

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, October 26, 1977

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. F. J. Potter)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

The **PRESIDENT** laid on the table the report of the Ombudsman for 1976-77.

QUESTIONS

CLASSIFICATION BOARD

The **Hon. R. C. DeGARIS**: Can the Minister of Health ascertain the total cost to South Australian taxpayers of the Classification of Publications Board in this State?

The **Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD**: I shall seek information on that.

HEALTH COMMISSION

The **Hon. C. M. HILL**: Can the Minister of Health report to the Council the progress being made in the establishment of the Health Commission? For example, can he state whether all the necessary committees have been established that were allowed for in the legislation passed by this Council? Can he give any date when the existing legislation will be repealed in favour of the new legislation, and can he say whether employees of the Hospitals Department and the Public Health Department are yet deemed to be employees of the commission?

The **Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD**: The commission was established from July 1, 1977, but, because of the appointment of one full-time Commissioner, who was then employed in Canberra (Mr. J. Blandford) and who was unable to leave that position until October 1, it was—

The **Hon. C. M. Hill**: Another interstate appointee?

The **Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD**: I do not know whether one describes Canberra as being interstate, but from time to time it has been called many other things. The fact remains that the Government has chosen the best people for the job and, if that does not suit the Hon. Mr. Hill, let him say that he wants second-grade people in these jobs. Let him say that that is what he wants, but that is not Government policy. The Government's policy is to pick the best person for the job.

The **Hon. C. M. Hill**: Who are the second-grade people to whom you are referring?

The **Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD**: The Government employs the best person for the job. Never mind about second best, third best or fourth best. We will pick the best man for the job, and members opposite should appreciate that.

The **Hon. C. M. Hill**: That was a disgusting statement.

The **Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD**: It was not. I have told the honourable member from time to time that it is the Government's policy to appoint the best man for the job and, if it is a disgusting statement, let the honourable member say why it is a disgusting statement. We pick the best people for the job. Let the honourable member make his point. Regarding the committees provided for in the Act, the Act allows for committees to be established and to be dispersed after they have done the job for which they were established, with the exception of the advisory committee. Presently, we are getting names in order to set

up that committee. In respect of the repealing of existing legislation, it has been indicated previously that legislation would be repealed progressively as the commission progressed to take over the various functions of the whole health set-up in South Australia. At this stage a date has not been set for the repealing of legislation.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

The **Hon. J. C. BURDETT**: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs, about consumer protection.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J. C. BURDETT**: In each of the last two sessions, in asking questions of the Minister, I said that the Federal Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs had undertaken to introduce legislation to make the Federal Government subject to consumer protection legislation when it entered the commercial field. I asked whether the State Government would follow suit. Regarding the question I asked in the first of the two sessions to which I have referred, the reply referred to the insurance field, which was only part of the spectrum. I did not receive any reply at all to the question I asked in the second of the two sessions. I hope that on this occasion I will receive a full reply. Will the State Government, when it enters into commercial enterprises, make itself subject to consumer protection legislation in the same way as private enterprise is subject to such legislation?

The **Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD**: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

WATERING PLACES

The **Hon. A. M. WHYTE**: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, in the temporary absence of the Minister of Lands, about tourism and the pastoral industry.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. A. M. WHYTE**: Some landholders in the Flinders Range have written to me expressing concern that the number of tourists or casual campers who are at present camping at watering spots is increasing. The absolute disregard for the needs of stock in such areas is causing great concern. In some instances parties have camped at watering spots for two, three, or four days. Because it is becoming hot in the North, stock must be watered daily. First, will the Minister consider an educational programme for these people who travel into the outback of South Australia, because I believe many of them are ignorant of the requirements of landholders and stock? Secondly, from a tourist viewpoint, if camping areas (and no-one begrudges such areas) are to be set up on pastoral properties, will the Minister consider the suggestion that water should be carried some distance away from the known sources of supply, so that people can camp for an extended period?

The **Hon. B. A. CHATERTON**: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague, who will provide a reply.

LITHOGRAPHS

The **Hon. ANNE LEVY**: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health about the purchase of lithographs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In his speech on the Appropriation Bill yesterday, the Hon. Mr. Hill referred to some hand-painted Gould lithographs purchased by two former members of the Craft Authority who, as reported in yesterday's paper, are setting up a shop for prints in Adelaide. Yesterday, the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw interjected:

If the Government had not paid for the trip, they would have had to pay for the trip themselves.

This interjection implied that the lithographs had been purchased while the two members of the Craft Authority were overseas at Government expense preparing a report for the authority. The Hon. Mr. Hill accepted the interjection from the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw and added the question which was reported in *Hansard*:

"Were these purchases made during the particular overseas trip for which the State has paid . . ."

Would not the Minister agree that the trip, the subject of discussion, where two former members of the Craft Authority were sent overseas at Government expense, occurred 12 months ago, and furthermore, that the "lightning swoop on New York" in which these lithographs were purchased, occurred in May of this year, entirely at the expense of the people concerned; and that one of these people, who is on a Government salary, took leave of absence without salary that enabled him to make that trip? Would the Minister agree that these facts completely give the lie to the despicable and slanderous slur which the members of the Opposition have made on these people?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is most unfortunate that members opposite, in their desire to attempt to slander people who give good service to the State, make the most outrageous statements in this Council, without any truth in them. This is a smear campaign against people who serve this State well. Those honourable members do not check their facts before they make these outlandish statements. They get a lot of publicity. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris in this Council the other day condemned the Hon. Mr. Foster for naming a firm that was touching the public, and suggested that an inquiry should be made before such a question was asked in this Council. The Hon. Mr. Hill gave a slanderous statement against these people without the slightest bit of truth in it. The Hon. Miss Levy's remarks about the leave of absence without pay of one of the former members of the Craft Authority, and about the date of purchase of the lithographs, are quite correct. There is no truth whatsoever in what the Hon. Mr. Hill, supported by the Hon. Mr. Don Laidlaw, said.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He should have said that outside the Council.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course, he is not game to say it outside.

WALLAROO

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, regarding the collapse of the Wallaroo gantry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Yesterday, the Hon. Mr. Foster made quite an impassioned plea, on behalf of the meat producers in this State, about the differential between loading flocks of sheep at Wallaroo, which were driven on to the wharf, and railing them to Port Adelaide for shipment. I thank the honourable member for his efforts on behalf of the primary producers. It is somewhat

odd to see a member on the other side of the House give them anything more than criticism.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: The honourable member is getting as bad as the Hon. Mr. Murray Hill.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Sheep presently at Wallaroo can be railed to Port Adelaide, but there is a substantial supply of grain at Wallaroo that will also have to be railed to Port Adelaide.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: It might have to go to some other port.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: That is true; it could go to Port Giles or Ardrossan.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: There is no railway at Port Giles.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: If the honourable member knew his geography, he would know that a lot of wheat is not railed in South Australia, either. There is a substantial amount of grain at Wallaroo which will have to be transported to some other port. Will the Minister also investigate some kind of subsidy with regard to shifting this grain? Unless this transportation is subsidised, it will have to be borne by the primary producer.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will certainly look into the matter. I do not know whether that, too, can be a liability to the shipowners in terms of their instructions being carried out or whether they are already liable for any other costs that are incurred. If that is the situation, I will have it looked into.

ABORIGINAL EDUCATION

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister of Health about Aboriginal education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I realise that perhaps Aboriginal education is not specifically the province of the Minister of Health but my question involves several Government departments so I think that, as the Leader of the Government in this place, he is the proper person to whom to address the question. In May of this year, a Mr. Brian Varcoe, of the Aboriginal Task Force of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, forwarded to the Premier a very detailed proposal concerning an adult school at Point Pearce, to which he has not yet received a reply. His reason for doing so is probably best explained in the opening paragraph of his submission, which states:

As a Point Pearce person who has been studying in Adelaide for the past two years, I have been continually concerned with the increasingly depressed state under which the people living there have to contend. A major worry now is that the recent tragic circumstances at Port Victoria could well become commonplace if some genuine, non-paternalistic assistance is not immediately forthcoming.

He goes on to say:

For a chronically depressed, almost totally dependent community like Point Pearce to be able to develop both a measure of self-sufficiency and a sense of self-reliance, it is essential that the various potential capabilities within it are located, developed and utilised—not only for the benefit of individual members but also for the common good of the community.

Because of his concern he has submitted the proposal I have mentioned. I would like to quote further from that proposal, where he sets out the aims of the project, which are laudable. He states:

This proposal is for a Point Pearce adult school that is designed:

- (a) to enable the community to determine and pursue its own direction and goals, and individuals their own personal goals;
- (b) to develop the community's sense of powerfulness and initiative;
- (c) to develop positive self-concept and positive identity as Aborigines;
- (d) to facilitate individuals taking up whatever role in the community they choose, providing they are in keeping with their abilities and interests and beneficial to overall development of Point Pearce;
- (e) to be more economical than the implementation of a relocation programme for Aboriginal people.

Mr. Varcoe's initial proposal is for staff to be appointed on the basis of one staff member for every 10 pupils, plus part-time staff for various specialised skills, and he has costed the project at \$75 000 a year, that money to be provided not only from State but also from various Federal funds, both Federal and State Governments being involved in this. In view of the value of such a project, what is the Government's intention in this matter?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will have the matter investigated for the honourable member.

DROUGHT RELIEF

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Yesterday, the Minister explained to the Council the funding arrangement for drought assistance. However, in today's *Advertiser* the President of the Stockowners Association accused the Government in rather extravagant and intemperate terms of "staggering mismanagement". Is there any truth in this accusation? Mr. James also said he was "dismayed" that drought loan payments were being staggered to avoid conflict with traditional lending sources. Can the Minister explain what is meant by this statement?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I was somewhat staggered by the garbled calculations that appeared in that press report this morning. I thought my explanation to this Council on previous occasions had made the situation quite clear. However, I should perhaps repeat that, with the exception of the stock slaughtering component of drought relief, the current agreement has been in force since October 1, 1976, and will continue in force until December 31 this year. Under that agreement, payment of the following sums has been approved as from October 1, when the figures were taken out: carry-on finance to farmers, \$1 980 609; freight on transport of fodder, \$66 591; subsidy on freight for the transport of livestock to agistment, \$93 822; subsidy on freight for the transport of livestock from agistment, \$84 094; payment to councils for the destruction of stock, \$13 788; and compensation to producers for the destruction of stock, \$21 640, making a total of \$2 260 544.

The point which I made previously and which I repeat is that, out of the sum of about \$1 900 000 that has been approved for carry-on finance for farmers, \$900 000 has still to be paid out. That is in accordance with the budgets that have been submitted by farmers themselves. There have been no delays and no tardiness in the payment of the \$900 000. In fact, the farmers submit their budgets, and loans are made on the deficits in those budgets as they occur during the farming year. This is, therefore, a situation of the applicants virtually having money in the bank, as payment of this money has been approved, and it

will be available when required. I am unable to understand why there is continual misunderstanding among some people regarding this fairly simple procedure.

The other point raised in this morning's press report concerned the staggering of the payments. However, in no way are the payments staggered because of any conflicts that exist with traditional lending sources; rather, it is because this is a requirement shown by the farmers themselves in the budgets that they have submitted to the Rural Industries Branch.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I understand what the Minister has said. However, will he say how many applications have been processed to date, and why he keeps referring to the October date when I understand that the contract with the Commonwealth Government relates to July 1?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The agreement with the Commonwealth Government was commenced on October 1, 1976, and continues in force until December 31 this year.

That is why the figures relate to that period. In fact, the figures that I have just quoted relative to a 12-month period were taken out on October 1 this year.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: Then, this Government must spend \$1 500 000 from October to qualify again?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: No. The agreement was that the drought in South Australia was a natural disaster. That was agreed on October 1, 1976, and therefore that is the time from which the agreement operates. An amount of \$1 500 000 must be paid in that natural disaster period agreed to, namely, from October 1, 1976, to December 31, 1977. That is the period that so far has been negotiated as being the period to which this sum of money is applicable. The point I have been making all along is that, whilst we have not yet paid out the \$1 500 000, more than \$1 500 000 has been approved, and we expect that the Commonwealth Government will meet its commitments under that agreement.

URANIUM

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a statement prior to directing a question to the Leader of the Council regarding uranium policy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Doubtless, members on this side have noticed, and they have commented about the matter in casual conversation in this place this morning, that the national press now reports, more than reliably, that several hijackings or thefts of uranium have occurred, to the extent that countries have been able to produce nuclear weapons. In view of the widespread reports in the *Financial Review* and the *Australian*, and as the Liberal Party federally has criticised the whole of this State Government (although, in doing that, it has seen fit to mention only the name of Mr. Dunstan, the Premier, or of the appropriate Minister, the Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Hudson), I ask the Minister whether the policy of the South Australian Government, and of the Australian Labor Party as adopted at the recent conference (which also has been criticised by the Federal Government), has now been justified by the alarming reports of easy access to material that enables the manufacture of nuclear weapons. What is more alarming is that, whilst the press reports that the materials have been hijacked, one instance relating to West Germany, obviously it has been done with the concurrence of the Government of West Germany, in accordance with what

the demands of the American C.I.A. have been in this regard.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Is this campaigning?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Hon. Mr. Hill has suggested that it is a matter of campaigning, but the lives of our children's children are at stake. The Hon. Mr. Hill dares to suggest that the question is a matter of campaigning. We in South Australia are not going to an election: we have just been to one and we won handsomely on our policy, which included the policy on uranium.

DROUGHT RELIEF

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement in regard to drought relief. The question is supplementary to one asked by the Hon. Mr. Whyte.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The Minister has told us that the period under review is from October 1 last year until December 31 this year, and it would seem obvious that that period would have had considerable relation to the drought conditions which obtained last year and which, unfortunately, are obtaining possibly in an even more serious way this year. In view of that, I ask the Minister whether he has made representations to the Federal Government for the extension of this period in the ensuing year, to cover the situation that now exists.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I believe that negotiations are currently taking place at officer level between the State Treasury and the Federal Treasury on arrangements for drought relief for next year.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Can the Minister of Agriculture obtain the following figures for the Council to help resolve problems in respect of drought relief: how many applications have been received, how many applications have been approved, and how much money has been committed for approved applications?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I refer to the figures applying on October 1, 1977, when 281 applications had been received, 170 had been approved and \$1 980 609 had been approved for those applicants. About \$900 000 is still awaiting to be paid out. I imagine that many of the other applications would have been processed since October 1.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply from his colleague to my question of October 6 on religious education?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: As I have a rather long reply for the honourable member I seek leave to have the reply incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Religious Education

The Minister of Education informs me that during 1975 and 1976 his department conducted formative evaluation of its religious education programme in its developmental stages. It sought particularly to consider:

1. The suitability of the aims of religious education as expressed in the Steinle report and the syllabus.
2. The likelihood of indoctrination or bias towards particular religious positions, and
3. The relationship between religious education and other parts of the curriculum.

The evaluation took three forms:

- (a) a critical analysis of the documents of the Religious Education Project Team conducted

by five independent academics from other States.

- (b) An empirical evaluation of the course from the South Australian Education Department's research branch.

- (c) Open submissions from about 80 teachers, parents, and interested bodies.

The Evaluation Committee in its report of February 28, 1977 (of which a copy is available in the Parliamentary Library), reached the following conclusions:

Religious Education in South Australian State schools:

Discussion of religion has a valid place in a State school education. The curriculum development being undertaken by the Religious Education Project Team is based partly on an assumption that religious material is not adequately covered at present in South Australian State Schools. Research has shown that this assumption is justified in that overtly religious phenomena, particularly those relating to religions other than Christianity, are often ignored in teaching in both primary and secondary levels.

The Aims of Religious Education:

The wording of the aims of religious education contained in the Steinle report, and the use of phrases like "the religious dimension of life" have given rise to suspicions that the proposed courses would be biased towards the importance of religious belief in general or towards Christianity in particular. However, the explication of the aims of religious education in the years 1-12 syllabus produced by the Religious Education Project Team seems largely to have removed the grounds for such suspicion. The approach described in the syllabus is an open and non-dogmatic one. There is no bias towards particular systems of religious beliefs, nor any explicit bias in favour of religious belief itself.

Then followed 17 recommendations, certain of which had already been implemented when the evaluation report was released. Others are now being implemented. In any event a Religious Education Curriculum Committee, broadly representative of a range of value positions, was established in March, 1977, to give oversight to the development of the religious education curriculum materials and their introduction to schools.

The principle of treating religious education like any other subject of the curriculum, which is implicit in a number of the resolutions, has been re-affirmed by the department. In this area, as in other areas of the curriculum, schools are free to implement programmes as appropriate. Within both primary and secondary schools, the relationship of studies in religion to studies in health, environmental studies, and general cultural studies is being explored, problems of overlap are being examined and pilot projects monitored.

Continuing evaluation of this, as in other curriculum areas, will continue with the help of the research branch of the department. Early concern about the adequacy of numbers of trained teachers is being allayed by the high numbers of teacher trainees undertaking studies in religion and by augmented inservice programmes. Extra units of study are appearing, particularly at the secondary level, which explore not only the phenomena of religions but also their conflicts. In brief, the separate recommendations have each been considered and action has followed.

DRUGS

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Health in respect of the supply of drugs in hospital out-patient departments.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Last night in another place the member for Torrens referred to the worsening situation in respect of the supply of drugs in hospital out-patient departments. As the Minister will be aware, when drugs are supplied in those departments, they are supplied on a dose-time basis, that is, if a patient is on three tablets a day and has his next appointment in a month he is given 100 tablets, and if the next appointment is in two months he is given 200 tablets.

As the member for Torrens indicated, and as I indicate, no-one wants to see chronically ill people deprived of adequate supplies of medicine, but it seems that in many cases the amounts supplied are more than adequate. The member for Torrens referred to several patients being given 20 or 30 times the quantity normally available on prescription outside of hospitals.

I refer to one example of a patient on tolbutamide (a hypoglycaemic drug used in the treatment of diabetes) who was given five bottles each containing 250 tablets. This patient received over 3½ years supply of this drug. Two matters arise out of this situation: first, there is the danger of excess quantities of drugs being kept in household medicine cabinets and, secondly, as evidence indicates that at least 10 per cent of drugs are not taken, a waste of public money is involved. Hospitals are aware of the problem and are trying to do something about it, but it is clear that they need a direction from either the Health Commission or the Minister. Is the Minister aware of the situation, and is he concerned about it? If he is, what action does he or the Health Commission intend to take?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have not been made aware of the situation existing in hospital out-patient departments. If this situation obtains, I would naturally be concerned. I shall seek a report.

HIGHWAY IMPACT STUDY

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Some time ago I asked the Minister of Health, representing the Minister for the Environment, whether copies of the National Highways Draft Environmental Impact Study on the Stuart Highway would be made available for honourable members and for the public. We have not received any copies of that impact study, yet submissions supposedly close on October 30. As we have not received copies of the impact study, will the Minister urgently confer with his colleague to ensure that the time for submissions is extended by one month, and will he make copies of that study available?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I shall seek a report.

JAM FACTORY

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I direct a question to the Minister of Health. In dealing with the Jam Factory the Auditor-General stated:

The payment of \$34 800 arose from an oversea trip by the then Chairman of the authority and his deputy, and included the payment of a consultancy fee to the latter of \$14 300; the balance of \$20 500 was mainly for the cost of air fares, accommodation and travelling expenses for approximately nine weeks.

Will the Minister ascertain how the \$20 500 was spent and on which items, and, secondly, was the sum of \$14 300 paid for the nine weeks trip alone, and were further salaries, wages and other expenses paid outside the consultancy fee for the nine weeks?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I shall seek a report for the honourable member.

CATTLE SLAUGHTER

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question regarding the on-property slaughter of cattle?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I have received a reply to a telex, which I sent to the Federal Minister, requesting that the beef-aid package which was announced recently should be extended to apply to people in the pastoral area for the slaughter of breeding stock. In another previous statement I made in respect of drought relief, I explained that all the measures that were in existence, except for slaughter payments, which were terminated on June 30, 1977, should not affect the slaughter scheme that was in operation last year.

The Prime Minister announced a package of assistance to the beef industry that included a measure whereby producers could receive \$10 a head assistance up to \$2 000 for a number of approved management procedures. Those procedures included the spaying of young heifers, certain disease-control measures, such as testing for tuberculosis and brucellosis, and for the dipping of cattle. I sought from the Federal Minister an extension to include the slaughter of old breeding cows. I have received a reply refusing the request, but I am further following up this matter because, in the explanation of the refusal, there seemed to be some confusion in the terms of what I was actually asking.

It was implied that it would be uneconomic to spay old breeding cows, which suggestion is completely correct, but it was not the request that I made: that owners should be given the option as to whether they wished to spay young stock or slaughter old stock. Both these options would achieve the same object of restricting increases in herds.

CONCESSIONS TO INDUSTRY

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture about concessions to industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Recent statements by the Minister highlight the ever-increasing difficulties of the fruit juice industry in South Australia and adjacent irrigation areas. Growers' returns are far from satisfactory. A direct subsidy is made available to the industry by the Commonwealth Government in relation to the cost of sugar to processors of canned fruit. The Federal Government or the Colonial Sugar Refining Company also makes available benefits in connection with the supply of sugar to the soft drink industry. Over recent years the local soft drink industry has been taken over by multi-national foreign companies. Can the Minister inform the Council whether the soft drink industry in Australia, controlled from outside and owned by multi-national companies, receives a benefit from the Commonwealth Government to the extent that there is unfair competition between the fruit juice industry and the soft drink industry? If that is the case, will the Minister submit to the Commonwealth Government that the fruit juice industry be given similar benefits to those accorded to soft drink manufacturers?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will certainly consider the matter raised by the honourable member. I am not aware whether soft drink manufacturers receive any assistance under the Commonwealth sugar agreement, but I am aware that certain sales taxes on soft drinks do not apply to fruit juices. Manufacturers of fruit juices and canned fruit receive sugar on a concessional basis, provided those manufacturers pay the fruitgrowers certain

prices laid down by the Fruit Industry Sugar Concession Committee. I will ascertain whether concessions apply to soft drink manufacturers.

PUBLIC SERVICE OFFICERS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In his Financial Statement the Treasurer explained the creation of a new Housing and Urban Affairs Department, which would include the State Planning Authority, the State Planning Office, and the price control division of the Environment Department. It appears that there are two senior officers in the new department—Mr. Mant and Mr. Hart. Which of these two officers is regarded by the Minister for Planning as the senior?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

BEVERAGE CONTAINER REGULATIONS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the regulations made on June 23, 1977, under the Beverage Container Act, 1975-1976, exempting certain classes of containers from the provisions of the Act, and laid on the table of this Council on July 19, 1977, be disallowed.

First, I shall give the history of this legislation from its inception to the implementation of the regulations. On March 29, 1974, when the first Bill was introduced, the Council requested the House of Assembly to appoint a Joint House Committee to report on the Bill. The Government refused to accept the suggestion of the Council, which then referred the Bill to a Select Committee of the Council. On that report from the Select Committee being made, the first Bill was defeated. The second Bill then came on the scene, and it was exactly the same as the original Bill, with a provision for a deposit on all containers, with the possible exception of some containers.

The Liberal Party's view at that time was that the legislation would not fulfil its aim; the legislation was emotional and would not be of any advantage. Finally, amendments were made to the Bill but these were disagreed to by the House of Assembly, and a conference was held between the two Houses. At that conference the following points were agreed to: first, that the maximum deposit should be 5c; secondly, that the Bill was not to come into operation until June, 1977; thirdly, that the Government would ask the Environmental Protection Council to examine the wisdom of a voluntary tax being paid by packagers generally to create a fund for dealing with the litter problem; and, fourthly, that the Government would introduce legislation to impose fines for indiscriminate littering.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Was that in *Hansard*?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, but that is a summary. This Council has warned the Government about the difficulties associated with deposits on cans. Other States have examined the question, and every State, including New South Wales, that has done so has not proceeded with this type of legislation. The adamant attitude adopted by the previous Minister toward this question was probably the main difficulty that the Government faced. The new Minister for the Environment, since the previous

one has been moved to the onerous portfolio of Chief Secretary—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Were you not Chief Secretary at one stage? Was the portfolio onerous then?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It was more onerous then than it is now. The new Minister, as reported in the press, has made known that he holds certain views suggesting that he may be taking a more realistic view of the problem than the previous Minister did. About six weeks ago I took up the question of the cost to workers in industry of the deposit legislation. The group with whom I discussed this matter expressed some gratitude to me for the fact that at least their viewpoint was receiving attention. A member of the group rang me to say that it had also questioned the Premier on this matter during the election campaign. The Premier told the group that he would see what he could do about the problems facing workers in industry in regard to the deposit legislation. Perhaps the removal of the Minister to the onerous task of Chief Secretary may be the first move by the Government in rethinking some of the problems regarding this legislation and the regulations. The history of this legislation shows the silly position that a Government can get itself into when emotional politicking becomes more important than practical administration.

I will examine some of the difficulties involved in this legislation and regulations at present. First, there is the problem of what I have termed "the closed environment", the large industrial canteen where there is no litter problem, where no cans are taken from the premises and the can is returned to the scrap metal line. In other words, in many industrial premises the worker takes the can on to the job; it is an acceptable container; it does not break; it holds its carbonisation; and when empty it goes into the scrap metal bin and straight into the recycling process.

There is no problem regarding litter in this environment. In most of those industrial premises, the management frowns on material leaving the premises because of security problems. One can see the difficulty in carting off the premises hundreds of thousands of cans to be taken back to a collection depot, maybe miles from where the worker lives. A realistic estimate of what the deposit legislation will cost workers in this industry is \$1 000 000 a year.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: How is that worked out?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It is worked out on the basis of, say, the G.M.H. canteen where about 800 000 cans are sold each year. The increased cost of cans to the canteen is 8c or 9c each. It could amount to between \$70 000 and \$80 000 in the G.M.H. canteen alone. If one multiplies that for a number of industries in South Australia, this legislation could cost the worker about \$1 000 000 a year extra. Then there is the problem in the north of South Australia. Even the previous Minister talked about a zone in the north exempt from the legislation. When the regulations came into force, the whole of the north was included. In the north, the can is by far the most satisfactory container. However, as there are no receipt depots there, the can will not come back. People are condemned to paying an extra 7c or 8c a can, because of the 5c deposit, and they achieve nothing. Either they have to pay more for the bottle, which is an expensive item to cart in that area, or they have to pay the heavy increase in the cost of a can.

Then there is the question of the towns along the border of South Australia. It is obvious that, if cans are going to be 7c or 8c cheaper over the border, people will travel only a few miles and buy their cans from a Victorian retail outlet. Then there is the complete anomaly of the Government's allowing a no-deposit small bottle which will replace the can in the beer trade. That is an odd piece

of reasoning: the so-called stubbie, which was the bottle the Government complained most bitterly about when this legislation came in, is now being renamed, and that bottle is a no-deposit non-returnable container.

The problem that will face the can industry in South Australia is quite dramatic. The can industry exists with a very minor profit margin, because we know that the can industry requires turnover to make it economic. The loss of 20 per cent, 30 per cent, or maybe 40 per cent of the can trade in South Australia will see the closure of the can-making industry here. We will draw our cans from other States, with a consequent loss of industry and a loss of jobs in South Australia. The Government is under some pressure at least to make some changes in the regulations, but I believe that it is waiting for the Legislative Council to disallow them. When that happens, it will embark upon its usual abuse of the Legislative Council on the question of disallowing regulations. There is no way that this Council can amend the regulations. The only way that we can get the Government to recognise the problems created under these regulations and the legislation is to disallow the regulations *in toto*.

If the regulations are disallowed, the Government has three options: immediately to regazette the regulations as they are at present; to gazette new regulations that are more realistic; or to drop the scheme altogether. As I have said, it is interesting to note that no other State, in the 3½ years that this debate has been going on in South Australia, has made any move to introduce similar legislation, although at the last election the New South Wales Government on the hustings did make some promises in regard to it. Since that time, however, I have discovered that it has no intention of proceeding with this sort of legislation, claiming that there are far better ways of handling the problem than introducing a costly deposit system in that State. I reiterate my opposition to this type of legislation; I do not believe it has achieved anything in South Australia, except to increase significantly the cost to the consumer, and it has changed very little in the way of litter control. There are better ways of handling this problem.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from October 19. Page 260.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I wish to speak in support of this Bill. The Hon. Mr. Burdett has introduced this measure three times. Owing to circumstances occurring within the Parliamentary system, the measure has not previously been debated in another place. However, there are many problems associated with pornography, especially where children are included, and where children's and their bodies may be photographed and photographs then offered for sale.

It is the status of man that builds a society; it is the status of society that builds a nation. History has proved time and time again that, when a man denigrates his own status by his licentiousness, then the society in which he lives inevitably suffers, and in turn, the status of the nation becomes dissolute and it is no longer a nation with a strength of purpose. It is no longer a nation of which to be proud. We are a young State in a young nation, this State that drew its first migrants from Europe and the United Kingdom, who came to pioneer, to find a better way of

life; they all helped to make this State a proud one. But, in spite of the courage of those early pioneers and in spite of the traditions that they created and handed down to us all, there are other nations whose manifestos are to demoralise the type of society in which we live; and one of the planks of their manifesto is to introduce pornographic material.

It is well known how through the years it was first sold on the wharves; then it was sold under the counter and then it was sold where the Government gave a restricted licence for it to be sold within the State. This can only do harm to our society; this can only help to demolish the moral fibre of the community. This permissiveness can only weaken the nation's inherited strength. It is repugnant to me but, worst of all, far worse than the pictures in glossy magazines of adult men and women in various positions of the sexual act are these pornographic displays of young children's bodies assisting adults in the perversions of the sexual act.

That is what the Bill is all about—to prevent the taking, distributing, or selling of photographs of young persons in pornographic positions; yet the Government is reluctant to support the Bill. Where is the pride in its responsibility to care for the weak? I challenge the members of the Government to support this Bill by asking them just one question: would members of the Government like to see their children or their children's children being photographed and the photographs being sold where those children are shown in the myriads of sexual positions that the perverted can imagine? I support the second reading of this Bill.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: This Bill is identical to the one that was brought into the Chamber on two previous occasions. I opposed the Bill then and I oppose it now, for basically the same reason. I do not wish to hammer it in detail, but those reasons can be found in *Hansard* of April 6 and July 22, 1977, when I made speeches on identical Bills. Anybody interested in either of those speeches can refer to them instead of my giving the reasons again.

The issue originally arose out of a considerable amount of publicity suggesting that this type of material was freely available in South Australia. Of course, on further investigation, that was found not to be the case. Where material was found and people were discovered to be photographing children in this manner, the police, the Government, and the courts took action, and in every case, to my knowledge anyway, these people were successfully prosecuted, as they should have been, and appropriate penalties were prescribed. The Hon. Mr. Burdett has not given any details or cited cases where people have been found to be engaged in this type of activity and there has been difficulty in prosecuting them. If the Hon. Mr. Burdett has any information of this nature and if he can cite a case where somebody has been discovered engaged in this activity and the police have been unable to prosecute because of some deficiency in the law, he should tell us. He certainly has not done so so far.

During the publicity surrounding this matter earlier in the year, the Premier immediately took action to see that what material was available certainly would not be available to anybody. I refer now to a Ministerial statement by the Premier in the House of Assembly on March 29, 1977. Amongst other things, the Premier said:

The upshot is that I subsequently had a conversation with the Chairperson of the Classification of Publications Board (Miss Layton), and I put to her the Government's view about material of this kind, especially that the Government's policy was that adults could read, see and hear what they wished, but that protection should be provided, that unsuitable

material should not be put in the hands of minors without the consent of their parents and that people who were unwilling to see material of this kind should not have it forced on them. I pointed out that, since the Government's policy was designed to protect children, it would be quite inconsistent to classify in South Australia foreign publications that involved offences of indecency concerning children which, if they occurred in South Australia, would be prosecuted and condemned. The Chairperson acceded to the point of view that I put and asked that I should set out the Government's view in a minute to the board, which I did subsequently as follows:

"I have been aware for some time of the tendency for pornography depicting children to become less of a rarity in Australia and for some of it to be 'hard core' compared with early samples which often comprised photographs of nude children who were not involved in sexual activities. In view of the intimation that your board was seeking special advice from Commonwealth classification authorities if they discovered pornography involving either sadism or paedophilia, I raised the matter at the last conference of State and Commonwealth Ministers concerned with classification matters. It was agreed that such material would be marked with an asterisk on future lists of Commonwealth classifications sent to you on the understanding that such titles would be given an additional restriction that they might not be advertised or displayed even in 'sex shops'.

More recently there has been considerable publicity regarding paedophilia and I think it is evident that current community standards are such that material depicting hard-core paedophilia should be refused classification by the Classification of Publications Board thus rendering any vendor of such material, in this State, liable to prosecution by the police under the provisions of section 33 of the Police Offences Act. I am therefore writing to say that my Government would be pleased if your board would adopt such a policy in the circumstances."

The board is meeting this week, and its Chairman has indicated that that will be put before the board. She expects there will be no difficulty at all about the board's complying with that view, which would be the board's own.

Of course, the board agreed with that view, that material of this nature should not be classified. It is interesting to compare the Premier's attitude then with that of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Tonkin, who in a report in the *Sunday Mail* of April 10, amongst other things dealing with the possibility of a future election, is referred to as follows:

Mr. Tonkin said that the Privy Council could give its finding at any time—

That, of course, related to the boundaries question—and it was obvious Mr. Dunstan was keen to have an election. The evidence being given to the Royal Commission into juvenile offenders, the child pornography question, and that of late shopping hours had embarrassed the Government. The longer these things go on the better it is for the Opposition, he said.

They were the words of Mr. Tonkin, who wanted the debate on child pornography to continue for as long as possible, purely for election purposes. It strikes me that he, too, sees political advantage in keeping this issue going. If the Hon. Mr. Burdett objects to Government members accusing him of the same thing, I think he should have a word with Mr. Tonkin, who wants to keep the issue going for as long as possible.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: He didn't say that.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: He said that, the longer it goes on, the better it is for him. That is a scandalous statement.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Playing politics!

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Of course, porn politics. The matter of penalties has been referred to. In his second reading explanation, the Hon. Mr. Burdett referred to the Government's policy speech, in which the Premier stated that the Government would examine the whole range of penalties in this area to ascertain whether any amendments were necessary. The Government is already doing this, and the Attorney-General intends to issue a statement regarding the review of penalties. I assume that this statement will be released later today.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: How convenient!

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: The text of that statement will be as follows:

As announced in the election policy the Government intends to review the penalties prescribed in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and the Police Offences Act. There will be a sharp increase in the fines for offences relating to child pornography. This matter is being considered by officers of my department at the present time and I hope to introduce amending legislation either this year or in the first session next year.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Or maybe the year after that.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Certainly at an early date. The statement continues:

When this issue was first raised some time ago by Mr. Burdett, the Premier and myself made it abundantly clear that the present law was adequate in dealing with offences involving children. For serious offences of this kind the law prescribes quite substantial gaol sentences. In a recent case before the Supreme Court, a person found guilty of offences of this nature was sentenced to four years imprisonment.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Burdett wants to exploit this issue for Party-political reasons. The use of children in pornography is totally repugnant to this Government and persons engaging in it will face considerable terms of imprisonment and very heavy fines. When such matters have been brought before the courts, they have been dealt with in an appropriate fashion.

Mr. Burdett's proposal is both irrelevant and unnecessary and the Government will not be a party to such a cynical manipulation of this issue for political means. I can only reiterate what I said to the House on March 30, 1977. If the Opposition believes that it has evidence of child pornography in South Australia, or of people manufacturing and peddling it, I invite them to come to me and I will have Government officers investigate the claims.

Another thing of which honourable members should be aware (I assume that most, if not all, of them are) is the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee of South Australia, which is known as the Mitchell committee and the terms of reference of which are indeed broad. On December 14, 1971, that committee was set up with the following terms of reference:

To examine and to report and to make recommendations to the Attorney-General in relation to the criminal law in force in the State and in particular as to whether any, and if so what, changes should be effected—

- (a) in the substantive law;
- (b) in criminal investigation and procedures;
- (c) in court procedures and rules of evidence; and
- (d) in penal methods.

All honourable members would agree that those terms of reference are wide and, should the Mitchell committee see a need specifically to investigate this matter of child pornography, it would have power within its terms of reference to do so. In any case, within the next couple of months a further report is due from that committee and we should wait to see what is contained in that report, as it may refer to this matter.

I do not see any point in delaying the Council any

further, as anything else that I could say has already been said twice previously. The Hon. Mr. Burdett has been unable to convince me, for the third time, that any person engaged in this type of activity cannot be dealt with under the present law. For those reasons, I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I support the Bill and congratulate the Hon. Mr. Burdett for persisting with legislation that all members in this Council know is necessary to curb the present and previously unknown exploitation of children in articles of pornographic literature.

The exploitation of children, no matter for what purpose, is one of the lowest forms of enterprise that can be countenanced anywhere in the world. However, that is what we are doing at present: we in South Australia are countenancing this practice.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That's not right.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The honourable member has the report before him, and he knows that there is plenty of evidence of this practice in South Australia.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Where, and what evidence? Produce it. Give it to the police.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The honourable member is bluffing.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You show me where the evidence is.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: We went through all this in the previous debate.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That's right. There was no evidence. Where was it?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Mike Drewer referred to it on T.D.T.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Did he go to the police?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What sort of an argument is this? There is any amount of law on the Statute Book that affords protection.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: We say that the law is there now. If you have the material, take it to the police.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Whyte has the floor in this debate and, if the Hon. Mr. Blevins wants to debate the matter with the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, he should do so outside this Chamber.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The proposed legislation which we are discussing and which the Hon. Mr. Burdett has persisted with is the same as a Bill he introduced last session, and it provides simply that a person shall not make or take any part in making a photograph in which a person under or apparently under the age of 14 years appears to be engaged in an act of indecency. That is the crux of the Bill and, if the Government says that that is insufficient, I am sure that neither the Hon. Mr. Burdett nor anyone else on this side will try to deny the Government the right to expand on the measure.

Certainly, the action proposed should be taken immediately. We should not wait for the Mitchell report or a Ministerial statement. The evidence is here, and there is no suggestion that we wish to deny the Government any kudos in this serious matter. All that the Hon. Mr. Burdett is asking for is immediate action. In his explanation of the Bill, the honourable member stated:

The maximum penalty for not wearing a seat belt is \$300. The maximum penalty under section 33 of the Police Offences Act, the only one that deals with this situation, is a fine of \$200.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That is not right.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The maximum penalty is a fine of \$200 or imprisonment for six months.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: There are offences covering the production. A few months ago, some people got 4½ years gaol for photographing a child.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: The Hon. Mr. Burdett wants to hang them.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: That may not be a bad idea, either.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Well, why don't you move that way?

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What did you say, the Hon. Mr. Dawkins? The Hon. Mr. Dawkins wants to hang pornographers. It that right?

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: I did not say that.

The PRESIDENT: Again, we are developing cross-debates.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I repeat that exploitation of children for any reason is bad enough and should be punished, but our laws should provide for the police to apprehend without further ado a person who exploits children for pornography. I do not agree with the Hon. Mr. Blevins. He agrees with what the Bill is designed to do, but he wants to wait for his Government to make further investigation. He wants to await the Mitchell report. Let the Mitchell report add to what the Hon. Mr. Burdett proposes if it so desires, but let us have this legislation as quickly as possible to try to stamp out one of the most cruel and most undesirable practices that this State has seen.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 25. Page 403.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I rise to support the Appropriation Bill with misgivings and a certain distaste as a result of my reading the Premier's petulant, not to say raving, diatribe in his Financial Statement. It would be improper of me, as a representative of all the people of the State, not to comment on this diatribe against the Federal Government that makes up the introductory pages of the printed speech. This type of posturing and ranting smokescreen production hides the fact that there is in the Budget speech little that indicates that either the Premier or the socialist economic advisers of his own Premier's Department have any concept of a plan to develop South Australia's future population-carrying capacity. However, before leaving that portion of the paper, I must refer to some blatant untruths that have been promulgated with the taxpayers' money. I refer to page 4 of the statement, as follows:

As I have already indicated, inflation had been wound down in 1975 from an annual rate of over 17 per cent to 12.1 per cent by September, 1975. We could have expected, in view of the exceptionally good compliance the trade union movement has accorded wage indexation, a further deceleration in 1976 and 1977. Instead, as the Arbitration Commission has repeatedly and bitterly complained, the Federal Government has not played its part in assisting wage indexation's contribution to lower the rate of price increases.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: What is untrue about that?

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Here it comes. The truth of this matter lies in the fact that for more than 10 years Federal Governments and industry have been telling the Arbitration Commission that the steady and high rate of increases it was making would price Australia out of world markets in manufactured goods and would, indeed, lose our home market for the Australian manufacturers. The Arbitration Commission apparently did not heed these warnings. The state of the economy around us and the unemployment leave us in little doubt about those facts. A

further misstatement of history may be found a few lines later. There the Premier states:

It is worth stating clearly what the Federal Treasury inflation forecast is for the coming year. While they do not give an explicit forecast, it is not difficult to deduce what it must be. The Budget statements indicate that award wage growth is put at 10.5 per cent. Since as an integral part of their forecasting exercise the Commonwealth Treasury assume partial wage indexation, they must be forecasting price increases in excess of this rate. These two facts, therefore, imply an inflation prediction of around about, let us say, 12 per cent. That implies no improvement at all on the inflation rate achieved as long ago as September, 1975. And, indeed, it is agreed by almost everybody that in the short term things will get worse before they get better. What a devastating indictment this combination of increasing unemployment and inflation is for those people who justified breaking almost every constitutional rule in the book two years ago with the claim that they could manage the economy.

The implication is that the inflation rate, the loss of market by our secondary industry both overseas and in Australia, and hence unemployment, all have happened over the past two years. The truth of the matter is that our present situation is not an indication of the present ability of our Federal Government and its hard-working departments, but a precise index of the extraordinary state to which Australia was brought by the Labor Government's experiments in socialism. The last sentence in the part of the Premier's statement to which I have just referred is a glaring untruth.

It is always difficult to be constructive about the Appropriation Bill by the time it reaches honourable members here, but I will try to be constructive on only some points. I refer first to pay-roll tax. Whereas the Federal Government has attempted to lighten the tax burden on the Australian people and on Australian industry in order to encourage further employment, we have seen no attempt by the South Australian Premier to reduce overall tax rates. Indeed, the Government continues to levy tax at a high rate on both successful and unsuccessful businesses alike. Profitable or unprofitable, it does not matter, as all businesses have to pay this unjust and stupid tax to the voracious Treasury.

In fact, pay-roll tax in South Australia is a tax on employment, and far from reducing pay-roll tax or even holding it, in order to encourage employment, honourable members can observe from the Estimate of Revenue that the amount to be collected from South Australian industry (only because it employs labour) will be about \$153 000 000 in 1977-78, an increase of more than 11 per cent on the past year. What an incentive to South Australian commerce to take on additional employees!

No wonder there is a lack of eagerness amongst employers to increase their staff. If the Premier believes that South Australia is so successful, he should read carefully the State of the State supplement published in yesterday's *Advertiser*. This large and well put together supplement has the clear objective of finding good in South Australia and its future but, regrettably, it contains much pessimism and little optimism. Indeed, it makes those of us who have given our lives to attempting to build up South Australia most disappointed.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Whose fault is that?

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: If the honourable member waits patiently he will find out. The enormous sums now being spent upon a variety of advisers, committees, and specialists in various Government departments seem to be producing little "get-up-and-go" for South Australia. The Government should look at the proposition that much of

this wasted money should be diverted to subsidising and modernising our primary production sector. South Australia has always relied largely on primary production for its wealth. Indeed, it becomes clearer every day that we do not have much else to look to for our viability.

There should surely be room for a great expansion of our research and development in agriculture. I refer especially to a concentration in the development of new products and more intensive means of farming our high rainfall areas. The money presently being spent on agriculture generally covers little more than weak support of husbandry, grain, flocks and herds. I draw particular attention in the State of the State supplement to the comments of Sir Mark Oliphant where he again presses for research into the use of wind power. The following statement was reported:

"Let's get on with the job", says Sir Mark Oliphant, dismayed at the decline in South Australia's fortunes.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: What did he say about uranium mining?

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I intend to refer to Sir Mark's comments. He states:

When, after 43 years away from Adelaide, I returned as Governor, I found the economy of the State still sound. The euphoria of the Playford era had carried over sufficiently to allow great developments by the Dunstan Government—in education at all levels, in health and social services such as the outstanding Regency Park Centre for physically handicapped children, and in the performing arts culminating in the completion of the Festival Centre.

But already ominous clouds were gathering on the economic horizon. Deterioration was rapid and since I retired in December, 1976, I have watched with dismay the decline in the fortunes of my native State. Why? Many people are tempted to blame the misfortunes of the State upon the actions, or inactions, of the present Governments, State and Federal.

In fact, they arise from a combination of circumstances which have exacerbated the generally depressed economies of most nations. In South Australia these are the lack of the abundance of natural resources enjoyed by other States, coupled with factories that are isolated from their markets in the east.

How often has that been said in this Chamber? Sir Mark continues:

I am not convinced of the wisdom of Australia's rapidly growing dependence upon the export of minerals to boost the declining income from agriculture and grazing. South Australia depended heavily—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: It's declining all over Australia.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: He referred to Australia. The honourable member must be deaf.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What about—

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I am quoting Sir Mark Oliphant. I thought his was such a fair statement that I should read it to the Council. Sir Mark is fair and blames no-one. He is taking the position that all honourable members should take. He continues:

South Australia depended heavily in the past upon exports of ores of copper and iron. The copper has gone and the iron is insignificant beside the enormous resources of Western Australia. There are some people who look to the export of uranium to help pay for the growing tide of imports, but South Australia lacks the rich deposits of the Northern Territory and Queensland.

A Yugoslav engineer once said to me that Australia was making itself a hole in the ground for the benefit of the major manufacturing nations of the world, as have the smaller phosphate islands of the Pacific. South Australia has some natural gas and a little poor coal but these will not last much

beyond the end of this century. Adelaide is utterly dependent upon salt-laden and polluted water from the Murray River and the cost of treatment is high.

I understand that it is \$4 000 000 a year, as reported in the *News* today. Sir Mark continues:

South Australia must recognise its paucity of natural resources and not endeavor to compete with the Eastern States by manufacturing in the wrong factories in the wrong place but use its people's brains and hands to maintain and enhance its living standards. The State is ideally situated for the development of both wind power and solar power, if it has the will to do so.

It should seek a multitude of small specialised industries, fed with new ideas and improved processes by its universities and colleges of technology. It could become the Australian centre for the finest precision engineering rather than bulk manufacture of ordinary consumer goods.

In this way, with proper planning and dedicated effort, South Australia could provide a better, more dignified and satisfying lifestyle, than any other part of the continent. I believe that this will happen.

That view is worth repeating and remembering. I am not one of those who believes that the world is heading for a disaster in respect of fuel supplies. I believe that we have to get moving on the development of alternative power sources, and possibly the reduction of some waste. We have before us a wide range of potential. First, we have the use of direct sunlight for the heating of water; secondly, the use of solar-electronic cells for the production of electricity; thirdly, wind power; and, fourthly, there are vast possibilities in the conversion of rapid-growth plant substances into alcohol distillate, which I understand is being widely examined and experimented with by world oil companies.

I suggest that in South Australia we give ourselves a good start in some of these fields and spend less money on some of the soft-job fairy floss. Press reports this week contained criticism of the maintenance and development of many of our parks and they concerned not always their development but often their decay. Indeed, I have noticed that the Cleland National Park, which is an interesting park and tourist attraction, has slipped badly through lack of maintenance and lack of funds.

In environmental matters we seem to spend far too much on professional advisers and far too little on workers. If I am to believe the common story, the talkers and the writers on the environment far outnumber the rangers in our parks at a ratio of about 20:1. I suggest that the Government does something with a view to reversing these figures.

It has been illuminating to read this Budget. There has been obviously much over-spending in many departments in the past year, with much of the over-spending attributable to wage and salary increases. As the Estimates show such an increase over the past year, I hope that the provision made against inflation will cover any further inflated salary and wage payments, and that those inflations will not be used as an excuse to overspend on the Budget provided by Parliament. Even the Premier in his appeal to Government departments to curb their expenditure is showing that he is trying to get off the tiger.

In supporting the Bill I believe that at last we are discovering where the Government is preparing to spend the State's money in the coming year, something which, to some degree at least, we have had previously conveyed in the Governor's Speech in opening Parliament. At least it is nice to know that we are not setting out on a great mystery tour of some sort.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill. The Hon. Mrs.

Cooper impressed me by suggesting that there are alternative supplies of energy and resources in Australia. She quoted Sir Mark Oliphant but, of course, she did not go on with the quotation where Sir Mark suggested that we should not mine uranium. In his Financial Statement the Premier says:

Members will recall that last financial year saw the introduction of an arrangement between the Commonwealth and the States for the sharing of personal income tax collections, an arrangement which the Commonwealth Government claimed would provide about \$89 000 000 more for the States in 1976-77 than would be yielded by a continuation of the previous financial assistance grants formula. Indeed, the Commonwealth used that claim to justify their actions in reducing specific purpose and Loan Council funds to a level which was well below the expected level of inflation.

When I gave members a detailed account of those arrangements last year, I drew attention to a number of matters which made me apprehensive about the scheme. I made it quite clear that, whilst the new federalism gave the impression of the States and the Commonwealth working together in some form of national revenue-sharing partnership, I regarded the benefits ascribed to it as largely illusory.

Nothing has occurred since then to cause me to retract or to modify that view. The facts now speak for themselves. Opposition members said that the Premier returned from the Premiers' Conference more than pleased that he had received an increase. However, if the Fraser Government's policies continue to have their present effects, manufacturing industries will continue to wind down, there will be a greater number of unemployed people, and there will be smaller tax collections. In those circumstances, instead of the suggested 38 per cent, there could be no increase at all to the States. I must congratulate the Hon. Mrs. Cooper on talking about the Budget to a greater extent than did the Leaders of her Party. She could be in the leadership stakes, because the Hon. Mr. Hill and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris did not perform nearly as well as she did.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: She would add to the beauty of the front bench on the other side.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I would have to agree with the Minister. Regarding the effective use of resources, in his Financial Statement the Premier also says:

Before turning to the more detailed explanations of the Budget, I would like to comment briefly on the benefits to be obtained from the long-term planning of our financial resources, from improved financial management and from reviews of policies and operations.

As members know from my previous reports on this matter, the Government has been planning its capital works on a three year rolling programme for a number of years. Forward planning has been of considerable benefit in achieving the effective use of our resources and, further, has helped us to cushion the adverse effects of recent budgetary decisions taken by the Commonwealth Government.

Last year I informed the House that we intended to develop a two year forward planning programme for Revenue Account with the intention of extending it to a three year programme as soon as possible. I warned members of the complexities of this exercise and, as anticipated, more work needs to be done before meaningful results can be achieved. Treasury officers are working with departments on this matter with a view to having more reliable information in April next about 1978-79 and future years.

On the matter of the review of the Government accounting systems to facilitate the development by Treasury and departments of budgets and financial management systems

which place greater emphasis on individual responsibility and accountability, further progress has been made. I expect a proposal to be put to the Government shortly on the matter. It is my intention to refer it to the Public Accounts Committee for consideration.

I should also mention that recently I have asked all departments to examine critically their existing activities and to identify those areas where economies might be achieved. This review should consider whether any activities might be reduced or eliminated because they have become of lower priority in terms of the Government's current policies and whether any operations might be carried out more efficiently and with less staff and/or other resources. I have asked the Public Service Board, Treasury and the Premier's Department to co-operate with departments in this exercise. May I stress the word co-operate. Long-term financial stability has been, and will continue to be, one of the major aims of this Government's policies. We see the firm control of expenditures within the limits approved, the improvement of our financial planning and budgeting, the achievement of economies wherever practicable and the flexibility to cope with changing circumstances as essential elements in the achievement of our objectives. This is particularly so in the present difficult economic climate.

The Premier said that. That gives all the answers. There have been slurs and innuendos used against the Australian Labor Party, and the Premier in part, during the last election on the matter of the Northfield Hospital. We continually hear the Hon. Mr. Hill attacking the Government because it does not administer the Public Service properly. In this document, the Premier has said that he wants the co-operation of the Public Service.

The Hon. J. A. Carnie: What about the Public Works Committee?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The Premier is not ignoring the Auditor-General. He is the sort of man who admits his responsibilities. I note the anger portrayed strongly by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris yesterday and by the Hon. Mr. Hill and other Opposition members, because this is a good document. It is a good financial report. I said in previous Budget speeches that at the very heart of any organisation, especially Governments, must be a good Treasurer. He must be a man who is able to change with the times, to innovate, to listen to the Opposition. The Opposition should give the Treasurer respect. Of course, respect is lacking in many areas on the other side of the Council.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: What about the criticisms and complaints of the Auditor-General? What do you think about those?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I do not disagree. What he said is true. One cannot blame the Premier if someone steals a loaf of bread or some sausages. Opposition members blamed him in the election. They failed in that election.

The Hon. J. A. Carnie: What about the Public Works Committee's Annual Report? Does that show firm control of expenditure?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I know the Opposition do not like me to give the Premier a rap-up. However, on this occasion he deserves it. I want to mention another thing which was mentioned by the Hon. Jessie Cooper. This is an article in the *Advertiser*, Tuesday, October 25, headed "South Australia faces a tough year". In that article, it is stated:

The State Government has followed policies which, to the limits of the State's resources, are aimed at keeping the State's economy buoyant. By encouraging both private sector industries and by setting an example through public sector investment, the South Australian Government has managed to lessen the effects on South Australia of the Federal

Government's economic policy. Industrial confidence has been boosted in a number of ways. Examples include the \$8 000 000 expansion by Uniroyal, Chrysler's \$3 500 000 investment in its Wylie subsidiary and its investment in new four-cylinder engine capacity, as well as significant marketing gains by South Australian companies. Sigal Industries has just won a \$2 300 000 contract with the Victorian Government.

One continually hears honourable members opposite saying that industries are leaving South Australia because of the high cost of their operation in this State. That is not true. Here is the proof of this, in the capitalist press which those honourable members support. The article talks about Clyde Industries (S.A.). That is a national company which has operations in all capital cities. The article continues:

Clyde Industries (S.A.) beat world competition to gain an \$11 000 000 contract with the New Zealand Government to refurbish diesel locomotives. Mr. Dunstan said the Government was playing a vital role in the economic welfare of South Australia by working with industry and encouraging industry to expand both in physical improvements and in marketing developments. The result had been South Australia's manufacturing employment had grown at a time when manufacturing employment in the rest of Australia had declined.

"We have gone against the trend because of good co-operation between Government and private enterprise and because the Government has supported the private sector by maintaining purchases and by a range of assistance," Mr. Dunstan said. "Clearly, economic considerations are the main ones facing the State over the next year." Mr. Dunstan's warning was echoed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tonkin).

This shows a new trend for the Leader of the Opposition. The article further states:

"At the risk of being accused by the Australian Labor Party of being a knocker, . . ."

The whole State accused Mr. Tonkin of being a knocker; that is why he lost the election. It goes on:

". . . I want to bring to the attention of the people of South Australia the difficult times ahead," Mr. Tonkin said.

He then talks about the State "teetering on the brink of economic collapse". I agree with him, that if Fraser has an election in December, that would be the effect of the matter.

Let us look at the last election. I want to congratulate the Hon. Frank Blevins on having included in *Hansard*, October 12, page 129, the policy speech given by the Premier. I mention some of the things he said:

So far from the new federalism they preached—under which the States were to have more say in allotting their own priorities, they have reduced our resources. The money paid to this State over the past two years has increased only slightly and by nowhere near enough to take account of rising costs. As a result we have had, in practical terms, a 7 per cent cut in funds. And this at a time when the Commonwealth has withdrawn from a wide range of programmes it previously ran and which it now expects the States to pick up and administer from our reduced resources. Fortunately, as a result of the Railways Agreement which the Liberals fought at the last State election, we have been in a position to do much to offset Federal Policy locally.

I know that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris still opposes this. He is about the only Liberal member who does. Honourable members opposite speak about tax. The Federal Budget increased the tax. The speech continues:

We have abolished the petrol tax, abolished rural land tax and abolished succession duty between spouses.

The farmers do not usually vote for us, although more

farmers are now voting for us, of course. The Premier's speech continues:

We have reduced succession duty rates and land tax rates for many. We have absorbed cost increases particularly in public transport in order to counteract inflation.

Honourable members would have recently seen that the cost of transport (fares on the buses) has been reduced by the Minister. The speech continues:

We have refused to cut our public services, and we have kept construction expenditure high both in public buildings and in housing. We have brought new industries and new technology to our State. We have provided job creation schemes which have ensured employment for thousands whom Mr. Fraser (who condemns such schemes) and Mr. Tonkin (who says they are a waste of money) would have left people unemployed. It will take all our resources of reserves and other funds to maintain that policy this year. We ask you to give us a mandate for the policy of using our resources to the full to maintain services, construction and employment and to give a mild controlled stimulus to the economy. That policy is endorsed by the Premiers of all States—regardless of political party—in contrast to the Fraser policy of reductions in services, employment and construction.

The Premier received the greatest ovation a political figure ever received when he delivered that speech. He talked about unemployment and the right of a worker who had accrued long service leave to get that long service leave, irrespective of why he leaves the job. In cases where the workman has worked 20 years for a firm, if he illegally leaves that employment (he may assault the employer, and some employers deserve to be assaulted) that is the position.

During the last election campaign, I travelled extensively and, if members opposite resent Mr. Dunstan's mild remarks in the preamble to the Budget, they ought to listen to what people are saying, for instance, about the decision to increase the price of petrol. Not only does that affect the farmer but the workmen all drive to work now; there is not much accommodation on grazing properties, so they drive out to their work. Therefore, the increase in the price of petrol is a bigger burden on the workers and on their method of getting to work. Further, most of these goods and services that are taken into the country areas are taken not by the State railways but by road transport. Therefore, as a result of the increase in the price of petrol, the costs of those goods and services, including food, will rise, and the worker has only one place from which to get his bread and butter—his wage packet. Another matter of concern was the increase in company tax. Previously, the Prime Minister said he would stimulate growth in the private sector. I do not know how he would, but he said he would. People in the private sector have said that this measure did not assist them at all.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Didn't he also offer to assist the pay packet of the worker by reducing taxation?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I am glad to hear that. I am led to believe that the new tax system will benefit the rich, the people earning \$20 000 a year and over. That will not stimulate the worker's pay packet. The Labor Government had proposed a levy of 1½ per cent on one's income to pay for Medibank. However, people can get cheap medical services by paying a maximum of \$375 or \$400 if they earn over \$8 000 a year, whereas in fact the rich should be paying up to \$1 000 a year, under the Labor proposition, which was based on ability to pay.

The Hon. Mrs. Cooper attacked the arbitration system. I am sure she knows nothing about that system. She said the continued wage increases being handed down by the

arbitration system were the cause of economic stagnation in South Australia.

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: I didn't say that.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Before you leave the Chamber, did you say that wages were causing all the trouble?

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: No, I did not.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: If the Hon. Mrs. Cooper did not say that, someone else did. Mr. President, I want to ask your advice. The preamble is a matter of only four pages. Rather than read it out and delay the Council—

The PRESIDENT: The preamble to what?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The Treasurer's Financial Statement.

The PRESIDENT: It is a Parliamentary Paper and is available and on file.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: But I want to have it in *Hansard*.

The PRESIDENT: It is in *Hansard*; it has been incorporated in the Minister's explanatory statement.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: That is fair enough. I want people to read it and judge for themselves the hostility being shown by the Leader (the Hon. Mr. DeGaris) and the Hon. Mr. Hill. Let us see how benign and democratic the Hon. Mr. DeGaris is in his speech. In reply to what Don Dunstan said in the policy speech—

We seek a mandate for simultaneous elections of the Legislative Council and House of Assembly, and the abolition of the six-year minimum term requirement for the Legislative Council—

the Hon. Mr. DeGaris (one would think he is the Governor; he has been here for a long time but has faced only three elections) said:

The first piece of false propaganda being peddled is that the Government intends legislating for simultaneous elections for the Legislative Council and House of Assembly. It is not false propaganda. All over the State where there were political meetings (and I addressed 30 of them) everybody was told what the Government's policy was on the Legislative Council, and they all agreed; and they agreed when they voted. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris continued:

It is not possible for the Legislative Council to go to the people without the House of Assembly. The two Houses cannot get out of phase. The problem seen by the Government is that occasionally when the House of Assembly decides to go to the people for a purely political motive, unless members of the Legislative Council have completed their constitutional term of six years, Legislative Council members continue to carry out their term until the next House of Assembly election after they have served their minimum six-year term. There is no way the term can be extended by the Legislative Council. I emphasise that point.

We all know that but he is prepared to go along with the proposition that we have the same sort of elections as the Senate. If members opposite disagree and do not vote for simultaneous elections and terms of less than six years, they are not acting as they profess to be—a House of Review—and are opposing the policy endorsed by the people of South Australia. This was not hidden away anywhere. The Hon. Mr. Hill knew about it.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Do you think everyone who voted for you supported that part of the policy?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Of course, and, if they knew all you people opposite, more would have voted for us. I should like now to refer to the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, who did not say much about the money items because they involved necessary expenditure. However, he said that he would like to refer to the Playfordian era. I can remember Sir Thomas Playford saying that he would not allow a

union official on his property because they were all paid agitators. Yet he was paying his cherry pickers only 10c an hour. Members opposite get richer by the day. I can recall Sir Thomas Playford's talking about the lottery, saying, "It is poison in the hands of children." Of course he would not support the T.A.B. Indeed, I do not support it much myself. However, because I am a servant of the people and the people wanted it, I supported it.

In Sir Thomas Playford's time there was no such thing as consumer affairs, because Tom believed in private enterprise. He believed that things should be produced with the cheapest labour and that anything could be knocked up and sold to the public. You people opposite believe that you are born to rule. Also, there was no State Government Insurance Commission, to which I will refer again and about which members opposite are upset. There were no Bee-line buses for our pensioners who get off the train at North Terrace and want to go to the city. No such facilities were provided for our elderly citizens.

In the Playfordian era, people had to work for low wages. There was no such thing as protection for consumers from used car dealers, who give members opposite the money to fight their elections. These private enterprise people, who are the real profit makers, give Liberal members their money. In Playford's time, people had to work with injuries because they could not afford to go home. That is how crook the workmen's compensation laws were.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Mr. Laidlaw knows about that.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Of course he does. That is why the people rejected Playford. In his day, there was no small business advisory unit, nor were there pensioner concessions. School facilities were bad; there was no Ombudsman; and nor were there any colleges of advanced education. The people in whom I am more interested are those who had to work for the Government in those days, the little people, to whom the Hon. Mr. Hill referred. He has referred to them as such only once since I have been in the Parliament, saying that they needed fruit and vegetables. They certainly did need them. There were not such things as service payments in the Playfordian era. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris said, referring to the "Playfordian dedication to economic growth":

... industrial growth may have been a little lopsided—I agree; it was lopsided for the people who had to work under him. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris continued:

with concentration in certain industrial areas. It is difficult to condemn the economic growth of South Australia purely on this ground. I believe that our industrial base (and this is generally recognised by most people who examine the position in South Australia) is concentrated too much in some areas. The South Australian population understood the Playfordian programmes and goals laid out for it: low costs, industrial peace, and cheap but good standard housing.

I have already referred to low costs. I should like to ascertain from the statistician how many people owned houses in the Playfordian era compared to those who do so today. There would be quite a difference. I know that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris would say, without his even knowing whether it was right or wrong, that that is not true.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There has been a decline in home ownership in South Australia since that era.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I will tell the Leader why: it is because of his friends, the money lenders.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Murray Hill's friends.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: That is so. I wonder whether that honourable gentleman got his \$380 000 house working for the minimum wage. I wish that the Hon. Mrs. Cooper was still in the Chamber. She says that wages are killing us. However, the average minimum

award wage in Australia is only \$133 a week. I bet that the Hon. Mr. Hill gets more than that in one day sitting in this place. I suppose he would get more than that each week from his shares.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Which shares?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The honourable member's shares. Does the honourable member deny having shares?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You tell me.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I will not make the honourable member's business public. Does he deny having shares?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You tell me.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I am not saying that the honourable member has them, but will he say that he does not have shares? He cannot lie to the Council. I do not think he would do that.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Is it a crime to have shares?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Members opposite talk about wages killing the country, yet workers are getting an average wage of only \$133 a week. The honourable member should not be knocking them; he should live like they do for a while and see how he goes.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: What's the \$133 that you talked about? That's the minimum wage.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Honourable members should listen to what else the Hon. Mr. DeGaris had to say. He said:

I do not criticise what one may describe as the compassionate society—

whatever that means—

but at the same time one must not overlook that incentive and opportunity must not be driven to the wall by an overdose of emotional compassion.

I believe that the Leader is talking there about the social reforms introduced by the Labor Government. I challenge honourable members opposite to tell me of one social reform relating to such things as consumer affairs, health and welfare that their Party has introduced. The answer is "none".

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Come on! 80 per cent of present social welfare services were introduced by the Liberal Government.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Community welfare was under a different name then.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: What are you talking about?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Mr. President, although he is out of order, did DeGaris say that 80 per cent of social welfare services were introduced by the Liberals? Good God, that's not true!

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The Hon. Mr. DeGaris did not say much more in his speech, so I will not have to take long to deal with him. However, he did say that we could not keep on knocking the profit motive. I think he attacked the Hon. Mr. Sumner when he referred to socialism. I can tell honourable members what is wrong with the country. These are the facts, and this is the profit motive about which members opposite speak.

The largest 200 companies in Australia produce half of our manufactured goods, and employ 580 000 workers; 30 200 small and medium-size companies produce the other half of our manufactured goods and employ 750 000 workers. Among the top 12 companies, seven are foreign controlled, and of the top 25, a total of 17 are foreign controlled. They put plenty of money in the Liberal Party's coffers. A total of 87 foreign-controlled companies employ 240 000 workers, and 113 Australian-controlled companies employ 340 000 workers.

For example, foreign control extends to 88 per cent of motor vehicles produced in Australia, 84 per cent of the

non-ferrous goods, and 78 per cent of industrial and heavy chemicals. I will give an idea of the profit that members opposite and their friends believe in. General Motors-Holden's in Australia is a totally United States-owned subsidiary of General Motors. The initial investment in G.M.H. in 1931 was only \$2 000 000. To get capital to start the Holden motor car project, an amount of \$6 000 000 was raised by the Australian Government in 1945. The next thing will be that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris will try to tell me that there was a Liberal Government in office in 1945!

That money was raised mainly through the Commonwealth Bank. General Motors in the United States would agree to this project only on condition that no United States money was spent on it, yet by 1974 dividends amounting to \$300 000 000 were sent out of Australia to American shareholders. The Government of the day made no mention of the deal that the United States enforced on Australia after the Second World War, leading to the limitation of local car production. Mr. Fraser has said that strikes and high wages are causing the downturn in our economy, but I do not believe that. I believe that the foreign investors, who exploit this country and who are supported by the Liberal Party (not by all Liberals but by a majority of them), are the cause.

I will give proof of how we are being ripped off by foreign-owned companies. I am saying this because the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that the Hon. Mr. Sumner's views were for a socialist society, and we ought to be based more on the American system. The American ideas of profits are the same as the ideas of members opposite. The American idea is to exploit small under-developed countries, not to make them rich or to create jobs.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Is the State Government investing in Malaysia?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I will answer questions later. I want to teach members opposite a lesson about profit and about Fraser and his friends ripping off this country. The following table shows what happened between 1966-67 and 1975-76:

INVESTMENT AND INCOME

Year	Percentage of private investment funded by overseas companies	Percentage of company income payable overseas
1966-67	23	23.2
1967-68	37.6	28.8
1968-69	33.6	27.4
1969-70	29.9	26.4
1970-71	40.3	29.4
1971-72	39.7	27.3
Labor Party elected		
1972-73	12.3	32.5
1973-74	8	36.5
1974-75	15.2	52.7
1975-76	11	55.2

As we all know, in 1972 the Labor Party was elected to office in the Commonwealth Parliament, and the foreign investment dropped to 12.3 per cent. We should bear in mind that two years before that there was 40.3 per cent overseas investment. Fraser and his friends opposite have told us that what causes inflation is increased wages. Inflation has many causes. One of the causes was a massive inflow of money from overseas in the early 1970's. Between 1970 and 1972, \$3 043 000 000 poured into the Australian economy, a much larger inflow than for previous years.

This money coming in was a hedge against inflation

raging overseas. It was used for speculation in fringe banking, share trading, real estate, property and mining. Some of the money was for currency speculation against the Australian dollar.

The amount of money racing around the economy rose by almost 30 per cent in the single year of 1971 to 1972 before the Labor Government was elected. In effect this was inflation caused by too much money chasing too few goods. Another cause was that America had to print more dollars to finance the Vietnam war. This caused deliberate inflation which was "exported" to other countries including Australia. The multi-nationals themselves carried out highly inflationary operations by raising their prices to maximise their profits and finance their own expansion.

I have read that information because I want to refer to the policy speech delivered by Malcolm Fraser in 1975. I think Mr. Dunstan went very light when he stated all the things that were crook about that gentleman. Mr. Fraser, when he conned the Australian people in 1975, had a big job to do. In the policy speech he stated:

Let us all as Australians determine to restore prosperity, defeat inflation and provide jobs for all . . . Australia needs change. Australia needs reform . . . Australia needs an immediate change of direction. What can be done immediately, and must be done, is to establish—for the first time in three years—sound and honest management of Australia's affairs.

We have the Hon. Mr. Hill impugning the reputation of our Premier regarding a press statement. He suggested that about \$34 000 was used by people who were sent overseas. He said that the "hand-outs" were about \$14 000 for a fee and about \$20 000 mainly for air fares. A report of a statement by the Premier is as follows:

Last night Mr. Dunstan said he would table in the Assembly soon the report of the Jam Factory workshops and "a long and valuable" report of the overseas trip by Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier. Asked last night to comment on Mr. Hill's allegations, Mrs. Lemercier said: "I suggest he investigate his facts before making allegations under Parliamentary privilege—so much of what he said was false and incorrect."

Yet, Senator Guilfoyle, on television recently, when questioned by Mr. Willesee (and the grin was as wide as your arm), was asked, "Are you not concerned that \$51 000 000 has been spent or misused and not accounted for by your department?" Senator Guilfoyle said, "You have to expect that."

In his policy speech, Mr. Fraser said that he would get more investment, that it would lead to jobs, and both would lead to more revenue. He went on:

There will be no international safaris by members of Parliament. The purpose and nature of overseas trips will be subject to clear guidelines. Australia does not need a tourist as Prime Minister.

What about his wife, who flew in a V.I.P. jet aircraft alone to see a show in the Sydney Opera House and returned to Canberra on the same night on another V.I.P. aircraft (and this has not been refuted in the Federal House)? Mr. Sinclair and Mr. Lynch are always overseas. Mr. Fraser stated:

On December 14, we will start the most rigorous planning for the 1976 Budget. We as a Government will be concerned that you get value for the dollars we spend on your behalf. Last year we got a 17½ per cent devaluation, a cut in our money. That would not harm the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, because he has plenty of money, but what about people whose children and friends were overseas? If they had \$100 in their pocket, it was reduced by 17½ per cent. Mr. Fraser also stated:

Over the next three years, we will introduce a number of major reforms to direct resources away from Government and back into the hands of individuals and business.

He has done that in the last Budget. Mr. Fraser cut the export tax for Utah Construction considerably, and he intends to cut out that export tax completely. Utah Construction is now exporting 15 000 000 tonnes of coal and will increase its production next year to 21 000 000 tonnes. That is the hand-out given by Mr. Fraser.

Throughout the 12 pages of the policy speech Mr. Fraser refers to priorities for jobs. He said he would support wage indexation, yet the support he gave to wage indexation was to cut it in half, to go to the court, and to argue not for half indexation but less than that. As a direct result of Mr. Fraser's involvement in the courts, I believe his influence on the Arbitration Commission led to the recent State Electricity Commission dispute in Victoria. Mr. Fraser stated:

As economic circumstances allow, there are a number of other reforms we will introduce. They are all important, they are all urgent but the problems of overcoming inflation and unemployment are pre-eminent . . . We will be generous to those who can't get a job and want to work. We will not use the earnings of Australia's families to finance Gold Coast holidays for those who don't want to work.

What has been done about poor people on the dole? Payments are not now retrospective but are paid in arrears and a person who loses a job will have to wait up to five weeks for any income at all. If honourable members examine the supplement referred to by the Hon. Jessie Cooper, they will see that even tradesmen are being laid off and, no matter what the circumstances are, they will have to wait five weeks before they receive a dole payment. Mr. Fraser further stated:

We will give Australian industry the protection it needs. We would sooner have jobs than dogma. We will instruct the Industries Assistance Commission to take note of the Government's policy. We will make Australian industry competitive again . . . We will abolish the Prices Justification Tribunal. It has presided over the worst inflation in our history.

Yet the tribunal is still giving increases to B.H.P., and has allowed an 8 per cent increase this year. Mr. Fraser had even more to say about jobs:

Unless confidence in private enterprise revives, Australia quite literally faces economic disaster—inflation will never be overcome—there will never be enough jobs . . . Only under a Liberal-National Country Party Government will there be jobs for all who want to work.

He talks about the rural community and the beef industry, yet honourable members know how people in those industries feel about Mr. Fraser and his Ministers. Mr. Fraser said that he would maintain Medibank, and I have told the Council what he did with Medibank. The Liberal Party has made cheap capital out of it. He further stated:

Aboriginal affairs under Labor has been a disaster which even they admit.

He must have forgotten about the recent election in the Northern Territory. Mr. Fraser went on:

We will maintain present levels of assistance to Aboriginals, enable Aboriginals to be self-reliant, introduce land rights legislation for the Northern Territory based on justice for all . . . We shall ensure that no person is denied legal aid because of lack of means.

He has cut Aboriginal services and legal aid services. This policy speech is an infamous document. The people of South Australia believed this document, and the two Leaders of the Liberal Party in this Council (the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and the Hon. Mr. Hill) had the audacity to suggest that Fraser is good for this country. As I have just

read this policy speech, those honourable members have either not read it or cannot accept that their Leader is telling lies.

I now refer to what we believe Mr. Fraser will do by Christmas. Certainly, he will give a Christmas gift: an election and 400 000 people unemployed. Nearly 91 000 people have been thrown out of work since Mr. Fraser's Government came to power.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: What is the document to which you are referring?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Why do you want to know?

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: For obvious reasons.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: If they are obvious, the honourable member should tell me, because they are not obvious to me.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: You're referring to a printed document, and I should like to know whose views you are advocating.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: You can ask for it to be tabled.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What's the document?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: It does not matter what it is, but there is proof in it. I bet you cannot deny that. The document continues:

The Government's Christmas present to the people of Australia will be more than 400 000 unemployed.

Then early in the new year more than 200 000 young people will be on the employment market for the first time.

The average length of unemployment is four months and getting longer, and 17 people are unemployed for every vacancy.

The cost of unemployment benefits is \$600 000 000 a year, and next year it will be \$800 000 000.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Who is responsible for the document from which you are reading?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Ask me to table it. The document continues:

Fraser's Government doesn't stop at the worst unemployment since the depression.

Its hopeless economic management has brought about worsening inflation, a deteriorating balance of trade, further pressure on the dollar for another devaluation, declining business confidence, slackening retail sales, a fall of 0.6 per cent in non-farm product, a fall of 1.8 in personal consumption, a fall of 9.3 in private capital investment, and a fall of 10.8 in investment in dwellings.

Mr. Fraser will go down in history as the greatest fascist in politics. He said that he would turn on the lights but, instead, he turned them off and said that life was not meant to be easy. The document continues:

The Fraser Government is increasing the difficulties and the hardships of the unemployed.

It introduced taxation of unemployment benefits, work tests were tightened, school leavers were excluded, and six weeks waiting time was introduced for the so-called "voluntary unemployed".

Now the Government intends to pay benefits two weeks in arrears instead of in advance and without removing the seven-days waiting period.

Government staffing is sufficient only to deal with 100 000, not the 355 000 registered unemployed at present.

Labor would initiate programmes which subsidise jobs.

Labor's purpose is to underwrite the private sector so that jobs can be generated, growth carefully fostered, and a healthier business climate restored.

The private sector must play a key role in leading any recovery, and Labor's programmes are designed to help the private sector fill this role.

Labor's plan to ease unemployment covers three major

areas: capital works, local employment and advancement programmes, and apprenticeship and job training.

An article in the *Financial Review* said that the number of industrial stoppages was the lowest since 1968 and that a worsening trend in connection with jobless people showed in the August figures. The following statement shows what the Arbitration Commission's role ought to be:

The role of the Arbitration Commission is a subject which is debated constantly, and the commission's decisions and utterances over the years indicate no coherent philosophy. The Conciliation and Arbitration Act directs the commission that its primary role should be the prevention and settlement of industrial disputes. That is, it should arbitrate between employers and employees in the interests of minimising strike activity, economic loss and personal hardship. The commission is also required to have regard to the influence on the "state of the economy of any award that might be made". This additional, potentially contradictory, requirement was introduced as an amendment to the Conciliation and Arbitration Act in 1928 by the Bruce-Page Government. It is this latter requirement which introduces the potential variations in policy . . . The delicacy of the compromise embodied in the indexation package probably provides the reasons behind the commission's rebuke of the Government's strongly-worded submission in February, 1976.

Having asserted its "independence", the commission handed down decisions for the March and June quarters which were precisely what the Government desired. The continuing recession provided ample opportunity to reduce real wages, at least temporarily, with impunity.

Yet the commission is walking a tightrope in this regard. The commission needs to see how the package works during an economic recovery. It certainly cannot continue indefinitely with partial indexation decisions like those in the March, June and December quarters of 1976. Already some bargaining has taken place for terms which are outside the guidelines. Since the commission has no power over such actions, it has silently legitimised some dubious cases under the work value clause.

The Victorian power strike, perhaps the most serious industrial situation in the history of the trade union movement, was solved only by Mr. Hawke, Mr. Halfpenny, and other union officials telling the Arbitration Commission that its job was to solve disputes. The Hamer Government was in great trouble in connection with land deals involving kick-backs into Party funds of many thousands of dollars. Long-standing members of the Liberal Party in Victoria refused to support a vote of confidence in the Victorian Government in connection with Housing Commission transactions. It is clear that the Hamer Government will do anything to divert attention from such troubles.

The average wage is \$133 a week. If a person is unlucky enough to work at the Perry Engineering Company, associated with the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw, that worker receives indexation only of his award wage. The average award worker in Australia receives about \$25 in over-award payments but if a person works for the State Electricity Commission of Victoria or the metal trades he does not receive indexation of over-award payments. However, members of the Municipal Officers Association in the State Electricity Commission receive a salary in which over-award payments are reflected. Such members receive 100 per cent wage indexation, but the men working in the powerhouses receive only partial indexation.

So, based on the average of \$25 in over-award payments in Australia generally, powerhouse workers suffer a penalty of between 15 per cent and 20 per cent. Wage indexation can work, but it is not the answer to all problems. When wage indexation was introduced,

employers were making huge profits, and they said on the telephone, "We would like to give you the wage increase that you are asking for, but you had better go to the court and put in an appearance."

Employers gave the 25 per cent increase without any disputes. These workers were looking for what they believed was justice, and could see their wives and families starving. One could see that they were sincere in their objectives, and that some process of arbitration would have to save the day. That process of arbitration will still save the day. Mr. Commissioner Mansini has returned the men to work on a five-point proposal. The Commissioner will see that one cannot have two people working side by side when one is getting a 100 per cent wage indexation and the other only a partial wage indexation. This should not occur under the arbitration system. People like the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and Mr. Fraser do not believe in the Arbitration Commission. They believe only in the courts that give increases which they are told to give. The Arbitration Commission, like the other courts of our land, must be independent from political interference.

I want to talk about compulsory unionism. Honourable members opposite have stuck up notices all around Parliament House, and all through the suburbs, on this subject.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Ask Boyd Dawkins about that.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The Hon. Mr. Dawkins wrote that article in the *Stock Journal* for his relatives. His uncle is Mr. S. L. Dawkins. Does the honourable member deny writing that article for his uncle?

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: I know nothing about that.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The Hon. Mr. Dawkins would agree with it, of course. On the subject of compulsory unionism, there are people in this State who are terrified about it. Some people in the Liberal Party say there are militants in the Trades Hall who run Don Dunstan. Tell me one piece of legislation the Premier has introduced, whether it is long service leave or workmen's compensation, which the Labor Party wanted to amend, that was put forward in South Australia which indicates that Don Dunstan is stood over by the militants at Trades Hall. The Premier has a good relationship with the people at Trades Hall. He has a good Minister of Labour and Industry. He goes to Trades Hall and talks to workers and is able to conciliate with them and to involve himself with the workers. He does the same thing with employers and stockowners. This shows the success of the Dunstan Government. The Premier confers with the workers and informs them of his actions before he does anything. Because he goes to the Trades Hall, members of the Liberal Party have put posters up all around Australia. They have published notices in newspapers saying, "A vote for Labor is a vote for compulsory unionism." That is a deliberate lie. Honourable members opposite know the policy of the Labor Government in this respect.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Those honourable members said that the Labor Party would have a mandate for it.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: It is not the policy of the Government?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Members on this side of the Council would not vote for compulsory unionism. I have seen it in operation and it did not work. Compulsory unionism works for the employer. I would vote against compulsory unionism anywhere.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You will lose the Hon. Mr. Blevins.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: He does not believe in it.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: I said that the Liberal Party started it.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: The Liberal Party members

voted for the compulsory sending of people to Vietnam, for them to be killed. Those members are all hypocrites.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Compulsory unionism works in favour of the employer. When multi-national companies come to this country, they ring a union and say, "Do not come near our office yet. We will send you a cheque for the sum you ask. You have 500 workers. We will give you the money. We do not care how much it costs. We will send our personnel officers to your office." G.M.H. does not want industrial disputes, nor does B.H.P., but for different reasons. They do not want a scab who will not join a union. I have been involved in dozens of industrial disputes. Employers do not want scab labour. The scab worker is usually not a good worker. I will tell you of an incident on the waterfront in South Australia.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: There is compulsory unionism on the waterfront due to Liberal Party legislation.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I am speaking about Queensland where I heard that someone was supporting compulsory unionism. I worked there for many years.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Was that under Charlie Oliver?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Give us the inside story.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I am not worrying about Charlie Oliver. Compulsory unionism is not supported by the Halfpenny's, nor by any of those people to whom you referred. Labor Party members believe in the right to organise. We believe that the best thing one can do is to explain what unionism is about, what it has done in the past, and what it can do for the worker. We have not had compulsory unionism in this State. My union is 95 per cent organised. The only reason that we do not have the other 5 per cent of membership is that the organisers tend to get a bit tired after a long day.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: A man could not drive a tram unless he was a member of a union when the Hon. Mr. Hill was a Minister.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I have here a Government instruction to the Public Service Board headed "Preference to unionists". It states:

Permanent Heads are informed that Cabinet has varied the provisions relating to preference to unionists by including a requirement that employing officers obtain an undertaking in writing that:

- (1) a non-unionist will join an appropriate union within a reasonable time after commencing employment;
- (2) an apprentice after completing his indenture and before being employed as a tradesman will join an appropriate union within a reasonable time after commencing employment.

Accordingly, the following provisions will apply in lieu of those prescribed by Industrial Instruction No. 464 issued on April 20, 1976.

A non-unionist shall not be engaged for any work to the exclusion of a well-conducted unionist if that unionist is adequately experienced in and competent to perform the work. This provision shall apply to all persons (other than juniors, graduates, etc., applying for employment on completing studies and persons who have never previously been employees), seeking employment in any department and to all Government employees. However, before a non-unionist is employed, or an apprentice after completing his indenture is employed as a tradesman, the employing officer shall obtain in writing from him an undertaking that he will join an appropriate union within a reasonable time after commencing employment, and remain a member of an appropriate union whilst employed in the Government. Cabinet also desires that, where possible, present employees who are not unionists be encouraged to join appropriate unions. It is not intended that this instruction should apply to

the detriment of a person who produces evidence that he is a conscientious objector to union membership on religious grounds.

That is the complete opposite to compulsory unionism.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: It is compulsory unionism. What else is it?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Fraser has said he has good relations with the trade unions, but he and Senator Guilfoyle wanted to take away the right of unemployed workers (about 400 000) who were not on strike but were affected by the strike of other workers. That was one of the most tragic and blatant bits of industrial blackmail I have ever heard of, but Mr. Street would not go along with it. He was too big a man—small in stature, perhaps, but big-hearted, and he would not go along with that. Why crucify the poor devils who had lost their jobs as a result of a strike by reducing their benefits?

I want to help the Hon. Mr. Cameron salve his conscience, to let him start thinking of representing people instead of thinking about me all the time. There have been two press statements that concern me. I assure this Council that I do not attack people personally outside the Chamber unless I have to do it as a result of some proof or as a result of a request from constituents. I read in the *Kangaroo Island Times* an article dated August 24, 1977, headed "Grazier accuses Dunford of being untruthful." I had to pay \$5 000, but anyway the union paid it for me. I did not ask the Government for anything because I have no time for Woolley or the people supporting him because it was a political caper. That is why I would not pay. He also wrote in the *Stock Journal*. I know many people in the farming community who now support the Labor Party. The people in Naracoorte have since the last election. Look at the figures and tell me if I am wrong. All through the country areas the farmers are giving away the Fraser Government because it is unrepresentative.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What is the figure for the country areas?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: That I do not know. I read this *Stock Journal*, and this is what Mr. Woolley had to say. I will clear up this point for the Hon. Mr. Cameron because, after Mr. Woolley reads my letter, he will not be writing the same sort of rubbish. He wrote it in the *Islander* and he wrote it in the *Stock Journal*. This is what he wrote:

Apparently Mr. Dunford, M.L.C., is a garrulous individual, who hopes that by repeating a statement often and loudly enough his hearers will accept it as fact. It has come to my notice that in the Legislative Council on July 28, 1977, Mr. Dunford made the following remarks *inter alia* ". . . graziers, including Woolley, were paying less than the award rates of pay . . ." *Hansard Legislative Council* 28-7-77 p. 243. Mr. Dunford has on several occasions alleged that Kangaroo Island graziers were paying shearers less than award rates. Until now I have deliberately refrained from public comment but since Mr. Dunford has seen fit to specifically name me I am no longer prepared to remain silent. I state categorically that I have never paid my shearers (who have been both union and non-union members) less than award rates. If Mr. Dunford's allegation had any substance why did he not enter the witness box and say so in evidence under oath when he had the opportunity during court proceedings six years ago? Mr. Dunford would be well advised to publicly withdraw the remark and refrain from hiding behind the cloak of Parliamentary privilege.

The exact letter with a different headline was in the *Islander*. This is the letter that has been sent to the Editor of the *Stock Journal Publishers Pty. Ltd.*, 11 Cannon Street, Adelaide, and to the Editor, the *Islander*, Kingscote, Kangaroo Island. This has been sent to the

press. There may even be a libel suit arising out of this! This is my letter:

I was astonished to read the attack made upon me by B. H. Woolley of Parndana in your paper . . . Mr. Woolley in his letter makes a number of statements and I will deal with each of them separately. In his first paragraph he accuses me of being garrulous. I have no hesitation in agreeing with him that at the time of the Kangaroo Island dispute in November, 1971, I was garrulous as I was fiercely defending the Pastoral Industry Award under which my members worked for their livelihood and I would have been less than an adequate union Secretary if I had not stood up for my members' rights.

In his second paragraph Mr. Woolley set out a portion of the statement which I made in Parliament; however, the context in which I made it was notably absent. The issue arose again because the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Goldsworthy) raised the question in the Lower House and I was commenting in reply. What I in fact said was:

"This dispute is about five or six years old now and I can remember the dispute quite clearly. I offer no apology, as I made quite clear during the whole course of the dispute, I was acting in the interests of the members I was representing on Kangaroo Island at the time, when graziers, including Woolley, were paying less than the award rates of pay. They were breaking down award conditions. They were employing non-union labour and making it impossible for bona fide workers of the Trades Union abiding by the Arbitration Court decisions by way of wages and conditions to gain employment."

Mr. Woolley has advised me to publicly withdraw the remarks and suggests that I am trying to hide behind the cloak of Parliamentary privilege when making this statement.

I do not withdraw the remarks and I say it in public. It was quite apparent from the transcript in the case of *Woolley v. Dunford* that Mr. Woolley was guilty of many breaches of the Pastoral Industry Award and in fact paid less to his employees in the shearing operations than was provided for in the award. If Mr. Woolley's memory is so short I suggest he look at pages 57, 58, 59, 71, 72 and pages 136-138 of the transcript of the case. Mr. Woolley in his letter also asks that if there was any substance in my statement in Parliament why I did not enter the witness box to say so under oath at the time of the case.

The reason I didn't enter the witness box was because Mr. Woolley said it all for me. There was in fact no dispute that there had been breaches of the award by Mr. Woolley and by other graziers. I therefore hope that this letter will complete the correspondence between Mr. Woolley and myself on the subject and that the facts are now set straight.

I thank you, Sir, and my Leader for your tolerance. I conclude by saying that I hope the Opposition now knows why this country is in such a state.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I have had the unfortunate experience not only of speaking after the Hon. Mr. Foster previously but also now of contributing to this debate after the diatribe of the Hon. Mr. Dunford. It is indeed alarming, when this State faces what must be the most serious financial and budgeting mismanagement in its history, to have the Hon. Mr. Dunford carrying on about some forgotten dispute on Kangaroo Island in which he obviously did the wrong thing and suffered the consequences. However, he did not have to pay much himself: the taxpayers paid it for him.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: He got a nice Volvo out of it.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes. I observed with interest the Labor Party's proposal to deny the Legislative Council the power to reject the Budget. I make clear my position on this subject. I would not accept or support a move to reject a Budget, as I believe that a Government is elected to govern and, if it misuses the trust put in it by the

people, the people will reject that Government at the next election. However, I believe it is imperative that this Council retain the right to scrutinise the Government's expenditure and revenue proposals.

I shall go further. I believe that at present the Budget debate, in its present form, in both Houses is a farce. In another place (and I have gone carefully through *Hansard* to check this) two-thirds of all questions on the Budget remain unanswered, yet the Budget has already been passed in that place. Some Ministers provided practically no information even on problem areas raised by the Auditor-General. We find that year after year, despite continual references by the Auditor-General, the same problems occur again and again.

Public accountability in this State by this Government has reached an all-time low. It seems that the Government and Ministers have developed a contemptuous attitude towards this Parliament and the public. As well as the problems which have been continually raised by the Auditor-General and which in many cases have been ignored by the various departments, there is the serious allegation of improper financial conduct raised in the report of the Public Works Standing Committee.

Even if honourable members asked questions on that report or on any sections of the Budget debate, I guarantee that we would receive practically no replies. All we will see at the end of this debate will be the Minister of Health rising and giving his usual half hour of empty nonsense, as we saw at the end of the Address in Reply debate. The Minister ranted and raved, and gave the Council practically no information that was of any relevance.

Rather than this Council's ceasing to examine the Budget, we should extend our examination to ensure that the Government is made fully accountable to the public. It is becoming clear that control over Government expenditure has reached an all-time low and yet practically nothing is being done to rectify this situation. Why? It is because the Government refuses to answer questions and runs away from any probing from the Opposition.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What is it?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Who the hell are you? I have risen on a point of order, so please have some respect for the place. Mr. Acting President, is it in order for the honourable gentleman to read his speech when on most occasions he never refers even to hand-written notes? Why is he reading his speech today?

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: It's against Standing Orders.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Is it in order for the honourable member to read the entire speech?

The ACTING PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: It is contrary to Standing Orders.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a further point of order. Would you, Sir, be willing to ask the honourable member whether he is speaking from copious notes or from a transcript on his desk?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You're scared of what he'll say.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Shut up, will you!

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! It is the prerogative of the Chair to decide.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I do not take exception to what the honourable member has said. In fact, I am reading from copious notes. Usually, most Government members read their speeches, but the Hon. Mr. Foster knows that I never do. Indeed, this is the first time that I have referred to copious notes. If possible, we should appoint a Select Committee to examine the Budget in

detail and to call heads of departments or any other relevant persons to account for their expenditures.

In the Federal Parliament, the Budget is subjected to close and detailed examination by the Senate, and I see the urgent need for similar action here before the situation becomes any worse. Of course, the Government is pressuring for the Budget to be passed urgently because it called an early election in order to hide its financial mismanagement, and in this way it is curbing public debate. So, there are obvious difficulties facing us at the moment.

I realise that it will be difficult to appoint any committee to do the job that must be done. Indeed, it would be almost impossible to do so. However, so that we can obtain some information, this Parliament should consider calling the Auditor-General and the Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee before it so that they can provide more information on the problems that they have raised. We would not be reflecting on their position but would merely be obtaining reasonable and honest information that we have not yet got about what is happening. It is totally unsatisfactory that neither the public nor the Parliament has the necessary information.

If any Bill is presented to deprive this Council of its right to examine the Budget, it is my intention to raise the problems we face in obtaining proper and meaningful information on this Government's expenditure and to move for the formation of committees of this Parliament that can examine in detail all Government Budget expenditure programmes before the passage of the Budget so that the public is told how its money is being spent. It is absolutely ridiculous, but at this stage we have departments that have not accounted to either House of Parliament or the public for their expenditure.

I will refer to some matters to which the Auditor-General has drawn attention, so that we know that as yet we do not have proper information. I refer first to page 87 of the report, dealing with the Education Department. In the paragraph dealing with budgeting and control of expenditure, the Auditor-General states:

It is considered that budgeting should be carried out in much greater detail to enable the appropriate authorities to make sounder judgments of the estimates. In some cases, e.g., staffing, costs should be recorded in similar detail to enable periodical comparison with the budgets with the objective of exercising greater control of expenditure.

If I asked whether that would be done, or what action the department was taking to carry it out, I would be told that some time I would be given the information, just as the Lower House has been told that time after time and about item after item. The next matter to which I refer in the report is at page 99, in the paragraph dealing with amounts unpaid at June 30, 1977. The Auditor-General states:

At June 30, 1977, the department had prepared for payment of accounts totalling \$199 000 which were not presented. The amount available from Consolidated Revenue at that date was insufficient to meet such payments should they have been presented. This action was in contravention of the audit regulations and shows that inadequate budgetary and financial control has been exercised over the expenditure incurred by the department. The department has advised that steps have been taken which should prevent a recurrence.

I should like to know how and why that was done. What action has been taken to discipline the people who allowed it to happen? Surely those people should be brought to account for allowing the situation to occur. At page 101, when dealing with the Further Education Department and stores, the Auditor-General states:

The present method of recording consumable stores held at colleges is unsatisfactory. In many cases stores held appear to be excessive which has resulted in some items becoming obsolete. Because inadequate stores records are maintained at the colleges, Principals and management of the department are not aware of the stockholdings of colleges.

That incredible situation has been allowed to arise. The Auditor-General continues:

The amount of security exercised over stores at colleges is also unsatisfactory. In many colleges stores are not under the direct control of stores staff but are stored at various locations throughout the colleges.

If that situation exists, what is the Auditor-General telling us? Is he telling us that these stores are at risk, as has occurred in the Hospitals Department? I should like to know whether the store records have been sufficient to show whether any stores have disappeared. I should like to ask the Auditor-General or the heads of departments what has occurred, what action has been taken to rectify the position and, again, why it was allowed to arise. In the paragraph dealing with the adult literacy programme, the Auditor-General states:

In approving personal tuition the department has accepted the fact that the cost of personal tuition is greater than that of class tuition but considers that other advantages offset the additional cost. Because of the accounting methods employed by the department neither the cost of the programme nor the additional cost of personal tuition are available.

Any business organisation that allowed that situation to arise would be in dire trouble, as I believe this Government is running into dire trouble in financial management.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It would probably get a report from the Public and Consumer Affairs Department.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I imagine so. At page 103, dealing with the School of Food and Catering, the Auditor-General states:

This school, which was previously situated at Pennington, commenced operations at the Regency Park Community College at the beginning of the 1977 school year. When requested, the Department was unable to advise the cost, to June 30, 1977, of the building which houses the School of Food and Catering, nor could details, including costs of furniture and the extensive equipment provided for the school, be supplied.

If that is not an indictment of the people who conduct this organisation, I have yet to see one. I will say more about the matter when I deal with the annual report of the Public Works Committee. At page 125 of the report, in dealing with the Environment Department, the Auditor-General states:

In my reports for 1974-75 and 1975-76, I commented on the unsatisfactory position relating to property, plant and equipment records, and also to accounting procedures in relation to the payment of salaries and wages. The present situation concerning these matters is—

Property records have been completed but the property procedures still have not been fully documented.

A complete review of the practices employed in recording plant and equipment has been undertaken by the Department's Projects Officer. Procedures have been documented and are to operate from July 1, 1977.

Salaries have, since January, 1977, been processed by computer under the common payroll system. Procedures relating to the payment of wages have not been finalised.

Budgeting and Control of Expenditure

As stated in my previous report an officer from the Financial Consulting Unit of the Public Service Board was seconded to the department to assist in developing an

effective budgeting and financial management information system. Following investigation the officer has submitted his report to the Steering Committee. No proposal contained in the report has been implemented to June, 1977.

I should like to know whether the recommendations have been implemented now, or, if they have not been, why they have not been. I should also like to know how that situation was allowed to occur. At page 151, dealing with the Hospitals Department, in the section dealing with financial management, the Auditor-General states:

My last report referred to continuing inadequacies in financial management and control systems in the Department and in particular to the necessity to extend management procedures, similar to those applied to construction activity, into preconstruction areas, and to develop a data bank to ensure best use of resources, particularly in road maintenance. The departmental working party referred to in the third paragraph duly presented its report dated August, 1976.

That report was adopted as a working paper and included "One of the objectives of the new Financial and Management Accounting System is to enable the department to account for the first time for all stages of a project, by allocating preconstruction costs and other engineering administration charges directly to projects. This will need a new set of procedures to be laid down for overall project control, linking the Financial and Management Accounting System with the Design Management and Pre-Construction Activity Systems."

The policy of integration of the various systems broadened the scope of investigations to include, among other matters, common project descriptions, a road reference system and a project control system. A working party set up to study project authorisation and control published its report in April, 1977. In the meantime another working party appointed to develop, implement and install the Financial and Management Accounting System proceeded with its task in the second half of the year. The probable date for implementation of the system is now October/November, 1978, although in October last I was advised of a completion date of December, 1977, subject to the availability of suitably qualified and experienced staff.

The setting back of the completion date and, on the experience of the past year, the likelihood of further delay, is a matter of great concern.

If there is a likelihood of further delay, despite the Auditor-General's having drawn attention to the problem, it is clear that he can be described only as a paper tiger, because he cannot ensure that his recommendations are carried out. Perhaps we ought to give him additional power to ensure that departments take note of the recommendations.

The Hospitals Department is a now famous area, and the part of the report dealing with budget control states:

I have previously drawn attention to inadequacies in the preparation of budgets and reporting thereon. The present pattern of budgeting does not relate costs to identified areas of functional responsibility. It merely presents cost information by object of expenditure and is therefore not designed for control purposes. The reporting function does not provide a base of information which reflects the activities over which responsible persons at each level of the organisation have control and does not highlight those activities which require corrective action.

The Auditor-General is saying that the department's accounting system is inadequate. That is serious, and the Minister should give the Council more information on this matter. Last year the Auditor-General drew attention to food costs, and in his report he states:

An examination of the matter of food costs in the Hospitals

Department was commenced by the Public Accounts Committee on December 2, 1976.

Financial control is also alluded to, and the Auditor-General refers to canteens and states:

I forwarded a report to the department in July, 1976, on the lack of adequate financial and physical control over the operations of the Glenside canteen. The financial records did not disclose the gross profit that should have been obtained and therefore management responsibility could not be exercised.

I do not know what the Auditor-General is trying to tell us, but I should like to know what was in his report on the Glenside canteen. What did he mean by saying that the profit was not adequately described? Is this what was said in the Epps report, that there should be investigations into other hospitals? Has there been an examination of this problem at Glenside? It must be a serious problem for the Auditor-General to refer to it specifically.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: We should have freedom of information in Government departments.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is the problem. Even if there is freedom of information, the Auditor-General is saying that the information is not worth the paper it is written on, because it is not properly drawn up. In his report he tells us, briefly, that there are problems. How does one find out what the problems are?

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: The Public Accounts Committee—

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That committee was told about a problem at Northfield 18 months ago, and we are still waiting for a report. Why? Because the departments concerned have continually frustrated the committee by providing information on a delayed basis and, even when it is provided, it is not what is needed, and it has to be referred back to the department again. The honourable member should not raise that aspect with me. We should not wait for some report to come out so that the Government is able to say, "That is old news, that has been around for a long time." We want to know of the situation now when the Budget is being passed. We want to know what are the problems.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Even Parliamentary committees do not get the information.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: True, and I should now like to read information I believe we should have had some time ago. I refer to the document headed "Public Accounts Committee Inquiry into Food Costs in the Hospitals Department, Minutes of Evidence, Thursday, December 2, 1976, at 11.5 a.m., at Parliament House, Adelaide." Present at that meeting as observers were Mr. K. Boland, Assistant Auditor-General; Mr. M. Abbott, Finance Officer, Treasury; and Mr. M. Whinnen, Investigating Officer, Public Service Board.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Are you being critical of those officers?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The honourable member will hear about what I am being critical of. I will not read all the evidence, because some of it is not relevant, but some parts are extremely relevant to the points I am putting. I refer to the following transcript of questions by Mr. Nankivell and the answers given:

You were aware of that situation for some time before it became the subject of a departmental inquiry?—Quite correct.

Do you believe that this situation developed because of poor controls that existed over the quantities of food that were being handled through the Northfield Ward?—Yes, speaking in the past tense.

There seems to have been a substantial reduction in the quantity of food consumed in 1975 compared to that

consumed in 1974. There must have been a substantial reduction in the number of patients or else food was being misused?—(Dr. Shea) There is little doubt in our minds it was caused by pilfering.

How much do you think the pilfered food would have cost your department?—A substantial sum. The charges ultimately laid and proven were modest but we believed it was a tiny iceberg that was proven in court and that a much more substantial sum was involved.

I have heard the Premier say that this matter was comparatively minor, that there was not a large amount involved, that the committee found no impropriety. To me, that is just a straight lie, because we have the head of the department—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Stop misrepresenting what the Premier said. The Premier was talking after that inquiry and after that investigation was drawn to the department's attention.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is rather interesting, but the Premier made the statement (and this is a direct quote) as follows:

It was then taken up by the Public Accounts Committee which has discovered no impropriety.

Where in this Parliament has that committee said in any report or in any statement that it has discovered no impropriety? Can the honourable member tell me that? He cannot, because it is totally untrue. It was a straight lie.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Was it taken up by the committee on any other occasion?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: No, it has never been presented. Can the honourable member tell me where it has been presented?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It's been hushed up.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: True, it has been drawn out until it has disappeared. I should like to quote further from the evidence, as I believe it is interesting—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What is the date of the evidence?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I have given the date of the evidence and the honourable member can read it in *Hansard*. I refer to the following transcript of questions by Mr. Chapman, another committee member, and the answers given:

Your department has been, during the whole five years, aware of the actual costs at Northfield?—Yes, and at every Government hospital.

So, it would be unfair to pass responsibility back to the management at Northfield? (Dr. Shea)—I dispute that. We provide financial information for them to take action.

I should like to know what action was taken. I now refer to a further extract of the transcript and a question from Mr. Keneally, another member of the committee, to Mr. Baker of the Hospitals Department, as follows:

Mr. KENEALLY: Have you any check on excessive food use? Does it fall within your area of responsibility Mr. Baker?—(Mr. BAKER) We were able to clear up the position at Northfield mainly because of investigations we carried out five years ago, when we picked up that wholesale pilfering was going on, although it took time to catch the people involved.

In other words, departmental officers picked up wholesale pilfering at Northfield five years before one of the gentlemen concerned was finally caught up with. If that was the case, why were the police not called in earlier? If that is not an indication of practically no accountability, I would like to know what is.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You are blaming departmental officers.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I am not blaming anyone. I am merely saying what occurred. The Premier said that

the Public Accounts Committee had discovered no impropriety; that is an incredible indictment against the Premier. The transcript of evidence before the Public Accounts Committee continues:

Mr. NANKIVELL: Did the food pilfered ever actually reach the Northfield stores, or was it diverted?—(Mr. BAKER) We were not after the Northfield wards then but, in trying to get another man, we found out what was happening. Whom was the department after? Was he from Glenside Hospital? These questions have not been answered. It is incredible that this situation has occurred during almost the whole life of the Labor Government, yet the Premier has referred to so-called firm control of expenditures within the limits approved and he has also referred to the achievement of economies wherever practicable! What a load of rubbish! How do we know that this kind of thing does not occur elsewhere? There is a cover-up. I shall quote from another portion of evidence given to the Public Accounts Committee, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN: Expenditure on meat fell from about \$89 935 in 1973-74 to \$88 968 in 1974-75 and to \$38 496 in 1975-76; what was the reason for that reduction, particularly compared to 1973-74? In 1975, the head cook was apprehended by the police, and Darwin evacuees were fed. Can you explain the difference?

Mr. CHOON: Not offhand.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Have you been aware of these wide variations in cost?—As a total, yes. I do not know on what basis the budget has been prepared or the money allocated. There has not been a report of increased usage of meat. It could be put down to increased costs. It could be that the type of meat purchased has been more steaks, chicken and mince, as used at North Terrace. The quality of the meal served here is probably better than that served at the R.A.H.—we might have steak more often.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you be willing to examine the situation and furnish us with a report?—Yes.

According to the Auditor's report of April 6, 1976, meat consumption fell from 5 500 kilograms monthly from July to October, 1974, to 3 000 in June to October, 1975; how do you explain that?—I do not know offhand.

Would you also examine that matter and furnish us with a report?—Yes.

I would be interested to see those reports, but we will never see them, because they will be hidden from Parliament.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: The committee can ask for them.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: If a committee member says anything outside, he is accused of stealing documents. The following is portion of a letter from Mr. R. L. Hooper, Administrator of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, to the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee:

An examination of the comparative figures provided by the State Supply Department reveals that the greater reductions in meat purchases occurred in the higher quality lines, that is, the better cuts of meat such as turkeys, chickens, hinds of beef, bacon, veal, ham, steaks. There was obviously not a normal balance between purchases of expensive and economical cuts of meat, and the preponderance of purchases of better cuts was no doubt due to the fact that they could be easily disposed of.

How did the State Supply Department, without raising the matter, continue supplying these better kinds of meat when there must have been a huge variation between the proportion of such meat that the Northfield Wards were receiving and the proportion received by other hospitals? Through anonymous telephone calls, Opposition members were told time and time again that everyone in the department knew what was going on, but no-one was

willing to say anything. People were frightened because, the moment they did anything, the axe would fall on them. The following is portion of a letter from the Public Accounts Committee to Mr. Hooper:

On page 3 of your submission you state that the calculation of patients' meals using the four meals a day system was introduced at Northfield Wards early in 1975. Would you explain how for 1973-74 it was calculated that 311 710 meals were supplied to 172 in-patients, after allowing for approximately 5 500 meals served to competitors in the National Paraplegic and Quadraplegic Games in October, 1973?

That works out at five meals a day for each patient; in that case the patients must have been very well fed! In reply to that letter, Mr. Hooper said that perhaps he could account for 2 000 meals extra, but no more.

I am sure that honourable members have heard about the radio interview, when the Premier said that he had not read the Epps report. Three minutes later, under close questioning, he said that he had read it. When he was questioned in the other place about it, he said in reply to a member of the Opposition:

The honourable member is obviously not aware that there are two Epps reports.

That showed the keenness of the Premier to avoid this subject. There are not two Epps reports; there is a summary of the full report. He again told a lie. I find that very disturbing, from the leading figure in this State.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: That is unparliamentary.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I do not care whether it is or not. It is very disturbing indeed. The Premier said comparative food costs showed that Northfield was equal to the average institution of its type in this State. That was not correct, and when he was questioned about that he made a reflection on the Epps report. I understand that Mr. Epps has now been moved sideways. That is what happens when one presents an honest report. I do not know Mr. Epps; I have never seen him, but it is most unfortunate that this ruthless Government has taken such action against a man who wrote the report at the request of his own department.

It was very alarming to me, and I am sure to all people in this State, that the Premier deliberately chose to mislead the public. We see a four-line sentence in the Auditor-General's Report saying that budgeting is unsatisfactory; however, we find underneath that taxpayers' funds have been filched and that one person has been caught with \$13 worth of food!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That person has been fined \$75, and he has been paid \$2 100 in wages since being caught, half of that being paid while he was suspended prior to his conviction. He was convicted on his own admission of guilt. He was proven guilty and was paid a further \$1 100. He went on for another three months at the hospital.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Did he get severance pay?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It could be called severance pay. That man must have been laughing all the way to the bank. There are too many unanswered questions on that subject. Why was Parliament not informed about that matter when it occurred?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It is a big cover-up.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes. You are right. How many other situations like this are being covered up? I now refer to weaknesses in accounting activities, as set out in the Auditor-General's Report. At page 186, the Auditor-General states, in reference to the Lands Department:

During the year it was necessary to draw the department's attention to unsatisfactory aspects of its accounting work in respect of—

- (a) inadequate internal checking procedures relating to the calculation and payment of salaries;
- (b) non-observance of accepted procedures for the payment of accounts;
- (c) cost reporting and budgeting control of the Survey Division; and
- (d) inventory recording of equipment.

I would like to hear from that department.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Read the next sentence.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I will read the next sentence:

Remedial action is being taken by the department.

What remedial action? Why was it necessary? What action was taken against people who allowed it to occur? The Hon. Miss Levy's interjection indicates her attitude to public finance. I want to know why that situation was allowed to occur. Honourable members opposite allowed it to happen. I did not hear any criticism from them. I was ashamed of the Hon. Mr. Dunford beating the drum for the Premier again. He is like one of the Hare Krishna group; he should be parading up and down Rundle Mall beating the drum, and chanting "For he's a jolly good fellow".

Page 265 of the Auditor-General's Report, referring to the Public Buildings Department, states:

Motor vehicles:

The department's attention has been drawn to the following matters in respect of motor vehicles—

- (1) Inadequacies in procedures for efficient and effective utilisation of the fleet.

I would like to know what that means. Is that similar to the position in the Hospitals Department in New South Wales where there were too many cars and they had to be sold? The report continues:

- (2) The non-compliance with Government policy on disposal.

That is a remarkable statement. What does that mean? Were they being sold to friends? I would like to know what the Auditor-General meant when he said that they were not carrying out the proper procedures of disposal. The report continues:

- (3) The failure to review vehicle operating cost accounts on a regular basis.

Certain procedures were implemented by the department to provide better control through costing information; however, other items are still under review.

In other words, there are still problems. I come now to the matter of forestry. The Auditor-General states:

Budgetary control and forestry accounting procedures:

In my 1974-75 and 1975-76 report comment was made concerning—

- (1) unsatisfactory budgeting procedures in the areas of forestry, administrative and service operations; and
- (2) a need to review existing forestry accounting procedures in relation to forest plantation accounts and in particular the determination of plantation surpluses.

This indicated that certain new procedures were to be implemented before July, 1978. The report continues:

In the latter part of 1975 the procedures for establishing an Internal Audit Section were completed. Although an officer was appointed in December, 1975, to take control of the section, it has not commenced operations because of retention of staff selected on other duties.

I trust that the Minister will tell us whether that procedure is now being carried out. It is unfortunate that it took so long. On page 305, the report states:

- (2) The matter of unsatisfactory budgeting procedures associated with forestry administration and service operations was referred to the department in May, 1974. The position at June, 1977, was still unsatisfactory.

This was three years after the matter was referred to the Minister. I could quote item after item in the document showing that the Auditor-General recognises many problems regarding Government finance, but that he has no real power to do anything about it. The only power that exists is for the Opposition, through publicity, to make the Government accountable for its actions. It is unfortunate that we cannot bring people into this Council or bring them before a committee, as happens in Federal Parliament, and find out what is going on in relation to these matters.

I am sure all honourable members were most concerned to read in this morning's paper (and for those honourable members who perhaps did not read it I have that document) the Fiftieth General Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works. That is a Government-nominated committee; the Chairman is a Government member. I will read what the committee has to say:

The following matters were reported on in the Forty-Ninth General Report of the committee:

The committee places considerable weight on expert evidence received from departmental witnesses and consultants when arriving at a decision in regard to a public work. Whilst most Government departments construct their particular public works at a cost in keeping with the evidence submitted to the committee after making appropriate adjustment for cost escalation, it has come to the attention of the committee that some public works have incorporated major modifications involving substantial increases in expenditure. Other public works, whilst not involving modifications to the initial proposals, have involved costs which bear little relationship to the original estimates presented to the Governor, to Cabinet and to the committee. These variations have the effect of placing substantial extra charges against the forecast budgets which in turn has the effect of the Government being unable to maintain the programme it has set itself. This matter has been referred to on several previous occasions in both periodical and annual reports but the situation has not improved.

Today, in the other place, the Deputy Premier has had the audacity to say that he was not aware of this problem; why was it not drawn to his attention? He has not read the report; he was not aware of the situation and yet it has been known for some years. That is an admission of financial irresponsibility and mismanagement on the part of the Deputy Premier; he admits he did not even know that the situation existed. To me, it is incredible that a man who is the head of probably the most important department, dealing with the major construction projects in this State, was not aware of this situation, when his own Chairman was on the committee and it is a committee dominated by the Government. I read further from that report:

Another matter causing concern is that, when the enabling legislation was passed it was the intention of the Government that any project which required an appropriation of funds in excess of \$500 000, it was a prerequisite that the project be investigated by the committee. By far the majority of the departments operate in accordance with the intention of the Act by including all details of the work, as well as advising the committee whether part of the funds are anticipated to come either from the Australian Government, local government authorities or private organisations. In this way

the committee is enabled to get the overall picture of the public works in question. Recently, however, some departments have not included some highly specialised and expensive equipment in their submissions to the committee. Their reasoning is, apparently, that "equipment" does not need to be investigated but the committee is at a loss to see how it is possible for it to adequately report on a proposal unless the total cost of the scheme is submitted to it in the first place. Some of this specialised equipment is extremely expensive and could have a substantial impact on anticipated expenditure commitments by the Government.

Which are these departments? What are the projects referred to? Who are the people responsible for going behind the back of Parliament—because that is what is occurring? They are avoiding the Parliamentary procedures laid down and followed by most departments. It is a matter of concern to all honourable members—

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: And followed by previous Governments.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON:—to realise that there are people, departmental officers and perhaps even Ministers, who are prepared to carry out this practice and allow it to go on. I shall want some information on this report from the Leader of the Government in this place. I should like to know just who these people are, which are the departments concerned and what action is being taken to ensure that these people are being brought to book on this matter. I will read further from the report:

A further matter causing the committee some concern is in relation to the definition of a public work. Reference is made to extracts from an opinion by the Crown Solicitor in 1937 as follows:

"... public work is defined in section 3 as 'any work proposed to be constructed by the Government . . . out of moneys to be provided by Parliament . . .'. . . The definition does not refer to a work proposed to be constructed partly out of moneys to be provided by Parliament . . .

It seems clear that when this Act was passed Parliament did not contemplate a case of a public work being constructed partly out of Government money and partly out of money provided privately and, consequently, no provision has been made for such a case. It seems to me that is a *casus omissus* and that the definition should be amended by inserting after the word 'moneys' in the third line some words such as 'in excess of £30 000' (now \$500 000), for it seems to be the policy of the Act that if Government money in excess of £30 000 (now \$500 000) is to be spent on a public work the matter should be referred to the committee."

I am sure we all agree that that should be the case, that even if private money is involved Parliament should investigate the whole programme. I will now read one section which indicates that even Mr. Jennings, the Chairman of the Public Works Committee, believes there is some irresponsibility on the part of the people who take these actions:

Finally, the committee considers that the attention of heads of Government departments should be drawn to the requirements of the Public Works Standing Committee Act in particular section 25 which provides that it is not lawful for any person to introduce into either House of Parliament any Bill either to authorise the construction of any public work or to appropriate money for expenditure on any public work estimated to cost, when complete, more than \$500 000 unless such public work has been first inquired into and reported upon by the committee.

Some witnesses when appearing before the committee have stressed the urgency of their particular public work and have requested especially prompt decisions in order that the

projects might proceed without delay. With all public works referred to it the committee works in the closest co-operation with the Government departments and carries out its investigations and issues its reports as soon as possible. With some of the special cases referred to above, the committee has carried out its inquiries with the utmost despatch and good faith and, on occasions, with considerable inconvenience, only to discover subsequently that the works which have been described to it as especially urgent have not been proceeded with when the committee has issued its recommendation. Sometimes the urgent need for the work has seemed to disappear altogether.

There is only one way to describe the actions of people who have done that, and that is contempt of a Parliamentary committee, because they have taken actions that have led to this Parliamentary committee perhaps placing their project on a higher priority than other projects and then not proceeding with it.

Substantial funds are involved in a number of projects that I have attempted to discover in the Auditor-General's

Report, where he has referred to these matters, but I find no information. For these reasons, on matters I have raised both in the Auditor-General's Report and in the report of the Public Works Committee, I believe this Council should consider bringing these people before this Chamber or, if that is not possible, before a Select Committee or a committee of investigation (I do not care what it is) so that we can find out what is going wrong. When we see growing evidence of gross mismanagement on the part of this Government, what can we do about it; what legislative action can we take to cure this situation? I support the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.25 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, October 27, at 2.15 p.m.