 1979-80, \$3 655 000 was spent during the rundown of the SURS system, creating the equivalent of 272 full-time jobs. Of the people involved, only 95, or 8.7 per cent, got full-time permanent employment.

We can see that, despite the expenditure of \$18 000 000, then \$7 800 000, and then \$3 600 000, the total number of jobs created, which was only about 3 000 over a three year period, was extremely small. Of the number of people who participated in the scheme, only about 12 per cent got permanent jobs out of it. There are two important conclusions to draw from that. First, we must consider whether there are any more effective means of creating jobs. I draw to the attention of the House that, since 1 October last year, when the Government announced its pay-roll tax incentive for additional employees—

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** Permanent employment.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Yes, permanent employment; 1 982 people were taken on under the scheme until the end of July; that was 1 982 permanent jobs at a cost to the State Government which was a fraction of the cost of SURS to the previous Labor Government. Under the Government's special incentive, under which it gave \$600 for the first additional full-time employee taken on and \$1 800 for the first two full-time additional employees taken on, 688 people were employed. We can see that the Government scheme, in nine or 10 months, has been more effective than was the Labor Party scheme in any one year, and at a fraction of the cost. A more important point still is that the Labor Party is now going to a Federal election—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The Labor Party federally is going into an election in which it is promising to create 100 000 jobs throughout a scheme almost identical to the SURS arrangement we had in South Australia.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** They'll do it, too.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The Party spokesman has said they will do it. Let me quote to the House the figures for creating every additional full-time job under SURS, so that we can draw a comparison of the cost federally. In 1979-80, it cost \$13 429 for every full-time job equivalent under SURS. In 1978-79, it cost \$10 699 for every full-time job equivalent. The Labor Party says it will create 100 000 jobs. If one takes the figures on experience—not the

estimates or the guesstimates of Labor spokesmen, but the experience of the last year in South Australia—to create 100 000 jobs federally will cost the Labor Party (it will not get into Government, so the scheme will not be put into effect; this would be the position if such a scheme were to be put into operation) or the taxpayers \$1 300 000 000. The Labor Party federally is claiming that the scheme will cost \$330 000 000, about a quarter of what it will cost. These figures are taken from the Auditor-General's Report, and they are available for anyone to scrutinise. It is interesting to note that the Federal Government has challenged the cost of the Labor Party scheme, stating that it would cost \$1 000 000 000.

**Mr. O'Neill:** Get a grip of yourself.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Well, it would appear that the Federal spokesman for the Labor Party should get a grip of himself. Its members cannot sit down and make calculations. The Federal Government has said that its estimate of the cost of the Federal Labor Party's scheme is \$1 000 000 000, and the Labor Party is saying that that is absolute rubbish. From the experience we have had in South Australia, it would appear that a more factual figure, based on 1980 costs, is likely to be \$1 300 000 000. I am sure the taxpayers, the funders of that scheme, will reject it in the same way as they will reject the Labor Party at the election on 18 October.

### PREMIERS' CONFERENCE

**Mr. O'NEILL:** Will the Deputy Premier say whether the State Government is still committed to securing a meeting of Premiers with the Prime Minister before the 18 October election to work out a new Commonwealth-State financial arrangement? The Deputy Premier will be aware that the Premiers, on the day before their recent meeting in Adelaide, wanted the Prime Minister to convene a special Premiers' Conference before Federal election day. The Premier of Western Australia, Sir Charles Court, on 11 September last, warned that it would be in Mr. Fraser's "own interests" to meet the Premiers before the Federal election. Sir Charles said that it would be interesting to see whether Mr. Fraser would resist such a meeting.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I suggest that the honourable member should ask the Premier, when he gets back, about what meetings have been arranged. I understand that the Premiers, in conference, have regular meetings for discussing matters of mutual interest, including generally those which devolve on their relationship with the Federal Government. I cannot say what meetings have been arranged, and I suggest that the honourable member should wait until the Premier gets back, when he will receive a definite answer.

### CLUSTER HOUSING

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Can the Minister of Environment say what are the advantages—

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** Couldn't you remember Dorothy's name?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. MATHWIN:** It is all very well for members opposite to think they are being entertained. My memory slipped.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to come to the question.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** What are the advantages of cluster housing, and how would the Government facilitate well designed cluster housing? There is some concern in the

community that the cluster housing legislation should come in as soon as possible. Can the Minister say what are the advantages of this type of housing, and when the legislation will be placed before the House?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I am glad to be able to help the honourable member, both before answering the question and after. The honourable member has mentioned to me on a number of occasions his interest in cluster housing, and has asked me about the Government's intentions in this regard; when the honourable member stood up, I was quite sure that he would ask me a question about cluster housing. I am pleased to be able to tell the member for Glenelg that, as I have already announced to the House, we will, I hope, introduce legislation towards the end of this year, in this session, to substantially amend the Planning and Development Act. We hope that this legislation will facilitate the legal aspects of cluster housing. As the honourable member and other members would probably already know, cluster housing has been in existence in Victoria for a number of years, and the concept has been very successful. I had the opportunity to discuss this matter with Mr. Lieberman, the Victorian Minister, to ascertain some of the details about the Victorian legislation.

Cluster housing is a form of subdivision and land development whereby subdivision and the building of houses is carried out as a single concept. Cluster housing dispenses with what are recognised as rigid requirements normally associated with conventional subdivision and, of course, allows for the free siting of houses and private gardens. The Government is anxious to introduce cluster housing, and I am pleased to say that considerable attention has been given to this matter. The legislation that I intend to bring down in regard to the Planning and Development Act will allow the introduction of cluster housing in South Australia. I believe this will be welcomed by the majority of South Australians.

### MARINE MAMMALS

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** Does the Minister of Fisheries agree with the view of the noted world renowned naturalist, David Attenborough, that increased penalties are needed under the South Australian Fisheries Act to safeguard the well-being of marine mammals in this State and, if he does, what action does the Minister intend to take? I am sure that the Minister is aware, from the considerable publicity at the time, that Mr. Attenborough, whilst visiting South Australia, signed a green peace petition, calling for increased penalties under the South Australian Fisheries Act, so that the law will act as a strong deterrent to those who molest, injure and kill our marine mammals.

**The Hon. W. A. RODDA:** It is the Government's policy that increased penalties be introduced to ensure that all infringements of fisheries regulations are dealt with. That does not exclude the areas that the member for Peake mentioned. Furthermore, we will employ seven new enforcement officers, who will help in this matter. Fishermen know very well that, under this Government, if they infringe regulations in these regions and if they are caught, they will incur increased penalties and their licence will be cancelled.

While the honourable member did not mention this fact, I point out that we have already taken action on one occasion, which is well known. Those people in the fishing industry and also people outside the industry have a sacred duty to ensure that the environment is protected, and it is this Government's policy to ensure that any infringements under the Fisheries Act or involving the slaughter of

mammals are dealt with. We are considering increased penalties in all of these areas.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: DEROGATORY REMARKS

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** From time to time in this place flak is directed from one side of the House to the other. In commenting on a certain situation that occurred in the House last night, I admit that I was a party to giving and receiving flak, and I do not object to that. During the debate on the Budget last night, the member for Peake made certain statements that were untrue and, I believe, undesirable in this place. I draw the attention of the House to the precise words used by that honourable member, who was in the throes of criticising the role of private contractors in the community. Following a remark directed to the member for Mallee, claiming that the member could only talk about dingoes, the member for Peake then said—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister has sought leave to make a personal explanation, which is in regard to the manner in which statements affect him, the Minister of Agriculture.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I have identified that part of the record that preceded the specific remark made by the member for Peake. Following an interjection from me, which I was provoked into making (I said "What has this to do with private contractors?"), the member for Peake stated:

The Minister would know plenty about private contractors; he was one himself and he robbed and stole from a lot of people in his time.

I believe that that remark is quite unparliamentary, unnecessary, unrelated to the address to the House, and untrue. This personal explanation is the only means at my disposal to remind the House of what occurred, to express my objection and, hopefully, to attract the honourable member, by whatever methods are available to him at a later date, to withdraw those remarks.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: IT'S GROSSLY IMPROPER

**Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr. CRAFTER:** Yesterday in debate on the motion for adjournment, I erroneously stated that the book *It's Grossly Improper* had been published prior to September 1979. In fact, it was published after that time. I was well aware of that fact and I apologise to any member who may have been misled by that statement. It was my intention to refer to the use of either all or part of the unpublished version of the book for the purposes to which I referred in the debate.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: NUCLEAR WARHEADS

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** In answering today, and also a day or two ago, a question which I raised with the Deputy

Premier concerning a possible cargo of nuclear warheads, the Deputy Premier said that another course of action was open to me, that I could have contacted the relevant defence authorities. I seek to indicate to the House that, yesterday morning, the day immediately following the day on which I sought the Deputy Premier's help in this matter, I sent two telegrams to the Hon. D. J. Killen, Minister of Defence, Parliament House, Canberra; up until 10 minutes ago, I have received no response whatsoever.

*At 3.20 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

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

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

(Adjourned debate on the question—That the House note grievances.)

(Continued from 24 September. Page 1110.)

**Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** This week, the Liberal Party sought to use the Parliament of South Australia to advance its cause in the coming Federal election. The device that it used was the tabling of a report and publicity surrounding it to make unsubstantiated and scurrilous charges denigrating political personalities and raising issues that have long since been dealt with through the appropriate public forums. I do not wish to canvass those matters again. I believe that the events of yesterday have ensured that they will not rear their heads in the future; that even the Liberal Party will realise that it has extracted every single ounce of political mileage that it thought was available; and that, by going too far, it has seen it explode in its face.

If we are to talk about the Federal election and Federal issues and how they affect this State (and that is a serious topic), surely we should be talking about issues and policies and not about personalities. I believe that on this occasion it is most appropriate, on the eve of a Federal election, when we are discussing our own State Budget, that we should look at the implications for this State of Federal-State financial arrangements and the policies of the Federal Government. We should consider it on the basis of issues, not personal attacks on the Prime Minister or his Ministers but on the policies that they have propounded and the severe financial impact that they have had on the State of South Australia—an impact under which we in Government suffered most acutely, an impact of which the present Government is not sufficiently aware, or it would certainly be changing its policies and public statements in relation to the Federal Government.

Let us examine the record of Federal Liberal Governments which, since November 1975, have had charge of the nation's affairs, and relate them to the South Australian situation. There are a number of areas in which one could look at this matter, such as in terms of the impact of national economic policies on areas such as unemployment, at the direct impact of Federal Government policies, such as specific grants, public works, and the share of taxation revenue. I intend to canvass just some of those matters in the course of these remarks.

Let us look, first, at unemployment, which is raised frequently amid some boredom or lack of interest. The chief fact about employment and unemployment in this country is that it is one of the surest indicators of our economic health and of our social health. In the past 12 to 18 months, Australia, and South Australia in particular,

has been experiencing difficult times because of an inability by Governments to get on top of the unemployment situation. It is not a boring topic that one should forget and leave aside for more sensational issues; rather, it is one that will always be fairly and squarely before us.

The facts are that in September 1979 the present Government chose to make as its major election plank its policies on employment and its promise to restore jobs in this State. The fact that there were already healthy signs of improvement throughout 1979 in our South Australian employment position did not worry them one jot. Government members talked about the job rot, and made much of that during the course of the election campaign. It is on the Government's employment policies and its record in this area that we must first judge the Government because that was the main plank of its election platform.

It has been interesting to see the change in the Government's attitude to employment in relation to who is responsible, who is able to correct the situation, and what can be the role of the State Government. The Deputy Premier is very happy to lay the blame for unemployment at the feet of the Federal Government when it suits him, that is, when Labor is in office. He is happy to gloss over the figures and make them look good when he believes that his own State Government's schemes must be boosted or supported and demonstrated as successes. In that, he shares his Premier's concern to represent the unemployment situation in this State in a way that will politically suit him at the time.

Neither the Premier nor the Deputy Premier has given any indication that he understands the underlying problems causing unemployment in this State; nor has either of them given any indication of a programme or policies to do anything about it; nor do they understand the figures themselves, because their statements on both the Bureau of Statistics and Commonwealth Employment Service figures that are published periodically indicate an abysmal ignorance of what they mean in terms of underlying trends and the true position. I need only instance the Deputy Leader's response to a question from my Deputy on Tuesday in this place when he was asked about the latest unemployment figures, which indicated a further deterioration of the situation in South Australia. He took the occasion, in quite an extraordinary manner, to blame the Whitlam Government for the current high level of unemployment in South Australia. The Deputy Premier said:

We all know perfectly well in this House where the explosion in unemployment occurred on the national scene and when unemployment in this State became the highest in Australia: it was the advent of the Whitlam Administration, in Canberra, which saw unemployment and inflation go through the roof. We know that, during the life of Liberal Governments in this State, we, in South Australia had the best employment figures of any State. We know that, if we are talking about the highest unemployment in the Commonwealth, something about which we are all not happy, we know when it occurred.

Indeed, it is true that, in 1974, unemployment took a sudden and alarming rise in Australia generally; that situation has continued and deteriorated under the five years of subsequent Fraser Administration at the Federal level, but his statements in relation to what happened in this State are patently untrue. The facts of the matter are that under previous Liberal Governments South Australia's unemployment, at times of recession, tended to be very much the highest in the Commonwealth.

The Deputy Premier says that we know that during the life of Liberal Governments in this State we in South

Australia had the best employment figures of any State. I refer him to the recessions of 1961-62 and 1965-66. The Deputy Premier would find that on both those occasions, under Liberal Governments, both State and Federal, South Australia was the highest, or certainly among the highest, throughout the period of those recessions. When things were bad in Western Australia, because of our dependence on white goods, vehicle industries, and our manufacturing base, they were even worse in South Australia. So, that statement is patently wrong. There was one exception in the early 1970's, in the recession just prior to the 1971-72 election, when unemployment leapt in Australia: in South Australia it did not go up by quite as much as it normally did.

It was interesting that that was a period in which there was a Labor Administration, but it was still high. Now, let us look at the period under discussion, the last six years. Right up to the end of 1977 and early 1978, South Australia's unemployment under a Labor Government was the lowest in the country, and by judicious management of our economy, by schemes such as the SURS, we were able to ensure that, while New South Wales was in desperate trouble, while unemployment levels remained high in other States, South Australia consistently had the lowest unemployment rate in the country. The Deputy Premier had better go back and study his figures—I doubt that he even looked at them initially.

It is only in the period from about early 1978 that we saw South Australia's level of unemployment rising, and rising sharply, and there was an important reason for that, a reason which I am going to explore in a minute. The chief factor involved in that was not the general recession in Australia because we had been hanging in there during that time. We had, as I have said, maintained a high level of employment comparatively with the rest of Australia. The chief effect was the cancellation of a number of special projects involving Commonwealth money and Commonwealth assistance which meant that this State, suddenly denied those programmes and those finances by Fraser Government policies, found itself in an extremely difficult position indeed. That is when the major job rot, if one can put it that way, occurred in South Australia. One can trace it right back to the drying up of those funds and those programmes. All this talk about making way for the private sector and opening South Australia for business ignores the reality of the South Australian economy, that in a small and vulnerable State such as this, unless we have full-scale public sector activity and finance, we are not going to enjoy economic prosperity in either the public or private sectors.

Those statements of the Deputy Premier were obviously quite wrong. He went on to say:

This Government is seeking to reduce taxes in this State, to provide incentives as we have done via the pay-roll tax concessions.

That is in the context of saying how much of a failure our employment creation schemes and public works programmes were in this State. The facts speak for themselves, and nothing that the Minister of Industrial Affairs has said in this place, even as recently as Question Time today, can get over the fact that those schemes were effective, that they pumped money into the economy, that they maintained confidence and thereby employment. Just remember in relation to the costing of a scheme such as SURS that one never takes into account on the balance sheet the amount of money saved to the Commonwealth in expenditure on social services or unemployment benefit to those who would not be in a job and the amount of tax contributed by those people working in employment under

those schemes, and the balance sheet changes quite drastically when one takes those into account. We repeatedly asked the Fraser Government to devote the unemployment benefit savings and the increased tax contribution it was receiving as a result of SURS to supplement that scheme, and it repeatedly turned its face against those requests; regrettably, we were never joined by the Opposition at that time. That is not surprising, of course, such is their hatred of any kind of public sector activity and job creation to solve this problem.

Have its alternatives worked? Clearly, no. It is not just the level of unemployment that suggests that: it is its own budgetary allocations for them. An astonishingly low amount of money was claimed and put into the youth pay-roll incentive scheme compared with the budgeted amount in the last financial year. It is interesting that the allocation has been reduced this year. These are the schemes which the Premier says in his Budget speech were the answer; these are the schemes the Deputy Premier had said, as late as yesterday, were the real ways to tackle unemployment. Why, then, has this budgetary allocation been cut? Why, then, is the Premier reviewing the effectiveness of the scheme if it is so successful? The facts are that it is clearly unsuccessful and that it will not work. We are finding this situation of shifting the blame—the Whitlam Government is blamed, quite falsely. The Fraser Government is ignored (obviously, political attention should not be drawn to it at election time).

In the Premier's Budget speech we find him talking about ultimate success depending on other factors, decisions taken in private business, consumer confidence, the attitudes of employees and their representatives, and economic management at the national level. How much different is that story from the one we have heard before the election, when everything that happened in this economy, every impact on employment, was said to be traceable back to the policies of the State Labor Government? That apparent belief that the State Government holds the total reins of economic power in this State was carried for a short time into Government. We can remember the famous statement of the Premier about some slight improvement in the figures of employment showing unmistakable proof that his policies were working and then as we heard month after month the sorry tale of mounting unemployment in South Australia, cutting across the national averages and the national situation, so we found the Premier shifting the blame, bowing out of it, suddenly discovering that it really was not the State Government at all that was responsible for these issues, that there was really nothing very much the State could do, that one must look at the private business sector: he told private business to get on with the job. He said that he wanted the consumers to be confident. He tried to talk up the economy. He referred to the attitudes of employees and their representatives; in other words, he is going to blame the unions if he gets an opportunity. He referred to economic management at the national level, which is a polite way of saying the policies of the Fraser Liberal Government.

The facts on unemployment in South Australia, taking the C.E.S. figures for July 1976, are that 270 000 were unemployed nationally, and in 1980 there were 423 unemployed. Yet the Deputy Premier can stand up in this House and say that on the national basis the percentage of the labour force unemployed has held steady. Of course it has, because the labour force itself has been declining in the short term as the discouraged job seekers drop out of the labour force. Meanwhile, the number of unemployed is increasing sharply, and the Deputy Premier says that there is an encouraging trend in a small fall in underlying

unemployment between the months of July and August in South Australia, ignoring the fact that that situation is far worse than it was between July and August last year, that the number of unemployed in August this year is far higher than the number of unemployed in August last year. It is time the Premier faced up to his responsibility in this area and did something about it.

I have mentioned the impact of Commonwealth funding cuts on South Australia. It is something that one would have thought that the then Opposition, now the Government, could have made more of as these cuts occurred, but it did not, and that now members opposite are in Government we would hear a little more about the impact on South Australia of these cuts, but we still have not. I suspect that the Premier will wake up in the near future and realise that the stark facts are that the funds we have got from the Commonwealth Government over recent years have been slashed substantially, and that slashing of funds has been accompanied by economic delays and sharp rise in unemployment—in fact, a rise which has us at the moment leading the unemployment stakes in Australia.

Under the Whitlam Government in 1975-76, we received \$975 800 000. In 1979-80 we received about 28 per cent more from the Commonwealth Government.

So, one could say that in money terms we are receiving more than we were five years ago, but the facts are that prices have risen in Adelaide in that period by about 50 per cent, well above the 28.9 per cent increase in funds. To keep pace with inflation, South Australia should have received in 1979-80 not \$1 257 000 000, as we did, but \$1 460 000 000. In 1975-76, we received about \$200 000 000 that we did not get in 1980; \$200 000 000 is a lot of money in our State economy. That cut would have been much larger had it not been for the Whitlam guarantee that kept general revenue transfers reasonably buoyant. In other words, without a Financial Agreement very favourable to the States, made by the detested Whitlam Government, we would have lost much more than the \$200 000 000 that we have lost over the past five years.

That guarantee has come to an end, and what the future will provide for us, we do not know. However, under Fraser's so-called new federalism, I suspect that we are in for an even harder time than we have had over the past five years, if he remains in office.

The largest percentage of cuts has been in specific purpose payments. In 1975-76, the last Labor Budget, we received a total of \$440 000 000 from the Commonwealth, about half of which was for current expenditure, and the other half of which was for capital works projects. In 1979-80, we received a total of \$464 000 000, an increase of a mere 5.5 per cent in five years. As I have pointed out, to keep up with rising costs and to maintain real value, we would have required 50 per cent more, that is, a figure of about \$660 000 000.

It is interesting to note further that our allocation for capital works projects has dropped quite sharply. The sum of \$205 000 000 was provided in the 1975-76 financial year. In the last financial year, \$139 000 000 was provided for capital works, a money terms reduction as well as a real reduction. Incidentally, that 50 per cent figure would be higher if one concentrated purely on building and construction, because the inflation rate in that area has been higher than the general level of inflation.

So, capital funds have been very severely hit indeed. Of course, the disaster that we are experiencing now is that, while under a Labor Government, we attempted to supplement through our Loan programme that loss in capital funding. Under the present Tonkin Administra-

tion, we are in fact seeing major cut-backs in our public works from the State contribution level. In fact, despite getting an extra 5 per cent through Loan Council from the Commonwealth Government, we are spending less this financial year. That money is not going into construction of public works. It is vanishing somewhere into making up the deficits that the Tonkin Government has created by its financial mismanagement.

I should like to choose four specific areas to demonstrate where the major impact has occurred in the drying-up of Federal funds. Let us look at housing. Specific purposes payments for welfare housing have been slashed by \$32 000 000 in money terms between 1975-76 and 1979-80. It is a massive cut. It is no wonder that the waiting list for South Australian Housing Trust homes is lengthening and that this year it reached a record high level. How are people to be housed when we are experiencing Federal Government cuts of that nature?

What about the urban water supply? The Whitlam Government provided funds for the filtration of Adelaide's water to bring it up to the standard of other capitals. The sum of \$9 200 000 in capital funds was provided in 1975-76, and last financial year only \$2 600 000 was granted to South Australia. That will have a major impact on the water filtration programme and time table.

I refer now to the school dental scheme, which is a vital service for South Australian children and to which, in 1965-76, \$3 400 000 was granted. Five years later, \$3 600 000 was granted, \$200 000 more despite a 50 per cent rise in costs. What has happened to this scheme is a good example of the operation of Fraserism in renegeing on commitments. Until 1975-76, the Commonwealth met the full capital and operating costs of the training facilities for dental therapists, as well as full capital costs and 75 per cent of the operating costs of school dental clinics. Now, it meets only 50 per cent of all those costs. So, we can see the major impact in that area.

I refer now to leisure and cultural activities. We heard the member for Rocky River talking about the Kadina Sports Centre and the fact that Federal money was involved in it. Members might have been misled by his interjection into believing that he was talking about some programme of Mr. Fraser's. The fact is that he was talking not about Federal money from the Fraser Government, but about Federal money from the Whitlam Government, under a scheme that has since been abandoned by Fraser.

*The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:*

**Mr. BANNON:** It was received in the time of the Fraser Government because commitments, entered into under the Whitlam Government, were honoured under the next two financial years of the Fraser Government. Although the commitment was made under Whitlam and the programme was initiated under Whitlam, it was cancelled under Fraser, and Kadina was lucky that it got its application in in time for it not to be cancelled. So, let us get that clear. That is the origin of the scheme. In fact, a programme of capital assistance grants was commenced in 1973-74; it had not existed before, and it was expanded. Payments were \$600 000 in 1975-76, and \$1 700 000 in 1976-77, after the programme had been announced to be discontinued. However, those commitments had already been made. The payment was \$1 900 000 in 1977-78, when the final payments were made under the Whitlam scheme and the three-year plan. It slumped to \$200 000 in 1978-79 and \$200 000 in 1979-80. That is what happened to the Federal Government's leisure and cultural programme.

There are other areas, such as the railways and the Adelaide to Crystal Brook railway, which the Opposition will be exploring in relation to other legislation; they

involve other areas of major cut-backs and major renegeing on commitments which were made and which would have assisted this State. Throughout all these times of hardship and difficulty, particularly through 1977 until the present time, we heard not a word of complaint from our Parliamentary opponents. Always, they tried to bolster Fraser and Fraserism. Always, they tried to blame the State Government for the cuts that were occurring and for the economic recession that was developing around this massive withdrawal of Federal finance from South Australia.

Liberal members certainly were not interested in the welfare of South Australia at that time. They saw that as a cheap way of attacking the State Labor Government, by refusing to look behind the figures and to look at the facts of the situation. Now in Government for the first time, they are coming face to face with it themselves, and, although they have not started talking about it yet, it is clear from their Budget that the problems posed by the continuance of Fraser would probably make the election of a Hayden Government one of the most welcome reliefs to Mr. Tonkin, as Premier of this State, in his current financial difficulties.

We have always said that our economic and employment record in this State is not just a symptom or a result of the policy of the State Government. It is governed by national factors and national policies, and by the international economic situation. We have always said that. It suited the Opposition over many years of our Government to ignore that fact totally and to blame everything on the State Government. There was absolutely no recognition of the delicate interrelationship between the arms of Government and the public and private sectors. Initially, in the first few months of the Liberal Government's term of office, there was equally no indication of an understanding by them of that relationship. Now, in their first Budget, they are coming face to face with that reality. The reality is that this State has economic problems of employment, because of the decline of public sector activity, as much as through as anything that has happened in the private sector.

Because of the withdrawal of Federal funding under the policies of Fraser, because of financial mismanagement under the policies of Tonkin, we are facing a grim time indeed in this State, and it is up to the Opposition to draw attention to this, and to constantly call on the Government to recognise its responsibility to this State to promote and develop it through a proper programme of public works and public sector activity.

**Dr. BILLARD (Newland):** The Leader of the Opposition, during much of his time in the last half hour, has sought to blame this Government of one year for the mess that was created during the previous 10 years by the former Government. I think that most South Australians will believe, with me, that it is impossible to turn an economy around in one year, and will share with me the faith that I have that this Government has indeed taken the correct steps necessary to put the South Australian economy back on its feet.

Today, as an illustration of my point, I want to examine one area in which the previous Government's operations had failed, and in which it will undoubtedly take years for those failures to be corrected. I refer to a subject which I introduced last night, and that is the lack of arterial connectors between Tea Tree Gully and the Salisbury and Elizabeth areas. As I said last night, the former Government had misplanned or had failed to plan adequately for this area. For some years, it was consumed with grand projects outside of the city of Adelaide,

namely, Monarto, and all its planners were engaged in that area. It was not until the mid-1970's that attention was turned again to Adelaide.

When that finally happened, and that Government discovered burgeoning suburbs in the north-east area that needed transport facilities, it made the mistake of assuming that all the people from the area travelled into the city. It threw all its eggs into the one basket and opted for a tram system to the city, taking no account of the other transport needs of the Tea Tree Gully area. So, we are left now with the result that there are no significant plans in the forward five-year plan of the Highways Department which will significantly impact this problem area, the problem of catering for the thousands of people who travel daily between Tea Tree Gully and Salisbury and Elizabeth.

I mentioned last night some of the traffic counts presently experienced on local roads, roads maintained by local government, and roads which should never be called on to carry the volume of arterial traffic that they are presently being called on to bear. This is the legacy that we face. Although we may now seek to change the plans for this area, to try to redraft what is required to supply the required arterial connectors, we all know that it will take years to correct the mistakes made in the past, simply because of the time that must go into planning, the detail engineering, and the funding and building of these arterial connectors. Those are not simple operations. They are expensive operations which take years to bring to fruition.

So now we are faced with this problem. Indeed, as I represent the people who have to put up with these problems, I face residents who, for the next four or five years perhaps, must continue to face increasing traffic problems. We have already seen how the people at Salisbury Heights are up in arms about the traffic on Target Hill Road; how Golden Grove Road at that point is narrow, winding, and totally inadequate to carry the arterial traffic. Quite apart from this fact, it is largely anti-directional, in that there is a large U in the road which takes it to the north and traffic travelling from Tea Tree Gully to Elizabeth does not travel entirely in the direction desired.

I have been contacted by people on Yatala Vale Road who have cars landing up in their front yards because there are several bad corners, and it is totally unsuitable for carrying arterial traffic. Although in some sections Murrell Road is comparatively wide for a local road, its camber is entirely wrong, and therefore it is a road which is dangerous if it is carrying arterial traffic. These are all local roads which should not be carrying arterial traffic.

Of all of those connectors between the two regions, only one is classified as arterial, and that is Golden Grove Road, which carries the least traffic of all the connectors. Perhaps the planners were misled by assuming, when the building industry in Adelaide was slashed during the past three years, that building in Tea Tree Gully would be slashed, and therefore there would be no further need. The fact is that, although the rate of building in Tea Tree Gully dropped, it was the first to recover, and currently private house building approvals in Tea Tree Gully are running at a rate higher than that for any other local government area in Adelaide or in the State, and throughout this year so far they have been running at over 20 per cent of the metropolitan total.

While there has been an overall decline in building, Tea Tree Gully is still steaming ahead and will continue to have great needs in future. Indeed, the very areas that are expanding fastest—Modbury Heights, Redwood Park, Wynn Vale, and Surrey Downs—are the areas closest to the areas of need in relation to arterial connectors. I

believe that it is imperative that we plan for an arterial connector up the old MATS freeway, from Modbury, through to Para Hills, and that it is necessary to offload the 5 000 to 6 000 vehicles a day that presently use Murrell Road and the 9 000 to 10 000 vehicles a day that presently use Milne Road and Kelly Road, two other roads which are also local roads but which, because of the failure of the previous Government to plan, are now being called on to take arterial traffic.

In addition, I believe it is essential that we change the previous attitude which was expressed by the Golden Grove Development Committee that there be no through traffic through the Golden Grove Development area. I believe that that concept is no longer tenable and that it is necessary that, in future, we plan for arterial connectors to utilise the Golden Grove area to connect Tea Tree Gully to the Salisbury region. It is a problem which we must now face, which the Highways Department will have to face, which the Golden Grove Development Committee will have to face, and which the councils of Tea Tree Gully and Salisbury likewise will have to face.

We cannot emphasise too strongly that this is a legacy left to us by the previous Government, because of its ineptitude in planning for the north-eastern area. The previous Government was consumed by other plans, first Monarto, and secondly, the I.r.t., which it thought was a panacea to solve all of the transport problems of the north-east.

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

**Mr. PLUNKETT (Peake):** Considering the high unemployment in Australia, I would be remiss in my duties as a Labor member of this House if I did not refer to the retirement from Federal Parliament of my very good friend, the Hon. Clyde Cameron. Although Clyde has retired as a member of the Federal Parliament, I am sure he will remain very active in writing his memoirs, which will no doubt be a wealth of knowledge, considering his 50-odd years of experience in politics and the union movement.

Clyde Cameron was elected to Parliament as the member for Hindmarsh in 1949 and was returned approximately 13 times (twice unopposed) at every election during his 31 years as a member. The huge majority he gained at every election over all candidates is indicative of the popularity and high esteem he enjoyed amongst his constituents.

Clyde had a very humble upbringing. He was born at Murray Bridge, being one of four sons. His father was a blade shearer and his mother a daughter of a northern grazier. At a very early age, he became involved in the struggles of the working class, and when only 14 years of age he was often seen speaking on the Labor Party platform in the Botanic Gardens.

After leaving school, he ventured out in the pastoral industry, first as a rousabout and later as a shearer. The hardships, low wages and deplorable accommodation he endured during those years were not forgotten in later years when he had the opportunity, as a paid official in the union, to enforce a better deal for his previous workmates.

When elected as an organiser of the South Australian branch of the Australian Workers' Union in 1941, he was determined to improve the conditions of employment of pastoral workers and to remedy the many injustices meted out to workers that he once experienced. His efforts in the pastoral industry, particularly in the West Darling area around Broken Hill, in getting proper rations for station hands and decent accommodation for station hands and shearing teams, was a topic frequently discussed by

veterans in the industry who had the pleasure of knowing of Clyde's achievements.

Clyde's exceptional talent and ability to organise was soon noticed by the rank and file members of the union, who elected him as South Australian Branch Secretary in 1943. The achievements and progress made during the period in which he was Branch Secretary would take too long to enumerate and it is not my intention to delay the House further in that regard.

Clyde Cameron held practically every position in the South Australian branch of the union. He served as Secretary, President, Vice-President and Branch Councillor. Also, during the 10 years he spent as a paid official, he was a delegate to the A.W.U. Convention, the A.L.P. State Convention and the Federal A.L.P. Conference. While Secretary of the union, he also served as State President of the Australian Labor Party, the highest office of the Party, a position he held on three other occasions.

The method of pre-selection of candidates and executive officers of the A.L.P. by a card-vote system was initiated by Clyde Cameron. The success of Labor candidates in this State in both Federal and State elections during the many years in which the card-vote system was used is enough proof of his foresight in that regard.

Clyde was a very successful debater and could talk on any subject without preparation or even notes. Many of the Labor Party's rules and its platform were introduced and adopted through his ability to convince others of his ideas. The retirement age for Labor politicians and also the levy to the Party by member's salaries were initiated by Clyde Cameron many years ago and still exist.

When my colleagues in the South Australian branch of the Australian Worker's Union were under attack by the Executive Council of the union in 1964-1965, Clyde gave very valuable advice and urged them that it was imperative, for the future welfare of unionism, to fight the oppression perpetrated by the then General Secretary of the Union, the late Tom Dougherty. In that same year, all the elected officials were sacked and stooges set up in their positions, notwithstanding the fact that the ballot held to elect the sacked officials was upheld by a decision of the Commonwealth Industrial Court held here in Adelaide. Three of the top and most popular officials were also expelled as members of the union.

Clyde's experience and unique knowledge of industrial law, and his dedication to see justice done, played a vital role during the lengthy hearing in the Industrial Court that eventually succeeded in restoring all the dismissed officials to the positions to which they were elected. I honestly believe that Clyde Cameron is the most respected, most capable and best contemporary politician South Australia has seen.

Trade unionists throughout Australia will remember for a long time the many changes made to conditions of employment, wages, annual leave and sick leave, etc., wage indexation, equal pay for female employees and the amendments to the Conciliation and Arbitration Act that paved the way in assisting to democratise the union movement. These benefits were introduced by Clyde when he was Minister of Labour.

Most people would agree that Clyde was a genius in regard to industrial law and knew more about industrial relations than any other person in Australia. Clyde Cameron has spent over 50 years of his life working and fighting for the welfare of workers and the underprivileged. His record of achievements will forever remain a monument to the calibre of one of this State's greatest sons.

There is a great deal more I could say in singing the praises of Clyde Cameron, but time does not permit me to

intrude any further on the time of the House. In conclusion, I wish Clyde continued good health, and hope that he enjoys many years of retirement, a luxury that he has most certainly earned.

It is appropriate for me, as a member of the Australian Workers Union, to ensure that these comments are forever on record in *Hansard* as an acknowledgment of a great person.

**Mr. Randall:** What about his replacement?

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** That interjection shows us the mentality of some members opposite. Clyde Cameron was involved for 50 years with the Labor Party and the trade union movement. This query comes from a person who has no brains whatsoever. How could one compare a person with 50 years of service who has devoted his whole life to the working-class people with a replacement? The member who interjects has the mentality of a small child, and it is clear that he will never have any member stand up in the House in another few years time to make sure he has some sort of monument; he will not be a member for long enough.

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

**Mr. GLAZBROOK (Brighton):** This afternoon, I will spend a few moments in reflecting on the irrational thinking and the ill-informed viewpoints taken by some reporters, and the misdirection taken by some Labor Party members in relation to petrol pricing. I often think that this issue has become so clouded that many people cannot see the wood for the trees, and many people do not understand anything about import parity pricing. I will make some observations and try to demonstrate, in simple terms, so that Opposition members will understand what I am trying to say.

In my Address in Reply speech, I referred to prices in 1960 compared to prices in 1980. I drew attention to the fact that, in 1960, the average wage was \$43.36 and that super petrol was sold at 3s. 8d. a gallon, or 8.29c a litre.

**Mr. O'Neill:** Were you in Australia then?

**Mr. GLAZBROOK:** Yes. In 1980, the average wage is shown as \$230, and petrol is being retailed in the metropolitan area at 31c a litre. Members can check the records for confirmation. Thus, wages have increased about 530.48 per cent, and the petrol price has increased by 361 per cent.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Too many interjections are coming across the Chamber.

**Mr. GLAZBROOK:** If members will listen, they will learn some facts. I will draw some comparisons in relation to the past 20 years. Regarding housing, in 1960 the average house in the metropolitan area cost \$10 000. The same house in the same area today would raise \$65 000 on the market, a 650 per cent increase, yet the petrol price is up only 361 per cent. A woollen worsted suit in 1960 sold for \$21. The same type of suit today sells for over \$150, or an increase of 714 per cent, yet the petrol price is up only 361 per cent. A motor car in 1960 cost \$1 800. The same type of car today costs \$9 000, or about a 500 per cent increase, yet the petrol price is only 361 per cent up. In 1960, bread cost 9.5c a loaf. Today, it costs 68c, or a 721 per cent increase. A pair of Grosby shoes in 1960 cost \$2, whereas today they cost \$28, or a 1 400 per cent increase. A large bar of chocolate cost 20c in 1960, but costs \$1.16 today, up 600 per cent, yet the petrol price is up only 361 per cent.

Let us look at where we stand in relation to some of these things in line with petrol, and see what parity pricing means. Our price of petrol at retail is the third lowest in

the world. Let us look at what people in some other countries have to pay for their petrol. In France, on 17 June, it was 73c a litre; Italy, 78c; Japan, 66c; The Netherlands, 66c; West Germany, between 55c and 59c; United Kingdom, 62c; New Zealand, 46c; and in the United States of America, which is a comparative price, it is 31c. We are not far off. Canada is the lowest of all, at between 19c and 20c a litre, because of the active interest in finding oil in that country. In Greece, the price is 73c a litre, and in Yugoslavia, it is 67c. What kind of Government has it?

**Mr. Mathwin:** Socialist.

**Mr. GLAZBROOK:** Yes. In Turkey, the price is 60c; the Philippines, 57c; Malta, 57c; and in Singapore, 43c. People talk about the petrol price going up all the time in this country, whereas it has gone up only 361 per cent. Wages (and this is not surprising, when you look at the comparative cost of all these other goods) have gone up 530.48 per cent. The *Petroleum Gazette* states:

The 1970s, a decade during which the OPEC nations had many major Western consumers scrambling over each other in a desperate bid for oil supplies, have left Australia noticeably less scarred than many countries in the world. The main reason for this is undoubtedly the indigenous crude coming from Bass Strait—or more accurately from the offshore Gippsland Basin.

Almost all Australia's 65 per cent self-sufficiency in oil is based on production of proven reserves under the narrow strip of water between Gippsland in south-eastern Victoria and the north-east corner of Tasmania. Crude from the Gippsland producing field provides approximately 95 per cent of the country's oil output and accounts for most of the current 420 000 barrels of daily flow.

An estimated 280 million barrels of recoverable oil was added to Bass Strait reserves early last year when Cobia and West Kingfish were declared commercial under the Government price increases.

The following is the interesting part:

Cobia was found in 1972, but at that time the price to Esso/BHP for Bass Strait crude was \$2.06 a barrel and the partners decided the field was not viable.

In other words, they could not get the oil out at a viable price to put it on stream. It was not until they introduced some parity pricing that they could lift the price of that oil to \$10 a barrel, thus making it a viable operation to get it out of the earth and to add 280 000 000 barrels of recoverable oil to the vast reserves.

Thus, people have fixed in their minds some idea of saying that we should not be making attempts to find more oil reserves in the country and that we, as a State, should not waste our money in trying to find oil. Unless we find sufficient funds to finance the exploration of oil, Australia will fall behind, and end up paying full tote odds for petrol and oil products from the other side of the world. If that happens, we will be paying 73c to 80c a litre, not 31c. Anyone with any sense will realise that we are in a lucky country, which has a sensible oil pricing policy, and a sensible scheme of exploration to save the country money.

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

**Mr. OSWALD (Morphett):** I would like to address myself in this debate to the need for more accountability for public expenditure from the Public Service and the accountability of departmental heads of the Public Service to the departments and particularly to this Parliament. There are several areas of responsibility, namely, the responsibility of the Executive to the Parliament, the responsibility of the Executive to the Public Service, and the responsibility of the Public Service to the Parliament.

The first area of responsibility of the Executive to the Parliament is achieved basically through the concept of Ministerial responsibility. I would like to quote briefly from a working paper I acquired from a seminar I attended in Canberra earlier this year. The paper states:

The theory of Ministerial responsibility is that Ministers can, through the Parliament, be questioned as to the activities of their department and their own activities in relation to the conduct of affairs in their department. A series of conditions apply which have to be fully met if that theory is to work properly. One must seriously question today whether all the conditions are met. If a Minister is to be questioned either in the media, at Question Time or through debates, the people who ask the questions of him—that is, in the Parliament in the first instance and elsewhere in other instances—have to be fully informed in such a way that they can ask competent and intelligent questions. If there is a lack of information about the activities of a Minister's department and information is not available adequately and in the appropriate form, it does make it very hard for members of Parliament to ask competent questions. A simple lack of available or relevant information can seriously inhibit the capacity of the Parliament to properly exercise the accountability function through Question Time and similar means.

There are times when I wonder whether this lack of information on departmental activities is a deliberate ploy, because I am convinced at times that there are certain public servants who would rather fish around in murky waters than impart information to this Parliament so that we can see whether they are being accountable. The paper continues:

The other practical qualification is the general problem of coping with the vast size and complexity of the bureaucracy. That structure is now so vast and complex that one must seriously ask whether we have not so much a situation of Ministerial accountability but Ministerial answerability. Ministers are put in a position now where they really are required only to answer questions in an informative manner if they can about the activities of their department rather than actually be accountable for their actions.

I would like to quote from two cases that the Public Accounts Committee has investigated over recent years. The first was the building of the Frozen Foods Factory at Dudley Park at a cost of about \$9 200 000. This matter was reported on unfavourably by the Public Accounts Committee in its 12th report. More recently there was the case of the construction of the Ottoway workshops at a cost of \$5 400 000. This matter was unfavourably reported on in the 14th report of the Public Accounts Committee. Both these projects are white elephants which would never have been justified if the facts had been properly considered and, I suggest, laid before this Parliament. I would suggest that the Parties of both political persuasions, if they had had the facts available, would have had a different look at both these projects.

In both those cases the Ministers were not held responsible. Because of the general anomalous nature of the bureaucracy—the Public Service—no-one inside the bureaucracy was held responsible. I might add that, if such a situation had occurred in private industry, severe disciplinary action would have been taken and certainly people would have lost their jobs over it. However, because it happened within the bureaucracy nothing was done about it and we saw no reaction to it. I would now like to refer briefly back to the working paper I brought from Canberra, which states:

One way in which we may possibly overcome this in future is to perhaps more rigidly and precisely define the actual accountability of permanent heads and senior officers in the

legislation and the way in which it is defined at the moment. Under the Public Service Act, only a very general accountability is laid down as far as a permanent head is concerned in the discharge of the activities of his department. The general management accountability of senior management of departments and authorities is only very generally defined.

I think it is ludicrous to expect Ministers to be familiar with the day-to-day management of departments. It is really this area of efficiency that I am mainly concerned with. There is little doubt that the approvals for the construction of the Frozen Food Factory and the Ottoway workshops were rubber stamped by all the appropriate authorities within the bureaucracy for compliance with regulations, but this did not avoid the unnecessary expenditure of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money on initial capital costs and the on-going operating costs.

If efficiency in the Public Service is to be improved, within the public sector there must be a situation whereby there is more responsible accounting for the spending of the taxpayers' funds.

**Mr. O'Neill:** We're not getting it from your mob.

**Mr. OSWALD:** I will get back to that interjection shortly. It is Parliament's job to ensure that the public is getting value for money where taxpayers' funds are involved, and certainly machinery in the Estimates Committees will give us a lead-in. I will be most interested to read the transcript of the Estimates Committees proceedings because it is there that we will be able to probe the justification for public expenditure. It is not the new areas of expenditure that we will be looking at for real justification; we will be looking at the justification for maintaining past levels of expenditure, particularly when Government departments are winding down. It is one thing to identify surplus weekly-paid staff, but it is much more difficult to shake out any of the entrenched long-term salaried staff in the departments. If Parliament is to exercise effective control over the purse strings, it is essential that departmental heads are made more accountable. This must be clearly defined by Statute.

I think it is appropriate that the Audit Act be amended so that the Auditor-General is charged with the responsibility for examining the effectiveness of Government expenditure with a view to attaining maximum cost benefit. If members opposite have not referred to it, I would ask them to think deeply on this subject. I refer them to the 1975 report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Public Service conducted by Professor Corbett, who makes several points along the lines of how essential it is that departmental heads of Government departments be responsible to Parliamentarians, the representatives of the people, who in actual fact should, under a true democratic system, be exercising an over-view of the way our money is spent in this State.

**Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I would like to take up a number of issues, particularly those raised by the member for Brighton, when he spoke about the average weekly wage. I refer him to a booklet, put out by the Catholic Church, entitled *Commission for Justice and Peace*. A caption in that book reads as follows, in sequence: "I make \$313 a week"; the next chap remarks, "And I make \$149 a week"; and the first person says, "That makes our average wage \$231 a week." The little chap says, "Well, I guess that means I have never had it so good." If that is the logic of the member for Brighton and his ilk, then God help the people in this State, and in particular Federal members. We also heard from him about this lucky country, the song that is peddled in this State by the Liberal Party in this State and its ilk federally.

Let me once again refer to this booklet by the Catholic Church. Let the Government attack the Catholic Church at its own peril; it certainly would not be game to do it. On page 4, it is stated that poverty in Australia is often ignored because the poor tend to be hidden away or concentrated in specific areas; but poverty is real. In the mid-1970's it was estimated that there were over 1 000 000 poor in Australia. At the end of the 1970's another estimate put the number at almost 2 000 000. That means that one person in seven in Australia has seriously inadequate access to housing, medical services, employment, education, and even food and clothing.

Who are the poor in Australia? In most cases the poor are those who, because of their race, status, or some disability, have no regular income and no power in society. They come up regularly. They are aged persons, single parent families, families whose sole breadwinner is on a low wage, sick and handicapped persons, the unemployed, the Aborigines, recently arrived migrants, refugees, and single women. Poverty in our society is on the increase as the real wage of many workers declines, and I take the point that the member for Brighton raised—he reckons this is a lucky country.

Poverty is on the increase as the real wage of many workers declines and as costs, especially housing costs, increase. Australia's response to those in the community who are poor has been grudging. Those who depend on social security for their income, the 1 900 000 Australians who are either recipients or their dependants, are forced to live in most cases on an income well below the poverty line. Many benefits have not increased over the last few years. This fact alone has forced a decline in the real income of many family units. Some benefits have not been increased for 15 years. Married couples without dependants are the only social security recipients who have improved their situation over the last two years. Far from being a lucky country, Australia has a worse incidence of poverty than has any other developed country, and a lower proportion of national income allocated to social security. That is an indictment of the Liberal Party, which promised in 1975 what it was going to do for these people in this country.

Let me remind members present of some of the promises that were made in 1975 and in 1977 by the so-called esteemed Prime Minister of this country. He is quoted, in part, as having said:

Our wish and our obligation is to serve all the people . . . Our willingness to put common interests above our sectional interests . . . We will govern for all Australia. We will commit ourselves to work for the well-being of all our people, wherever they are, whatever their work. We will protect the weak and the disadvantaged.

He repeated this on election night in 1977. I turn to what has happened since the Fraser Government came into office. Mr. Fraser said that he would make the fight against inflation a No. 1 priority. Inflation was running at 14 per cent in 1975, it is now running at 10 per cent, and is expected to be running at 13 per cent next year.

Regarding unemployment, in 1975 Mr. Fraser promised jobs for all who wanted to work, yet now we have the highest unemployment since the Great Depression in this country. What do young people find when they apply for jobs in this country? They find restrictions applying to the youth of the nation. An *Advertiser* report headed "Dole form demands 60 answers" states:

This is one of about 60 questions which have to be answered in detail if you want to claim unemployment benefits.

New four-page application forms—double the size of the old forms—are now being distributed by the Department of

Social Security.

Other questions include whether your family received family allowances in the previous year? If you have lived in Australia less than a year, on which ship or airline did you arrive?

How much money do you and your spouse have in a bank, credit union, building society, shares, bonds, notes or debentures?

I imagine that the unemployed and people on the dole probably have millions salted away in those societies, in bonds—they are the hidden capitalists of this country! The report continues:

What is the annual dividend and interest rate received?

What is the name and address of your last employer, and your pay-roll or personnel number (if known) and the pay-roll number and nature of work of your spouse or *de facto* spouse?

If the questions are not correctly answered, \$51.45 dole payment (the single rate for over 18's) won't be made.

Wrong answers can make an applicant liable to a fine of \$500 or six months gaol.

Yet tax evaders get away with capital, and are murdering the country. The report continues:

The Opposition's spokesman on social security, Senator Grimes, yesterday said the Government was trying to intimidate the jobless from receiving unemployment benefits by producing a new application form of "absurd complexity". He said the form could well deter an unemployed person unable to answer all questions from presenting it across the counter.

**Mr. Slater:** Not everyone readily understands it all.

**Mr. HAMILTON:** That is so true, and so it goes on. I refer to the underspending of moneys by the Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs, underspending by about \$10 000 000 in this country. This is by a Government which was going to provide jobs for all who wanted to work. I refer to the questions raised by the member for Brighton in respect to petrol prices. A report states:

A family whose six-cylinder car uses a tank of petrol a week now pays about \$11 a week more for fuel than it did when the Fraser Government took office. The retail price of petrol has increased by 125 per cent, of automotive distillate by 100 per cent—

and so on. Turning to social welfare, the same report states:

Erosion of the standards of certain groups—there is a graphic fall below the poverty line for people such as the unemployed and single parents between 1975 and 1980.

Another issue to which I refer is the question raised by the Minister of Industrial Affairs today about what this State Government was doing. I can recall a couple of months ago when a forelady and eight sole parent women were sacked from a factory, because the management of that factory wanted to pick up the Government incentive.

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

**Mr. ASHENDEN (Todd):** I rise this afternoon to rebut statements made recently by the member for Salisbury. It is unfortunate that I find it necessary to do this, but I believe that, if I do not, some people outside who read *Hansard* may think that, because they have not been challenged, these points must be correct. Many of the points made by the member for Salisbury in relation to north-east transport were quite incorrect. I had hoped that, when he spoke, at last we might have a member of the Opposition putting forward some facts to support his argument, but unfortunately, on scanning through and listening to the speech he gave, I could not find any facts.

I think perhaps the only reason that members oppose

are so anti a bus proposal is that they probably still have horrible memories of their dial-a-bus fiasco and, because they made such a mess of that, they think that no Government could use buses successfully. That is quite incorrect, and we will see over the years the wisdom of this Government's decision.

First, the member for Salisbury certainly admitted, on a couple of occasions, that he was "assuming". He made a number of assumptions when he spoke recently, and also when he spoke some time ago, in relation to north-east transport. He said that he assumed that the guideway would go along the ordinary roads—and, of course, he was found to be quite incorrect. Subsequently, he said that he assumed that, when the large articulated buses reached the end of the route, they would follow a principal corridor. In both cases, his assumptions were quite incorrect, and his many other assumptions in his speech recently will prove to be just as incorrect. It behoves members opposite, instead of talking on emotional lines and talking about assumptions, to bring forward some facts to support the arguments they are advancing.

The member for Salisbury went on to say that the city of Essen is installing a guideway system at great expense. That is totally incorrect. That section of guideway is replacing a section of light rail in that city because it can be put in at a cost far lower than the cost of upgrading the present system. I have pointed out many times in this House, and I guess I have to do it again now because members opposite seem to have difficulty in absorbing this information, that, both in the short term and in the long term, the busway proposal will cost considerably less; in fact, even at its worst, it will cost only one-half of the cost of the light rail proposal.

The busway system will service all the north-east suburbs, and not just Tea Tree Plaza. The member for Salisbury talked about Hamburg, as if he were giving us some new information. We know full well that the system there was in operation for only a short term, but he did not explain why that was so. He neatly tried to infer that it did not work, and so it was pulled out. That is far from the truth. The government of that city wanted the O'Bahn put in there to show people what it could do. In a few short months of operation, it went without any failure at all. It proved extremely successful, and therefore achieved what it set out to do. To put any other inference on that is totally false. It was put in to service a fair that was conducted in that city. It was new, the Government wanted to show the people what it could do, and it did it. The member for Salisbury should have explained that.

He talked, too, about 150-passenger buses romping all over the city of Tea Tree Gully, and he said that more than once. He subsequently referred to "their 150-passenger capacity". I do not know where he got that information; I have not seen any proposal put forward by this Government indicating that any of the buses will be anywhere near such a size. I do not know whether he is assuming that, but it is totally incorrect to be talking of buses of that size.

**Mr. O'Neill:** What size will they be?

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** I did not hear the interjection clearly, but they will have 70 seats; in other words, less than half the size the member for Salisbury mentioned. He was not far out! He went on to mention three times that he thought we should be using low capacity feeder buses because these huge buses, travelling through the suburbs, would be grossly under-utilised, and he made various other points three times on that.

The honourable member knows full well (or I hope he knows full well) that the buses are nowhere near that size anyway, and that at no time was it intended to have small

feeder buses, because the cost of providing the staff to man them would be prohibitive. The buses we will be using out there will, as I have said before and will have to say again for the benefit of members opposite, be able to negotiate the roads in exactly the same way as present buses do, and will have lighter axle weights. So, once again another assumption made by the member for Salisbury is shown for what it is. He asked what the Government would do to recompense the Tea Tree Gully council for the damage these huge buses would do to the roads. For the benefit of the member for Salisbury and that of all members opposite, I point out that these buses will cause less damage because their axle weight will be lower than that of the buses presently used.

**Mr. O'Neill:** Can you identify them by their title?

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** They will be articulated Mercedes-Benz vehicles, as I am sure members opposite know. The member for Salisbury went on to make a number of other points. He referred to an article that the member for Newland placed in the *North-East Leader* rebutting arguments, or so-called arguments, brought forward by Mr. Klunder. The member for Salisbury said that the article referred to by the ex-member for Newland, Mr. Klunder, was taken straight from the S.T.A. report. The member for Newland immediately contacted the officers who wrote the report, and they said that at no time had they made the statement that the former member for Newland said that they had made. It was the usual total misrepresentation by that person.

The member for Salisbury also said that I had accused the former member for Newland, Mr. Klunder, of misrepresenting the facts. If members would like to look at some of the articles Mr. Klunder has placed in the *North-East Leader*, they will see that no description other than that fits them. As I said before, his whole exercise in relation to this and to the Modbury Hospital is abysmal, because Mr. Klunder has not argued facts; he has argued emotionally and brought forward a number of, I believe, deliberate misrepresentations.

Another matter put forward by the member for Salisbury was that I, in particular, and the Government in general, are against l.r.t. That is a totally false statement. There is no doubt that light rail is an extremely good system. That is now said by me publicly, and I hope that members will never bring this matter forward again. However, I do distinctly favour the busway proposal; it is as simple as that. I favour that proposal because, as I have already pointed out, it is cheaper in the short term, cheaper in the long term, and certainly more convenient for the residents of my electorate. The member for Salisbury says that he has used a feeder system to catch a train for a number of years and that it does not worry him. Fine, but if we can provide a proposal which can result in this changeover not occurring at all and which can provide the people who live in our electorate with a system that is even better because there will be no changeover, then surely we should do that.

The bus system is more flexible than the light rail transit system. The thing is (and I come back to this again) that three of these busways could be installed for the cost of the one light rail system that the previous Government was going to install. Let us not forget that that light rail proposal would have serviced only the area from Adelaide to Tea Tree Plaza, whereas the Government's proposal will cover all the north-eastern suburbs.

That is why I favour that proposal. It is also a more comfortable system. Under the l.r.t. proposal there would have been people standing at the rate of four per square metre in the trams, while under the busway proposal no person will stand in the articulated buses. Thus, they are

preferable in relation to cost, comfort and convenience, and that is why I favour the busway proposal. I stress again that I acknowledge the points that the light rail system has going for it, but I believe that the busway has more in favour of it, and that is why I so strongly support the busway. Certainly, from feedback in my electorate, I believe that the people out there see that the Government is doing the right thing.

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

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources):** I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

**Mr. O'NEILL (Florey):** Coincidentally, I, too, will refer to the O'Bahn system, and I want to make clear that I am not imputing any impropriety to the Minister of Transport when I express my concern in this area. Originally, I believed that the O'Bahn system was a gimmick, used prior to the last election to influence voters. It is now quite clear that, at that time, it was a concept only. The Daimler-Benz Corporation was very careful to use that word.

I notice, from the material that I have, that the Minister used the word "concept" in relation to the O'Bahn system, as reported in the *Advertiser* of 4 October 1979. Anyone who took an interest in this matter would know that the system was not operating, despite some of the loose verbiage used by the newspapers, such as an article written by the present Press Secretary to the Premier on 4 September in the *News*, as follows:

The O'Bahn system uses articulated buses already in service in Perth.

At that time the impression created was that the O'Bahn system was already operating in Perth; the inference was that the system was operating. We now know that the O'Bahn system went into service on 1 October in Essen, and I refer to an article which appeared in the *National Times* of 10 August 1980, which was written by Peter Burden (who apparently went to Essen) and which stated:

Mass transport of an entirely novel sort will begin operating on 1 October in the West German city of Essen. It will be revolutionary . . .

In regard to the designer, it was stated:

He is also responsible for another far-out transport mode.

I am concerned that, once committed to the O'Bahn system, "This closes out other bus manufacturers; it also raises the prospect that it may be impossible at some time in the future to switch to another manufacturer's bus when an established fleet needs replacing," as stated in another article. A lot of other material about this system quite clearly indicates that it is fraught with danger, and I cannot accept the confident predictions of the member who has just resumed his seat in regard to costs. My thoughts go back to another Liberal disaster—the F111—which we were told in 1963 would cost \$56 000 000. We paid the final payment this year—a total cost of \$261 000 000 for a heap of junk that is of no use to us at all in the area of defence.

The main thing as far as I am concerned, and the point I want to get to is that in all this the name Daimler-Benz crops up and, as I have shown, this Government is locking us into a situation that will cause us to be beholden to the Daimler-Benz Corporation. I could not figure the matter out until I started reading some material relative to uranium treatment. Then the penny dropped. Daimler-Benz has a subsidiary in Germany, named MAN, which,

amongst other things, produces motor vehicles. It is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Daimler-Benz Corporation.

It is interesting to note that MAN also engages in other engineering, research and development areas. To find that out, one must read material from Urenco-Centec and read about the treaty of Almelo and the constituent bodies to that. We have Urenco and Centec. Centec is that part of this organisation that is responsible for the design, development and supply of centrifuge plants, and MAN has access to technology that allows it to produce these centrifuges.

Why is this important to South Australia? During the course of these readings, it dawned on me that there was a connection between MAN and a South Australian company, and this leads me to wonder why one of the former representatives of multi-nationals in this country gets up in this Parliament and works so hard to justify the O'Bahn system and put the case for Daimler-Benz. Of course, the company that he worked for, Chrysler, is well known for using people through Governments throughout the world to get its way. I make no allegations, but it may well be that the gentleman is applying his expertise in that area on behalf of the Daimler-Benz Corporation to make sure that we—

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is making imputations against me that are totally false.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. The honourable member has recourse to a personal explanation in due course if he wishes to refute any such statement.

**Mr. O'NEILL:** The South Australian connection is the firm Johns Perry, which has agreements with the Daimler-Benz Corporation in respect of the production, under licence, of truck chassis, I believe, and I am assured by a person closely associated with that company that this connection gives it access to the technology from the MAN company of Germany for the production of gas centrifuges for uranium treatment engineering. Some people may say that that is a good thing for South Australia because, if Johns Perry gets into the gas centrifuge area, that will create a lot of jobs.

However, that is totally false, because I have been given to understand that the technology and engineering processes are highly automated and that there is not a great need for human involvement in the processes. However, millions (perhaps billions) of dollars can be made in this area because of the high attrition rate of gas centrifuges and the fact that they must be in peak condition to deliver the product that they are required to deliver.

Any company that gets in on the manufacture of gas centrifuge supply to uranium treatment works will be home and hosed in the dollar stakes. It is well known that conservative Governments see, as their main aim, not the welfare of the societies that they govern. Their main aim is the maximising of profit, and they will do anything to get that. That is why serious doubt and a grave question have been raised over O'Bahn and just what some people may be up to with their connections through big business and in other areas in the matter of committing the taxpayers of this State to pay for an F111 bus system, which could cost us millions of dollars, to try to get in on the production of engineering materials for an obnoxious uranium treatment plant in South Australia so that those private companies can make billions of dollars for private citizens, placing the people of South Australia at great risk so far as their health and financial future are concerned.

This is a frightening thing. I hope that I am wrong, and I

certainly will be glad to hear any member dissociate himself from it. However, it seems to me that a lot of members are trying to push us headlong into the uranium treatment plant race. Anyone knows that the situation is getting to the stage where the world is over-supplied with those treatment plants, anyway. However, it seems that we must have one in South Australia. There is a big "Why" hanging over that. I will be interested to hear Government members assure me that they have no connection with anything that might in the least be unsavoury. The situation, I am sure, will be taken seriously.

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

**Mr. GUNN (Eyre):** In taking part in this debate, I make clear that I have in no way set out to deny other members the opportunity to speak, because it was my view that all members would have an opportunity to participate in this debate. The matter about which I will grieve is the effect of the proposals which the Federal Labor Party would have on rural industry in this country. As one who represents a large rural electorate, which has played a significant role in providing export income, and being fully aware of the great benefits which flow to this nation from that income and the number of jobs that depend on it, both directly and indirectly, I think that it is important that the House is fully aware of the effects that will flow from the introduction of policy as put forward by the Labor Party. We are aware of a large number of pronouncements by Labor spokesmen. The Federal member for Grey, who represents over 80 per cent of the land mass of South Australia, has had nothing to say in relation to the Labor Party's rural policy.

He spouts about other matters of little importance, or makes wild predictions, most of which are grossly inaccurate. However, I would like that gentleman, Mr. Wallis, clearly to indicate to the people of his electorate, particularly those who reside in my district, where he stands on these issues; I want him to reply.

I remind the House of what the Labor Party did when it was in Government. On a previous occasion, it abolished the superphosphate bounty. Can the Labor Party give an undertaking that it will not do that again? It also abolished the fuel equalisation scheme. Can it give an undertaking that it will not do that again? The Labor Government added millions of dollars to farmers' income tax payments. It introduced a rebate system that discriminated against primary producers. It abolished the investment allowance. Will the Labor Party give an undertaking that it will not do that again? It abolished the allowance on the establishment of water equipment which had been of great assistance to people installing water systems throughout the country. Will it abolish that concession and the investment allowance in relation to people who convert diesel oil powered equipment to electricity?

The Labor Government repealed a number of other concessions to rural industry. It drastically slashed the rural arterial roads allocations and, in my district, this delayed the Hawker to Leigh Creek Road, the completion of the Flinders Highway, and reduced the distance for the installation of telephone lines in the country to only 8 km. Most of these things have been rectified by the current Government. I therefore ask Labor spokesmen in this State and in the rest of Australia, because I am concerned about what the Party's proposals will do, to state publicly, before 18 October, where their Party stands on these issues.

There are one or two other matters that have not been mentioned. Where do they stand on capital gains tax?

Would they reintroduce death duties in this State? Mr. Bannon has been very quiet. Where do Mr. Hayden and Mr. Wallis stand on this issue? Where do they stand on a wealth tax? They have said nothing, particularly in their rural policies. It was interesting to note, in a publication circulated widely in the rural areas, namely, the *National Farmer*, on page 21 of the latest edition, the heading "Labor falls short of the mark". It has a photograph of a character called Mr. Walsh, who, I understand, is the Labor spokesman. The article states:

But it has to come up with a number of policy statements if it is to win wider approval from the bush. It did not, in its rural paper, mention its attitude to rural commodity marketing arrangements other than wheat, tax averaging, income equalisation deposits, rural adjustment funding, the superphosphate and nitrogenous fertiliser bounties.

They never mentioned the Primary Industries Bank or the Commonwealth Development Bank. It is essential that they indicate where they stand on the issue of income equalisation deposits. This programme was recommended to the previous Government by the Industries Assistance Commission, which had it for a couple of years and did nothing about it. These matters are important to my electorate, to the people of this State, and in particular to those machinery manufacturing industries in the State which provide such a great deal of employment for South Australia and also produce first-rate machinery. They are important matters affecting the people of this State and the people of this nation.

I believe that people should be fully aware of the effects of Labor Party policy. It should have been noted that it was during the term when Mr. Hayden was Treasurer that taxes rose so fast. Mr. Hayden is now talking about certain plans that he has, but it should be remembered that, if Mr. Hayden's 1975 tax scales had remained, a taxpayer on average weekly earnings today, with a dependent spouse and one dependent child, would have to pay \$22 a week more in tax. Let us have no more of this talk of how highly taxed we are in this country. In the three years of Labor Administration, aggregate personal income tax collections rose by 125 per cent compared with average weekly earnings, which rose by only 67 per cent.

In one year, 1974-75, the then Government's take from personal income tax rose by 40 per cent. I believe I have clearly explained to the House that the Labor Party owes the people of this State and this nation a clear explanation. We do not want any more of the type of statement that we have had recently from Senator Walsh and other people. It is very fortunate that they will not have the opportunity to put into effect their policies. I do believe that they should come clean and clearly explain to the people where they stand on these important issues that I have mentioned.

**Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla):** In the time at my disposal I want to speak about what I consider, and have considered for some years, to be the most degrading and the most important question that faces the nation. I refer to unemployment. I was very pleased to listen to my Leader earlier this afternoon when speaking in this debate. In my opinion, he quite rightly pointed out that the policies of this Government are now in line with those of the Fraser regime in Canberra, which has administered the same policy in this nation for the last five years. They believe, as a matter of economy in any country, that Governments cannot afford to spend money at the cost of inflation. That is their economic reasoning. They also say that, if Governments do not spend, it will mean a boost somehow to the private sector.

That is absolutely ludicrous, to say the least. The facts suggest the opposite. If Governments do not spend

money, the private sector, too, will not spend money. We have found that in the past five years. However, in coming into office last year, the Government gave an election promise that it would boost employment in South Australia by 7 000 jobs, and it went to 10 000 jobs almost overnight, yet this afternoon we heard at least one Government speaker tell the Opposition that this sort of situation cannot be improved overnight. We did not hear that 12 months ago. We then heard from Government members promises to the people of this State that literally overnight the unemployment position in South Australia would improve by about 10 000 jobs.

**An honourable member:** In three years.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I suggest to the honourable member who has interjected that it will not happen in 30 years unless the Government improves and alters its current policy. If the Government is going to cut back its spending, I can assure it that the private sector, too, will cut back in its spending.

I refer to a project in my district on which the Government is spending, that is, in relation to hospital extensions. It is all done by private enterprise. Every brick laid and all construction on that hospital extension is undertaken by private enterprise. The contractor has given sub-contracts to other private enterprise people. The whole thing is being undertaken by private enterprise. If the Government was not spending money in that area in my district, the unemployment situation there would be worse than it is, and that is saying something.

I cannot help but refer to the member for Brighton, because his contribution in this debate was taken up with a barrage of figures to convince me that suddenly everyone in this country was well off, and that we have never been better off in our life.

**Mr. Slater:** We are the lucky country!

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Yes, we are a lucky country. In effect, the honourable member is saying that we have no underprivileged people at all.

**Mr. Glazbrook:** I did not say that. I said it was a lucky country.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** The honourable member's figures implied it. He referred to the price of a motor car increasing from \$1 400 to \$9 000.

**Mr. Randall:** Most families have one.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** There are not one but hundreds of people in my district who cannot afford a motor car, not even at \$1 400.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! This is not Question Time.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** What a load of absolute hogwash to say in this House that we are a lucky people. The honourable member should come up to my district and do a little door knocking and find out how lucky those people are.

I want to refer briefly to the remarks made by the member for Eyre a couple of days ago. He did much grandstanding on the basis of where the representatives of the Iron Triangle stood on the question of the possible construction of a uranium enrichment plant in the Iron Triangle and whether we would have the gumption to say in this place where we stood on that issue. I find that remark of the member for Eyre rather amusing, to say the least.

**An honourable member:** Tell us where you stand?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I have never at any stage backed off from where I stand on this question of uranium. My constituents know where I stand, and so does the member for Eyre. Let me tell the member for Eyre (and he knows this) that I have stated publicly my attitude about the petro-chemical works. Unfortunately, we have heard this

afternoon that we are likely to lose that project. I am not making that as a derogatory statement. Although I am not surprised at what has happened, I do not like it.

I have always said, in my district and in this House, that I believed that the possibility of building a petro-chemical works in South Australia, especially in my area, was a most important matter for the State. I have said that, knowing full well that there was opposition from conservation people to the building of such a plant. Let me say in defence of that statement that I am aware that, if we listened to the philosophy of certain people in the community (and I do not wish to have any fight with them), we would not build any projects at all. I do not believe that the powerful B.H.P. organisation would ever have been allowed to build a pellet plant in my area if we had subscribed to that philosophy. I am not suggesting that B.H.P. is free of responsibilities in relation to pollution of air, land and sea.

**Mr. Oswald:** Do you want a uranium enrichment plant in the Iron Triangle?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I would be prepared to build a uranium enrichment plant at Burnside. Apart from that, I will not have a bar of it. However, if members of the Government want to build such a plant at Burnside, I will give the matter reasonable consideration. Apart from that, let me make clear, once and for all, especially for the benefit of the member for Eyre, that I will not have a bar of it. I do not believe for a moment that the member for Eyre could convince the people of Whyalla that they want it, either.

**Mr. LEWIS (Mallee):** I draw to the attention of the House the following quotation:

Noting the depressing condition of liberty in Australia . . . and the protection of minorities against discrimination and the protection of citizens against abuses . . . conference expresses its support for . . . guiding principles and minimum standards of liberty to be observed . . . and provide effective machinery for the protection of individual rights against the abuse of official power.

So said the A.L.P. State Convention in 1979, after the Hindmarsh Federal Electorate Committee had moved that motion. Let us see who the Labor Party has endorsed as a candidate to run at the next Federal election. I refer to the following report:

"Our organisation told members, 'You have no say. The decision is made' ", Mr. Scott said. "But don't let us allow ourselves to become divided. The effect (of the strike) was devastating as far as industry was concerned, where we have control, where we have unionism."

That is John Scott's idea of liberty and the Labor Party's idea of liberty, and that is what it will provide for the people of Hindmarsh. That is what it is asking the people of Hindmarsh to support at the next election. That is the kind of Government that it would give Australia if the people of Hindmarsh and elsewhere were stupid enough to vote for a man with those values, a man who is capable of that sort of hypocrisy. That quotation came from the *Advertiser* of 23 June 1979.

Of course, the strike in which he was involved was commented upon as being nothing more or less than an utter schemozzle. Mr. Armstrong of the A.G.W.A., who was taken to task by Mr. Scott, replied as follows:

I never knew it was a crime in Australia to be too honest or forward with your membership. My council, my executive, does not direct my members.

That is in stark contrast to the kind of person that the A.L.P. has endorsed for the electorate of Hindmarsh in the forthcoming Federal election. What price industrial democracy, brothers, or any democracy? Let us look at

this fantastic Party and the way in which it believes in liberty. Contrary to the sort of motion it passes in its mouthings at its State convention, a motion to boycott the *Adelaide News*—a campaign that turned out to be a fizzer—stated:

That the Labor Party should initiate a campaign to persuade members and supporters to cease buying publications of the *News* group and to reject its subsidiaries in the electronic media and any lotteries or pools which it is promoting.

They went on to say that "no news is good news." Is that the sort of society they want to live in, where they would muzzle the press to suit their own political ends? I wonder. The people of Hindmarsh need to think, and think carefully, before they make their decision, if they have in the past been in the habit of supporting a man called Clyde Cameron, who will, in due course, turn in his grave if John Scott ever succeeds him.

Of course, they described this man in the *Herald* earlier this year as one of eight children in a family facing hardship in war-time Glasgow. I do not know what relevance that has. That is about as inane as my standing here and saying I am from a family of 10 children in war-time Australia. I do not think that qualifies the man, or makes him any more or less capable of being a member of a Parliament, whether this Parliament or the Federal Parliament. The Labor Party does not share my attitude, of course. It is a real tearjerker. He had to catch the school bus after an 8.45 a.m. conclusion to his milk round. Of course, he did not belong to the union at that stage and was probably scab labour. He was fortunate because he had a school bus to catch. There were a good many people in this country at that time, and even today, who had to run two or three kilometres to work, and they had a good deal more than a milk run to get through in the morning. It is pointed out that he was careful to remember the houses where he could expect to receive a tip. I wonder why, and where that fits in with his idea of equal pay for trade unionists, and where the consistency of opinion emerges in that respect.

I read that he came to South Australia in 1962. If my memory serves me correctly, that was a year during which Sir Thomas Playford was Premier. I wonder why he came to South Australia. He had found himself without opportunity in New Zealand and he cast about him and came directly to South Australia. I will tell members why he did that: this State was prospering, developing, and providing job opportunities for people. The job opportunities were provided not only for John Scott but for hundreds of thousands of other migrants who came here during that period, and those jobs were being provided by a Liberal Government. The article I read pointed out that he was originally a soccer fan but he has been turned off that and is now going for footy. I do not know what is wrong with soccer, or what soccer fans should think about his opinion of their sport. He is also interested in the live theatre. My word, from some of the performances I have seen him put in on television, I do not doubt that.

Let us look at the sorts of things he has had the privilege, if that is what you can call it (at least, the honour, so he says), to support at branch conventions of the A.L.P. here in South Australia since coming to prominence. He said that he supported the Amalgamated Metalworkers Union motion, as follows:

That the South Australian A.L.P. convention expresses the view that the A.L.P. at both State and national levels should work towards the enlargement of the public-owned section of industry, including Government workshops, and that a first objective should be to ensure that all Government

work can be performed in publicly-owned workshops so that tendering out work to private enterprises can be eliminated.

The people of Australia and the people of Hindmarsh need to recognise the threat to the industry and to the real jobs in this country (that are provided by private employers who tender for public works), if that is the sort of attitude that this man has. All those people who work for Perry Engineering, Baulderstones and a few other firms like that must take note of that comment. At the State convention of the A.L.P. in 1978, it was stated:

The practice of observing, photographing and filming injured workers who are claiming compensation, without the knowledge of those workers is condemned as a contemptible invasion of privacy . . .

We request the State Parliamentary Labor Party to draft regulations, or amend the South Australian Workmen's Compensation Act to prevent the taking of evidence, whether verbal, written, photographic or films which has been gathered in obnoxious manner, in a court of law convened for a purpose relating to a claim for workmen's compensation by the injured worker.

No-one knows how evidence of misdemeanours will be collected because, every time someone is paid to do nothing, that person is given spending power to live without producing anything and someone else who wants to work is denied a job, and there is also a multiplier effect. The value of the currency is being inflated. If it cannot be ascertained whether someone is cheating on the system, how on earth can abuses be prevented? It would suit all members opposite with their fairlyland idea of economics to have a situation in which we were all on the dole, or on worker's compensation, with no-one doing any work. Goodness knows who would deliver the milk, the bread, or whatever.

Let us consider what has happened since Mr. Scott has been in the public arena. It is a matter of record that he was second on the ticket of the successful candidates in the left wing take-over of the State Executive, as reported on 20 February 1979. He is recognised as being a member of the left, the second in line.

On 20 August 1979, an article appeared in the *News* regarding Mr. Scott and the Wylie dispute, in which he was involved. This dispute threatened to spread to wider areas and flared into a membership battle between the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights' Union and the Australasian Society of Engineers. John Scott was happy to let it run on. He said that the unions could put four options to the commission—I do not know what they were. He wanted people to be reinstated. We must remember the case that went through the courts in 1976, in regard to the reinstatement of the notorious Ted Gnatenko, a battle that took 1½ years. What a battle! I am sure that the productivity of the whole of the automobile industry improved tremendously as a result of the waste of hundreds of thousands of dollars! That person did not want reinstatement then, anyway; he walked out and turned his back on all of the money that had been spent in his interests. One of Scott's companions is quoted in the *Advertiser* of 21 August 1979 as saying:

If you go back now you might as well have a chain and leash around your neck because that's what you'll be—dogs.

Is that what he thinks of trade unionists; does he think of them all as dogs? The 200 strikers who were involved in that dispute at Wylies incurred a cost of literally 10 men for a year, apart from the other peripheral effects involved.

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

**Mr. PETERSON (Semaphore):** I refer to unemployment

in this State and the technological changes that are likely in the future. There has been much comment in this House and in the press since the change of Government 12 months ago about the great developments that are about to take place in South Australia and the benefits that will flow to the people and to the State from these projects. I am as sad as anyone to hear that Dow has deferred the petro-chemical plant, because I believe that that plant is necessary for this State. However, I believe and hope that another company will be found.

Benefits will flow from these projects; there is no doubt about that. Predictions have been made about employment, and this is an area in which vast improvements are forecast. There is no doubt that more people will be employed in the manufacturing of equipment, the construction of plants and the necessary mining and processing work required in this State.

A big question that has to be answered is, "When will this take place?" Many of the major projects are still at the feasibility or exploration stage and, as I have said, unfortunately Dow today has deferred the Redcliff project. Even when the feasibility, research and exploration have been completed, a detailed planning period is still required. Then the contracts have to be let and worked upon before any effect will be seen in our community. According to figures in the press, unemployment is increasing all the time. Also, during the lead-up time, there will be the added effects of technological change. I do not think anyone doubts that there will be an effect.

I have visited all the factories that I have been able to visit in the time I have been a member of Parliament, and some important points have come out of my discussions with the management and employees of the plants. One point is basically that all plants are working at well below what I suppose we could call normal capacity. There is quite a leeway there to be made up.

**Mr. Glazbrook:** Not enough demand.

**Mr. PETERSON:** No. This means that both men and machinery have a significant leeway to be made up before any additional manpower would be required. I assume that any demand on production would be taken up in the form of overtime and longer machine hours.

**Mr. Glazbrook:** You've got to get the money circulating.

**Mr. PETERSON:** I do not think the money will circulate. If one man is given twice the amount of money, that does not affect the person who is unemployed. The whole thrust of what we have been talking about is added employment. I do not see where an extension of hours is added or extra employment for people. We have been talking about more jobs and a better chance for people to be employed.

**Mr. Glazbrook:** As people spend they need more, and that leads—

**Mr. PETERSON:** That has not the same multiplier effect as putting people in jobs, because then you get the effect of their wages as well. Anyway, that is getting pedantic, and we are not getting anywhere. The other point that people have stressed to me in some of these plants is that, mostly in the area of consumer goods, most of these companies have plants in other States that could now supply the whole South Australian need. The State plants here could be closed down, and that would make no difference. This trend was particularly evident to me in the area of building and allied products. That area stood out. The fact that these things should be mentioned to me by these people indicates that the management and workers in the factories are far from optimistic about their short-term future, let alone their long-term future.

Even when work is commenced on these projects, there is no guarantee that South Australian companies will be given the work. In this State in the past, we have had a good base for small engineering companies and small industries that could provide the necessary skills and expertise that will be required in those projects for the construction and fabrication of plant and any sort of equipment in that way. These industries have dwindled over the years and those that are left will have to compete, on a fairly competitive interstate markets, with large firms. I believe that consideration should be given to keeping all possible work within this State.

I have been told that Government contracts have been let out. I think it was yesterday that I heard the member for Gilles speak about Morphettville racecourse, for which fittings and other things were being brought from interstate. I had heard that the roofing came from Western Australia, when it could have been provided from here. Another project was the new powerhouse at Port Augusta. I understand that it is being clad with aluminium. It could have been clad with asbestos products that are made in this State. I do not think that the Electricity Trust sells power to interstate aluminium producers.

It makes more sense to me to spend the money in the State where the work is. However, they did not do it. It is of concern to me that the people who are expressing this uncertainty to me are, in the main, the managers of these factories who are in possession of the facts that will govern the future of their companies. If they are doubtful about their ability to survive in today's economic climate, I do not know how the Government can be all that confident. Luckily, in my district a couple of companies have attacked their problems aggressively. They are in unique areas. One is a cement company, which has attacked overseas markets and which has managed to keep employment; it is also looking at expanding that market.

**Mr. Randall:** I.C.I. also.

**Mr. PETERSON:** Yes, I hope. Luckily, it has a fairly exclusive hold on the products that it sells, and it also is looking at expansion. Because of the technological changes in our community, there will not be a huge impact on jobs. At least they are managing to maintain the jobs that are there, and possibly have a small increase. The Government must be more involved in any project that is likely to be developed in the State. The Government must support it, and extend all possible aid to ensure that these projects get under way.

The area that I represent has particularly high unemployment. The groups of unemployed are spread right across the age spectrum: those who have worked for 20 or 30 years who have then found themselves unemployed, the school-leaver who cannot get a job, and those who have left school or who are about to leave school who have no hope of getting jobs in that area. These are the real problems that the Government must attack. It must support companies (it is against the philosophy of the Liberal Party to foster industry) or somehow encourage industry into the area. Unemployment in the area was borne out by a report in the *News* of 14 July under the heading "Factory jobs moved out of town", which stated that the outer suburbs have profited in terms of jobs gained by the movement of manufacturers from the inner Adelaide suburbs. However, in the term of years between 1969 and 1978 Port Adelaide had lost 665 manufacturing jobs, a loss of 12.4 per cent of the manufacturing work force in the area. This figure is made all the more significant by the facts shown up in the recent survey which showed that 31.2 per cent of the people in the work force in the area were employed in manufacturing, whereas the metropolitan average for

similar employment was 23.1 per cent. So, many more were employed in that area than for the metropolitan average. These figures are only the tip of the iceberg, for the loss of job opportunities in other areas are far greater.

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

Motion carried.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: MERCEDES-BENZ

**Mr. ASHENDEN (Todd):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** I wish to make a personal explanation in relation to remarks made earlier this afternoon by the member for Florey. He said, in making the allegations, that he was not going to make any, and then did. He made a statement that was totally hypocritical. I believe that the comments that he made were a misuse and abuse of Parliamentary privilege. He made the allegation that I represent Mercedes-Benz in this Government, and he used my previous employment—

**Mr. O'NEILL:** On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not make that allegation.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. If the honourable member considers that statements made about him are inaccurate, he will have the opportunity to make a personal explanation.

**Mr. ASHENDEN:** I was explaining the comments that I take objection to, in that the honourable member inferred that, because of my previous employment with the Chrysler company and because of the way that he states that company operated, I could well be the Mercedes-Benz representative within the Government. I totally deny that type of imputation and allegation. Indeed, I totally

deny any imputation whatsoever that I have anything at all to do with the Mercedes-Benz company, that I have ever had anything to do with that company, or that I represent the Mercedes-Benz company in any way. That is totally false, I deny it absolutely, and I challenge the honourable member to make those allegations outside this House.

**Mr. O'NEILL (Florey):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr. O'NEILL:** That little outburst—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member must make a personal explanation.

**Mr. O'NEILL:** The explanation concerns the outburst against me by the member for Todd. He himself used the word "inferred" after I had to get up and seek your leave. You overruled me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but nevertheless you were quite right in doing so. The honourable member then used the word "inferred". I do not know what inference he drew from the proposition, but I am glad that he has made a clear and categorical statement to the House on his position. I made no charges against him. He is making the statement that I made charges and he drew inferences. If he has a guilty conscience, that is his problem.

#### ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) and the Public Purposes Loan Bill be referred, as follows, to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report on 21 October 1980:

#### Estimates Committee A

##### *Appropriation Bill (No. 2)*

Legislative Council  
House of Assembly  
Parliamentary Library  
Joint House Committee  
Electoral  
Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works  
Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement  
Legislature, Miscellaneous  
Premier's  
State Governor's Establishment  
Public Service Board  
Premier, Minister of State Development and Minister of Ethnic Affairs, Miscellaneous  
Treasury  
Treasurer, Miscellaneous  
Law  
Supreme Court  
Attorney-General, Miscellaneous  
Corporate Affairs Commission  
Minister of Corporate Affairs, Miscellaneous  
Industrial Affairs and Employment  
Trade and Industry  
Minister of Industrial Affairs, Miscellaneous  
Public Buildings  
Minister of Public Works, Miscellaneous  
Local Government

Minister of Local Government and Minister of Housing, Miscellaneous  
Arts  
Art Gallery  
Minister of Arts, Miscellaneous  
Minister of Health, Miscellaneous  
Tourism  
Minister of Tourism, Miscellaneous  
Engineering and Water Supply  
Minister of Water Resources and Minister of Irrigation, Miscellaneous  
Lands  
Minister of Lands and Minister of Repatriation, Miscellaneous

##### *Public Purposes Loan Bill*

State Bank  
Treasury  
Public Buildings Department  
Department of Local Government  
South Australian Health Commission  
Engineering and Water Supply Department  
Renmark Irrigation Trust  
Pyap Irrigation Trust  
South-Eastern Drainage Board  
Department of Lands  
Second Schedule

## Estimates Committee B

*Appropriation Bill (No. 2)*

Services and Supply  
 Deputy Premier, Miscellaneous  
 Mines and Energy  
 Minister of Mines and Energy, Miscellaneous  
 Education  
 Further Education  
 Minister of Education and Minister of Aboriginal  
 Affairs, Miscellaneous  
 Police  
 Auditor-General's  
 Correctional Services  
 Chief Secretary, Miscellaneous  
 Fisheries  
 Minister of Fisheries, Miscellaneous  
 Minister of Marine, Miscellaneous  
 Agriculture  
 Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests,  
 Miscellaneous  
 Environment  
 Minister of Environment, Miscellaneous  
 Urban and Regional Affairs

Minister of Planning, Miscellaneous  
 Transport  
 Highways  
 Minister of Transport and Minister of Recreation  
 and Sport, Miscellaneous  
 Community Welfare  
 Minister of Community Welfare, Miscellaneous  
 Public and Consumer Affairs  
 Minister of Consumer Affairs, Miscellaneous

*Public Purposes Loan Bill*

Department of Services and Supply  
 Department of Mines and Energy  
 Education Department  
 South Australian Teacher Housing Authority  
 Department of Fisheries  
 Department of Marine and Harbors  
 Department of Agriculture  
 Woods and Forests Department  
 Department for the Environment  
 Department of Transport  
 Highways Department  
 State Transport Authority

Members will recall that, during the Treasurer's Budget speech, and on the preceding day during the debate on the Estimates Committees sessional order, the Premier made reference to supplementary Budget papers that would be prepared in preliminary programme form and circulated to members. I should now like to make further reference to those supplementary Budget papers, which have been distributed. In particular, it is important that the House be informed of their relevance and status in Estimates Committees' deliberations.

Members will notice that the Supplementary Papers are marked "Provisional" and are prefaced by an introductory statement containing important qualifications, several of which should be read into the record. Page 1 contains the following observations:

What has been attempted here should be taken as a draft and as only the first steps in a longer-term process to provide Parliament with a programme and performance budget. These documents do not provide a complete analysis of all the resources—financial, manpower and physical—required to carry out the designated programmes. The information here should be regarded as indicative rather than accurate to the last dollar and manpower number.

On page 4 the following comments appear:

In many instances, the allocation of manpower resources has been estimated or inferred rather than calculated accurately. In all cases, resources have been calculated on the average number of full-time equivalent staff engaged on programmes in 1979-80 and expected to be employed on programmes in 1980-81, rather than using staff ceiling numbers or actual numbers of staff at a specific date.

Again, on page 5, the comment is repeated that, "these documents are the first draft of what is a supplementary examination and presentation of the Government's expenditure plans in a programme format." In other words, members should not, as the Government does not, expect more from the Supplementary Papers than can be provided in this first year of operation.

This is not to say, of course, that the Supplementary Papers will not be of additional benefit to users. They will, for the first time in the history of public administration in this State, provide explanations of each department's

objectives, functions and programmes. In addition they provide:

- (1) a broad-brush description of the financial and manpower resources allocated to programmes, both last year and this year;
- (2) explanatory comments on the major variations between last year and this year in financial and manpower resources devoted to programmes;
- (3) a summary showing the major sources of departmental income; and
- (4) a reconciliation of aggregate departmental expenditures as shown in both the official Estimates of Expenditure and the Supplementary Papers themselves.

As the Treasurer has said on earlier occasions, the Government believes that this additional information will be of substantial assistance to all members.

With regard to the operation of Estimates Committees, for example, the supplementary material may well reduce or obviate the need for certain questions which might otherwise have been asked. It will also, no doubt, prompt questions which might not otherwise have been asked because necessary background information had not previously been available.

The question remains, however, as to the limits of utility of the supplementary papers, given the qualifications which I have already quoted from the introductory statement. It would be quite unproductive, for example, for an Estimates Committee to pursue vigorously a minor discrepancy in figures between the official estimates and the supplementary papers. Yet, at another level, it may be quite profitable for the committees to seek information regarding the relationship of programmes to objectives.

Once members have read the supplementary documents, I am sure they will clearly see the point I am making, and will agree that the limits of utility are more easily recognised than defined. In these circumstances the Government relies on the good sense of all committee members to use the supplementary papers constructively, that is, to avoid ascribing any greater accuracy to them than they themselves acknowledge.

I should remind members that the supplementary documents are being circulated informally. They are not being tabled as an official Budget Document. Strictly speaking, therefore, the only documents before the Estimates Committees will be the Estimates of Expenditure, both revenue and loan, as tabled in this House on 28 August. This is not to say that committee members should pretend the supplementary papers do not exist. On the contrary, the Government trusts that the documents will be used, as I have said, in a constructive manner, and for the provision of additional information to all members.

It does mean, however, that it would be reasonable for the Chairmen of Estimates Committees to disallow questions which seek to use the supplementary papers beyond their own stated limit of utility. With respect to the Chairmanship of Estimates Committee B, I should inform the House that, pursuant to the sessional order, I have notified the Speaker in writing that the Chairman will be the member for Goyder.

Members may also recall that the sessional order requires each committee, forthwith at its first meeting, to establish a time-table for consideration of the estimates over the following fortnight. To make that task easier the Government has prepared a suggested time-table, for presentation to each committee which takes account of Ministers' other commitments through the two weeks.

Provision has been made on this suggested time table for each Minister to devote a full day to attending the committees. Finally, I wish to repeat the Treasurer's earlier assurance to this House that the opinions of the committees, and of private members, regarding the transition to programme budgeting, and observations upon the supplementary papers, will be taken into account fully by the Government as this project proceeds.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That Estimates Committee A be appointed consisting of Messrs. Abbott, Ashenden, Becker, Glazbrook, Gunn (Chairman), Hamilton, Olsen, O'Neill, and Wright.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed consisting of Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Hemmings, Langley, Mathwin, Oswald, Randall, Russack (Chairman), and Schmidt.

Motion carried.

**The SPEAKER:** The Legislative Council has given leave to the Attorney-General (Hon. K. T. Griffin), the Minister of Local Government (Hon. C. M. Hill), and the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. J. C. Burdett) to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly in relation to Appropriation Bill (No. 2) and Public Purposes Loan Bill (No. 2), if they think fit.

#### PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.48 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 21 October at 2 p.m.