

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, October 27, 1977

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

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

QUESTIONS

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Will the Minister representing the Minister of Transport ascertain whether there is to be any postponement of the proposed opening date for the extensions to the South-Eastern Freeway and, if there is, what are the reasons for the postponement?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the Leader's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Leader of the Government in this Council about Parliamentary privilege.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: This morning the press reported a matter raised by the Hon. Mr. Cameron yesterday that the Liberal Party considered to be very important, because it is still suffering from the effects of the recent election.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. The Hon. Mr. Foster's remark does not appear to have anything to do with the question.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Hon. Mr. Hill spoke in such circumstances for 25 minutes yesterday, and I have not yet got off the ground. Would the honourable member support a suspension of Standing Orders?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Foster has leave to make a statement with a view to asking a question. I hope his statement complies with Standing Orders.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I sought leave, which was granted. I thought that you, Mr. President, would draw the Opposition's attention to that, rather than your drawing my attention to it. It is reported in this morning's press that the Hon. Mr. Cameron said yesterday that he was considering calling before the Bar of this Council a member of the public. I say bluntly that the Hon. Mr. Cameron's statement was irresponsible.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. That is an expression of opinion.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! How can I hear the point of order when there are so many interjections? The Hon. Mr. Foster will resume his seat.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I refer to Standing Order 109. The Hon. Mr. Foster said that, in his opinion, the Hon. Mr. Cameron had acted irresponsibly. It was clearly an expression of opinion, which was quite out of order.

The PRESIDENT: We get that sort of thing all the time. I think it is perfectly legitimate for one honourable

member to say that another member is irresponsible, if that is what the honourable member thinks.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The honourable member has stooped to the same level as his former mate, Mr. S. Hall, when he hauled an innocent Adelaide businessman before the Bar of this Council under the privilege of the Chamber, and Menzies did the same with a member of the gallery.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Under Standing Order 109, I think the explanation of the question is going beyond the scope of the Standing Order.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member ought to state his question. I was not in the Chamber when the Hon. Mr. Cameron spoke last night. I read his speech this morning. The Hon. Mr. Foster is reading more into it than was there.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Never mind; I draw the attention of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris to the report in the *Advertiser* this morning. He suggested that he knew nothing about the matter. He is a liar because he was given a copy of it at 3 o'clock.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Question!

The PRESIDENT: Does the Hon. Mr. Foster want to ask a question?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes.

The PRESIDENT: What is the question?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Hon. Mr. DeGaris knew perfectly well about this matter.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member should ask his question. He is quite capable of doing that.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Does the Leader of the Government in this Chamber believe that a member of this Council, or in another place, who flippantly threatens a member of the public with being dragged before the Bar of the Chamber, thereby denying that person the right to legal assistance and justice, is taking a measure that is not necessary? Is it the opinion of the Minister that that measure is not necessary, and is it also his opinion that on previous occasions, where members of the public have been drawn to the Bar of the Council in South Australia, and in the Federal Parliament in the last two years, this action was quite unwarranted, and is it not a gross abuse of Parliamentary privilege on the part of the member concerned? This procedure has been confined to the Liberal Party. It happened in relation to scientology.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The honourable the Minister can answer that question. I ask him to ignore the emotional words.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I think that the threat implied in the Hon. Mr. Cameron's statement yesterday will have nothing but ill effect on the running of this State, and that is his threat to call public servants before the Bar of this Council. I have been present on one occasion when a gentleman from the public was called before the Bar of the Council on a most flippant excuse. There was no sense in it, no rhyme or reason, merely because he stated that a member of the Government at the time, who was a Minister, had indicated his views on a certain question.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That was not the reason.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It was also because this gentlemen had the audacity to suggest that the Hon. Mr. Hill, who was then a Minister, could not be impartial. Honourable members opposite saw that they brought this person before the Bar of the Council.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I raise a point of order. The question is not being answered by the Minister. He is moving right away from the subject. If he wishes to answer the question, I ask him to do so.

The PRESIDENT: It is not entirely out of order for the Minister to refer to a previous occasion when a person was

brought before the Bar; however, I do not think he can canvass all the rights and wrongs of that long, unhappy, far-off event.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The President and I are on the same wave length. It was long and unhappy, and was a disgraceful state of affairs.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Let me make my position quite clear. It is obvious that the Hon. Mr. Foster has not read the *Hansard* pull today of what I said.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: On a point of order, I did not suggest that for a moment. I dealt with the press report only, not with what is in *Hansard*.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: If he has, he has chosen to ignore totally what I said. At no stage did I threaten to call that gentleman to Parliament House. I said that, if we cannot get information from this Government on the gross mismanagement of this State's expenditure, perhaps we should consider that so that we can get the truth about the financial situation. It is obvious it has touched a raw nerve of both the Minister, who will shortly rave on in his usual way and give no information, and the Hon. Mr. Foster.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I will say—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member has made his personal explanation; he is now proceeding to get involved in other things.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I utterly refute the stupid and inane remarks of the Hon. Mr. Foster in his personal explanation.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Mr. President, I seek your guidance. It is obvious that my remarks in regard to the press report have brought some reaction from the Hon. Mr. Cameron, and understandably so. He referred to my reading *Hansard*. I have not yet had an opportunity of reading *Hansard* and I seek guidance from the Chair. I take it from the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Cameron that he claims to be misrepresented by the press. As the statement he made yesterday was in the hands of the press by 3 o'clock, he cannot make that allegation; it was also in the hands of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: No; you are misinterpreting the report.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: What form of protection is available to members on the floor of the Chamber when they claim to be misrepresented in the press? A newspaper report may be different from a *Hansard* proof. What protection can be afforded the members of this Chamber from the Chair in those cases where misreporting has occurred?

The PRESIDENT: The matter of misreporting is constantly in honourable members' minds. The honourable member should know that, if an honourable member claims he has been misrepresented in the press, he can seek leave to make a personal explanation in the Council to put the matter right; but I did not hear Mr. Cameron mention the press at all.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He did not mention it; I did.

The PRESIDENT: He did not mention the press at all; he said that the honourable member had misquoted what he said in *Hansard*. I have read what the Hon. Mr. Cameron has said. I think, in all fairness, the Hon. Mr. Foster put his own gloss on it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There are too many interjections.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Hon. Mr. Foster said that the speech made by the Hon. Mr. Cameron yesterday was in my hands by 3 o'clock; that is not true.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I do not expect you to tell the truth.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The position is that the statement I made in the press this morning, that I had no knowledge of it, is correct. The statement made by the Hon. Mr. Foster is untrue: I had no knowledge of what the Hon. Mr. Cameron would say.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: There was a highly alarming report in today's press regarding the possibility of Flinders Medical Centre being a fire hazard. Can the Minister of Health provide any reassurance to the patients at the centre and to the public generally on this matter?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am indeed getting concerned about the scare tactics being used by certain people. However, I assure the Council that there is absolutely no truth in the allegation made by Dr. Pressley that the Flinders Medical Centre is a potential fire hazard.

At a seminar in Melbourne this week, Dr. Pressley made a number of allegations concerning fire safety at the centre. These allegations have been investigated. There appear to be five main criticisms, which are as follows: first, the use of acrylic carpet within hospital ward areas. I am advised that the carpet installed within the ward areas conforms to current Australian wool testing authority standards for flammability of materials. In conjunction with other fire safety measures existing at the centre, it is considered that no undue fire risk exists.

Secondly, I refer to the absence of fire sprinkler systems. True, no sprinklers exist; however, this is in line with current practice in modern hospital construction. However, in order to maximise fire safety within the hospital more than adequate fire detection and alarm facilities have been installed which provide automatic and direct notification to centre personnel and the South Australian Fire Brigade in the event of any fire emergency.

A number of other fire safety measures also exist which provide for the containment and minimising of risk to occupants in such a fire emergency. Furthermore, under the guidance of our experienced safety officer at Flinders Medical Centre, internal staff fire teams have been organised and trained to respond rapidly in the event of fire emergencies. The leader of each fire team has received training and has been certificated by the South Australian Fire Brigade in accordance with current legislative requirements.

I refer, thirdly, to single entry to accommodation flats and absence of fire stairs. I believe that the Minister of Works is issuing a statement on this matter. I am advised that entrances to and exits from the accommodation flats conform to current building regulation requirements. In addition, during planning stages the South Australian Fire Brigade was consulted on all aspects of fire safety relating to these buildings. Continual liaison is maintained with local South Australian Fire Brigade personnel to ensure the maintenance of a high safety standard.

Fourthly, I refer to flammable fabrics in the flats. The flats referred to in the House yesterday are within one block out of a total of seven such blocks. This one block was furnished separately to the others as a matter of

urgency in order to provide temporary residential and office accommodation for School of Medicine staff. Owing to the urgent nature of the accommodation requirement, the choice of carpeting was not subjected to the same selection processes as carpeting in other areas of the centre. However, the carpeting in question was of an acceptable commercial standard. The remainder of carpets in other blocks of flats conform to the A.W.T.A. standards for flammability.

Fifthly, regarding cotton blankets used within wards these articles are standard South Australian Hospital Department issue and are common to all Government hospitals in South Australia.

I am assured by the Flinders Medical Centre that it has kept abreast of all reports and developments in the field of standards of equipment for hospitals and intends to maintain this practice and, indeed, already has introduced some improvements in equipment and materials in anticipation of the acceptance of current draft standards.

I trust that my reply will allay the unnecessary fears that have been aroused by a member of the public who went to another State to deliver a paper at a seminar. Although I am not in any way questioning that gentleman's qualifications—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Who gave the paper?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Dr. Pressley delivered the paper at a seminar that was held in Melbourne, and his remarks were first reported in the Victorian press yesterday.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You don't think that we should raise this matter in Parliament?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I did not say that at all. I said that Dr. Pressley should not make these sorts of statement unless he was sure of his facts. Why should he create fears in the minds not only of the hospital's patients but also of its prospective patients? That is all I am saying, and honourable members can ask as many questions as they like. I understand that Dr. Pressley made one visit to a certain flat to see a certain person at Flinders. I understand that that was the basis on which he wrote a paper that he presented at the seminar in Victoria.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I direct a question to the Minister of Health. Was the Fire Brigade consulted, before Flinders Medical Centre was built, regarding fire protection measures? If so, what recommendations did it make? If it was not consulted, why was it not?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: To put the honourable member's mind at rest, I point out that the whole plans were submitted to the Fire Brigade. The planning team considered the whole question in relation to the building of Flinders Medical Centre, and the Fire Brigade at all times approved what was being done in relation to the building there as regards safety and the prevention of fires.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask a supplementary question regarding Flinders Medical Centre. I ask the Minister of Health whether it is a fact that Flinders Medical Centre authorities have given an undertaking that, when the present acrylic carpet is worn and requires replacement, it will not be replaced by the same carpet material, because of the fire hazard?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have already indicated that one block was furnished separately from others as a matter of urgency in order to provide temporary residential and office accommodation for School of Medicine staff. Owing to the urgent nature of the accommodation requirement, the choice of carpeting was not subjected to the same selection processes as carpeting in other areas of the centre. However, the carpeting in question was of an acceptable commercial standard. The remainder of carpets in other blocks of flats conforms to

the A.W.T.A. standards for flammability. I have also indicated that continual liaison is maintained with local South Australian Fire Brigade personnel to ensure the maintenance of a higher safety standard, and, if they make recommendations to Flinders Medical Centre, I am sure that those recommendations will be considered carefully.

WALLAROO

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Marine.

The PRESIDENT: On the subject of?

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: The recent maritime accident at Wallaroo wharf.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: By way of explanation, I point out that the port of Wallaroo does not have tugboats stationed there on a permanent basis and, should the pilots who pilot the ships into and out of Wallaroo require a tug, it would have to be ordered from elsewhere. This is the position at other ports at present. For example, Port Augusta has been also in the same position and has ordered tugs from Whyalla or Port Pirie. For deep wheat ships that require tugs, they also are ordered from Whyalla. Tugs for Port Giles and Port Stanvac are ordered from Port Adelaide. If I may comment, it seems that the provision of tugs may have prevented that accident at Wallaroo. If the ship was not responding to the instructions of the pilots the tug could have taken action to see that the damage was minimised, at least. Will the Minister ask the Minister of Marine to consider instructing pilots at Wallaroo to order tugs to assist in the berthing of ships at the port?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the question to my colleague.

MAGISTRATES COURTS

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Premier, about the work load in magistrates courts.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Honourable members will have noticed the report in the *Advertiser* this morning that Mr. I. C. Grieve, S.M., stated in court yesterday that the work load of courts was too heavy. He is reported as having said that he regretted that litigants had to be called at 10 a.m. as many of them could not be heard until well into the afternoon. My question is directed to the Premier because magistrates work under his department. Does the Premier agree that the work load on magistrates courts is too heavy and will he investigate the possibility of appointing additional magistrates?

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

INSURANCE POLICIES

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to addressing a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Attorney-General and Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs, concerning house insurance policies.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I have recently seen a news letter issued by the Consumers Association of South Australia. It seems that the association conducted a survey on house insurance policies available in this State and approached several insurance companies. The association reports several disquieting features arising from its survey, not the least of which was the wide variation in premiums quoted for the same property.

The association also believed it was extremely difficult for non-lawyers to understand the exclusions from each company's cover, as these were often expressed in highly technical legal language. The association also suggests that many of the provisions in the policies were unenforceable anyway, but could mislead people and deter them from seeking advice on their true rights.

Further, in some cases it was not even possible for the association to obtain information about exclusions, as some companies would not supply a specimen policy document to the association's researchers. One company refused to supply such a specimen on the ground that, if it did, people could make claims without having paid the premium. One would have thought that companies checked on whether or not premiums were up to date before paying out on any claim, and such an excuse seems rather paltry.

Other companies would not supply proposal forms except for completion and lodging on the spot. This seems extraordinary, unless the companies have something to hide. The association makes several suggestions resulting from its survey and I ask the Attorney whether he will consider implementing legislation which would, first, ensure that copies of policy documents can be obtained before a proposal is signed; secondly, prohibit the inclusion of void clauses such as arbitration clauses; and, thirdly, prescribe a minimum size of printing on policy documents.

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

DRUGS

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question on drugs?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: As the honourable member has noted, the South Australian Government took the lead in establishing an inquiry with wide terms of reference to examine questions relative to the non-medical use of drugs. The Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs is already well advanced on its programme of work. As to the three specific questions raised by the honourable member, first, the Commonwealth Government has approached the South Australian Government for assistance with the work of the Commonwealth Royal Commission into Drugs.

Secondly, the Commonwealth Government proposed that South Australia should appoint the Commonwealth Royal Commissioner to head a State inquiry with identical terms of reference to the Commonwealth inquiry. The South Australian Government has taken the view that as a matter of policy it is undesirable to issue commissions to two similar inquiries to operate within the State at the same time. The prior existence and wide-ranging activities of the South Australian Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs have meant that the State has been unable to agree to the Commonwealth's request. The Commonwealth has been informed of this decision.

Thirdly, the terms of reference for the Commonwealth Royal Commission, as made available to the South Australian Government, are as follows:

- (a) The extent of, and the methods used in—
 - (i) the illegal importation of drugs;
 - (ii) the illegal exportation of drugs;
 - (iii) the illegal production of drugs; and
 - (iv) the illegal trafficking in drugs;
- (b) the places where drugs mentioned in paragraph (a) are produced or from which they are obtained and the places to which those drugs are sent;
- (c) the extent to which—
 - (i) drugs are illegally used;
 - (ii) drugs lawfully obtained are diverted to illegal trafficking or illegal uses; or
 - (iii) drugs are misused in so far as such misuse is relevant to the illegal use of drugs;
- (d) the extent (if any) to which the illegal activities mentioned in paragraph (a) or the illegal use or the diversion mentioned in paragraph (c) are engaged in, directly or indirectly, by persons who engage, on an organised basis, in other illegal activities, whether or not related to drugs;
- (e) the adequacy of existing laws (including the appropriateness of the penalties) and of existing law enforcement (including arrangements for co-operation between law enforcement agencies) in relation to the prohibition, restriction or control of the importation, exportation, production, possession, supply or use of, or trafficking in drugs; and
- (f) whether new laws should be enacted or other measures taken (including the taking of initiatives for the making or revision of international agreements) to remedy any inadequacies found to exist under paragraph (e):

Interpretative provisions:

- (g) the expression "drug" means a narcotic or psychotropic substance and includes every drug or substance specified in any of the schedules to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs or the Convention on Psychotropic Substances;
- (h) a reference to a drug includes a reference to an article or substance containing a drug;
- (i) a reference to the production of a drug includes a reference to the manufacture of a drug by any means and also includes a reference to the cultivation or production or any plant or substance from which a drug is capable of being derived; and
- (j) a reference to the importation or exportation of or to trafficking in, a drug includes a reference to the importation or exportation of, or to trafficking in, a plant or substance referred to in paragraph (i) or of a seed from which such a plant can be cultivated.

Direction to Commissioner: To the extent that alcohol may be regarded as a narcotic substance, the Commissioner is to be directed to have regard to it only in so far as it is necessary to do so for the purpose of establishing the extent of the illegal use, or of the misuse of other drugs in accordance with paragraph (c).

MAGISTRATE'S TRANSFER

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about the transfer of a magistrate?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member has not read the whole correspondence. The Premier offered to see Mr. Wilson, who said he saw no point in an interview in the circumstances.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In his reply to a question I asked yesterday, the Minister of Education indicated that his department had been studying the recommendations made by the religious education evaluation committee. He said that some of the 17 recommendations had been implemented before the report was released and that others were now being implemented. Will the Minister obtain further information as to exactly which of the recommendations have already been implemented and which of the others are to be implemented soon? Which, if any, of the 17 recommendations are not intended to be implemented in 1977 or 1978?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

STUART HIGHWAY

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about Stuart Highway?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague the Minister of Transport wrote on October 12, 1977, to the honourable member advising that copies of the draft environmental impact statement were available for inspection at various points, and a copy of the advertisement was also enclosed with my colleague's letter. The advertisement stated that copies of the draft environmental impact statement could be purchased for \$10 from the Secretary of the Highways Department. It is not intended to make available to members a free copy of the draft environmental impact statement.

HOUSING DEALS

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Attorney-General, about housing deals.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: We have heard comments, especially from the Hon. Mr. Hill, about the cost of housing in South Australia. I, too, am concerned about this matter, but for different reasons. The honourable member has said that his information comes from the Housing Industry Association, the Master Builders Association, and some other authoritative people. However, none of these people has stated to my satisfaction how these problems can be solved. I have been approached by constituents who have signed contracts for house extensions costing \$5 000 or \$6 000. Many salesmen in this field work in together and say, "We have a better proposition, but it will cost \$2 000 extra." The people are persuaded to sign a contract on the spot, and they cannot legally get out of the contract, because there is no cooling-off period. I forget the company's name at the moment, but I can ascertain it. The company was a subsidiary of a larger company.

When I telephoned a member of a wellknown and respected family who is often mentioned in the society columns, he said, "Look, Jim, that matter has been fixed up. The deal has been cancelled, and we have had a talk with the salesman. He won't do it again." In other

situations builders have said that there will be no increase beyond the contract price. The builder has said, "I can get bricks from a certain company, and the work will not be held up, except for the possibility of strikes." Later, the people found that they were not getting the bricks. I telephoned the manufacturer and got the bricks out to them, and the house was built, but for an additional sum. In South Australia bricks are much cheaper than in other States.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Clay bricks?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Yes.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Then, why are building costs higher in South Australia?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Perhaps the Leader can tell me. Two or three years ago clay bricks cost up to \$75 a thousand, and the same bricks in Victoria cost up to \$120 a thousand. The cost of labour and the cost of land are cheaper in South Australia. Most of the cottage work in South Australia is done by non-union labour—by subcontractors. They recently marched on Parliament House.

The PRESIDENT: Order! This is a long, meandering explanation. It does not matter whether the builders' labourers marched on Parliament House.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I referred to subcontractors.

The PRESIDENT: I point out that the subject of the honourable member's question was housing deals.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: If you, Mr. President, were buying a house, you would be upset, but you are not in that situation. I am concerned that people do not know the interest rates and therefore do not know their commitments. I owe a small sum in connection with a mortgage. I pay \$160 a month and, after many inquiries, I found that \$148 of each monthly payment goes in interest and only \$12 goes in reduction of the principal.

That is on a mortgage of about \$12 000. One can understand people's concern. An article headed "Warning on House Deals" states:

The advertising of minimum-deposit house and land package deals is causing concern, the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs says in his annual report to Parliament. Mr. L. H. Baker's report was tabled in the Assembly yesterday by the Attorney-General (Mr. Duncan). The report says builders should disclose in writing prospective buyers' ultimate financial commitments under such deals. "The advertising of new homes on minimum deposits has again recently come under scrutiny by the branch," the report says.

This matter was mentioned in last year's report concerning being that purchasers were not being made fully aware at the time of entering into land and home-building contracts of the heavy financial burdens to which they were committing themselves in the ultimate. Discussions with the main firms involved in this type of advertising resulted in some improvement in the disclosure of the financial details involved in these transactions.

There was only some success in this area. The article continues:

However, the depressed state of the new home market must tend to influence advertisers to make their "packages" as attractive as possible to the consumer. The branch came to the conclusion that there should be an obligation on home builders to provide prospective buyers with full pre-contract disclosure in writing of the likely terms of repayment of both the short- and long-term finance arrangements usually involved in land and home purchase contracts.

I thank you, Mr. President, for your indulgence.

The PRESIDENT: I think the honourable member can thank the Council, not me.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Will the Minister

representing the Attorney-General ask his colleague to investigate the possibility of drafting the strongest possible legislation to stop advertisements of so-called attractive package deals to home buyers? Will the Minister also ask that in any proposed legislation it be made mandatory, in line with Mr. Baker's report, that builders should disclose in writing to prospective buyers the ultimate commitment under such deals? I believe that this legislation ought to apply equally to established houses and flats.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

ART GALLERY BOARD

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Will the Minister of Health, representing the Premier in this Chamber, ascertain whether any members of the Art Gallery Board had oversea trips this year at Government expense? If so, what are the full details of such trip or trips regarding the person or persons concerned, the purpose or purposes of any such trip, and the costs and itinerary involved?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will seek that information for the honourable member.

ATHELSTONE ROAD

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked recently about Lower Athelstone Road?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Lower Athelstone Road is an urban local road under the care, control and management of the corporation of the City of Campbelltown. The condition of the section of road in question has been inspected by Highways Department officers and discussed with the City Engineer of the Campbelltown council. The condition of the road is such that temporary measures would be ineffective and reconstruction is necessary. I understand that council is considering applying for urban local road grant funds in 1978-79 to finance reconstruction of this section of Lower Athelstone Road.

RUMBLE STRIPS

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about rumble strips?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: There has never been a requirement to remove the rumble strips at Norwood High School, and there has been no such request from the Commonwealth Police to have them removed.

PORT AUGUSTA TO WHYALLA HIGHWAY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands received from the Minister of Transport a reply to my recent question about the construction of the Port Augusta to Whyalla highway?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: To September 30, 1977, \$4 600 000 has been spent on the reconstruction of this highway. It is estimated that it will cost a further \$1 860 000 to complete the work. Tenders have been let in the past to private contractors for work on this highway.

IMPRISONMENT

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I ask a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Attorney-General.

The PRESIDENT: Does the honourable member seek leave to make an explanation?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Yes.

The PRESIDENT: What is the subject matter?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: It is imprisonment. Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Great concern has been expressed to me by constituents about imprisonment. All my life I have believed that there has been a law for the rich and a law for the poor.

The PRESIDENT: That is an expression of opinion.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: People outside this Council are saying that they believe—

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member knows that he cannot give an opinion.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I will not give my opinion.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member is quoting somebody else's opinion, which is just as bad.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I rise on a point of order. It relates to the proceedings in this Council today, and particularly to Standing Order 109, which honourable members opposite were very pleased to quote to you, Mr. President, when the Hon. Mr. Foster sought to ask a question earlier. It will be seen that that Standing Order prohibits—

The PRESIDENT: Is the honourable member raising a point of order on something that has already happened?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: No, I am merely getting this matter into perspective for you, Mr. President, and honourable members in the Council. Standing Order 109 states:

In putting any question, no argument, opinion or hypothetical case shall be offered, nor inference or imputation made, nor shall any facts be stated or quotations made including quotations from *Hansard* or the debates in the other House, except by leave of the Council . . .

When leave of the Council is granted to make a short statement—

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member should read the remaining words.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I appreciate that. That is another point. Mr. President, you have ruled out in explanations the expression of opinions when opinions are included in the same phrase as facts. So, on the basis of your ruling, honourable members in their explanations should not be able to state facts, either. That would seem to me to make the whole explanation totally pointless. Surely, once leave has been granted by the Council, a member is entitled to state facts, to make quotations from *Hansard*, to make inferences and imputations or to put argument or opinion. They are all listed in the one Standing Order, Mr. President, as you well know.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not need any assistance from the Hon. Mr. Foster.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: If leave of the Council is granted to make an explanation, and in that explanation a member is allowed to state facts, surely he is allowed to do all the other things which are prohibited without leave by Standing Order 109.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Read the rest of it!

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The remainder states:

. . . and so far only as may be necessary to explain such question.

That obviously has to be relevant; I am not arguing about

that. My point is that the President has consistently ruled that opinions shall not be stated in an explanation. If that ruling is correct, neither can facts or argument be stated; neither can hypothetical cases be put; and neither can quotations from *Hansard* or newspapers be made. It seems that, in the Council's giving leave to make an explanation, all those things are possible within the general constraints that they must be relevant, or related to the question that is being asked. Therefore, prohibition of opinion in an explanation is wrong.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the honourable member for his legal argument; I do not uphold it. It has been a long established tradition in this Chamber and in other Parliaments that this matter of giving opinions or making inferences or imputations is completely out of order in making explanations. I intend in the fairly near future to call a meeting of the Standing Orders Committee.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Do you agree I am right?

The PRESIDENT: I do not agree that the honourable member is right but I follow his argument. I indicate that this particular Standing Order seems to need to be completely rewritten.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Make a ruling now and knock it out in one hit. You can make a ruling now.

The PRESIDENT: I will not make any such ruling, but that Standing Order will be referred to the Standing Orders Committee along with other amendments. The Hon. Mr. Sumner, who is a member of that committee, can argue his case there. In the meantime, I propose to follow what has been done here for many years and rule that expressions of opinion in explanations prior to asking questions are out of order. The Hon. Mr. Dunford started it off by expressing an opinion.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I said that people are saying these things outside. They are coming to me and saying, "Will you bring this to the notice of Parliament?" How can I do that if I do not say what it is all about?

The PRESIDENT: That is all right; the honourable member has leave, but we do not want to be told there is one law for the rich and another law for the poor.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: In the *Advertiser* of Saturday, October 1, 1977, a headline states, "Mother, 21, imprisoned". She was put in prison for two months. She had forged some cheques to the total value of \$645.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: On a point of order, the honourable member has just stated a fact. Has he got leave to state facts?

The PRESIDENT: He has leave to make an explanation prior to asking a question. All explanations are alleged facts; we cannot avoid that.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: How does that comply with Standing Order 109?

The PRESIDENT: Because it is necessary to explain the question. There are some things that are necessary and some things that are unnecessary.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: What you are saying is that a member can state facts that are necessary to explain a question but cannot state opinions that are necessary to explain a question, despite both those things being referred to in the one Standing Order more or less following each other, and that with leave of the Council opinions and facts can be stated. My argument is that, once leave has been granted, it means that a person can state facts and opinions in so far as they are necessary for the asking of a question. Any other ruling seems to be totally inconsistent with the literal, plain-word meaning of the Standing Order.

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry the honourable member finds it so ambiguous; I do not. The plain fact of the matter is that the leave granted to an honourable member is for

making an explanation before asking a question. When he asks a question, it is not possible to include in that question an opinion.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Or a fact.

The PRESIDENT: Maybe—or a fact. The only point, when those matters are in issue, is the explanation. I intend in future to maintain that expressions of opinion in an explanation are out of order.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I will not give an opinion about this case because I am not qualified to do so, but I think honourable members opposite will know how I feel, anyway. Here is a 21-year-old mother with two children who has been gaoled for two months for forging cheques to the total value of \$645 involving Graham Bros., John Martin's and Target (and they have ripped off a few people in their time). This is what the newspaper report states:

He noted that the defendant had no previous convictions and her childhood and marriage had been unhappy. At the time of the offences she had been living on a supporting mother's pension in a house she shared with relatives who had been on relief. The house had needed furniture and the offences had been largely an effort to provide furniture and other items. He had decided, with regret, to impose a prison sentence. He sentenced the defendant to two months gaol and ordered her to enter into a \$100, two-year good behaviour bond.

According to that press report, the woman is to serve two months. For that period there is no remission, but for three months there is remission. Will the Minister representing the Attorney-General investigate the possibility of her being considered for parole or release on a suspended sentence?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Are you criticising the court sentence?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Yes; I think it is ridiculous, compared to your mates the doctors.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That is opinion.

The PRESIDENT: Order! It seems to me that the honourable member has asked a question about the functions of the Parole Board. Is the Parole Board under the control of any Minister in the Government; can the Hon. Mr. Banfield tell me that?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes; I will obtain a report from the Chief Secretary.

PUBLIC SERVICE APPOINTMENT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I understand the Minister of Health has an answer to a question I asked recently about the change in status of Dr. Inglis.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: A Government has the responsibility of ensuring that Public Service staff are used in the most effective manner to implement the aims of Government. Therefore, any arrangements to be made within the Public Service to achieve those aims are the prerogative of the Government of the day.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 26. Page 474.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I rise to support formally this Bill, but with considerable reluctance because of the irresponsible way in which the State finances have been

wasted under this Government. The diatribe of the Premier in the preliminary statement to this document was a disgrace to him and to the Government. It has been referred to by my colleagues and I do not want to repeat it all but there are one or two points in it to which I should like to refer. First, he said that inflation had not come down. Secondly, he said that the Prime Minister had attempted to move Australia in a direction opposite to that of any other country. They are completely false statements, as I will show, in the opinion of prominent people in other parts of Australia and overseas.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Who are those prominent people? Describe their prominence.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: If the Hon. Mr. Foster will keep quiet, I will draw his attention to the comments of Mr. Neilson. He is a member of the Party to which the Hon. Mr. Foster subscribes. Mr. Neilson is the Premier of Tasmania and he said this recently:

It is apparent that the rate of inflation fell significantly in 1976-77 from the high level of the previous two years.

That is in complete contradiction to what Mr. Dunstan said. Mr. Neilson continued:

With this fall have come tentative but fairly definite signs of some economic recovery in Australia . . . New investment in manufacturing industry, although still below the level of investment a few years ago, increased considerably in 1966-67 over the level in the previous year.

This means that the Tasmanian Premier, a member of the Labor Party, takes a completely realistic and accurate view of the problems facing the Governments of this country today. He also said:

The dilemma facing all Governments at present is that on present trends no significant improvement in the unemployment position can be expected for some time, because such a reduction would lag behind economic recovery and the signs are that this will be slow. A return to reasonable levels of economic prosperity with a satisfactory level of job opportunities can only be achieved by a co-operative effort by the public and private sectors.

Once again he seems to be in complete disagreement with the comments of Mr. Dunstan or whoever it was that wrote his speech. I refer now to the comments made by Sir Charles Court, the Premier of Western Australia. He said:

As I have consistently maintained, the essential first task of all Governments—

and he was there referring to all Australian Governments—

must be the control of inflation. The task is not easy, and the medicine is unpalatable, but we cannot afford to waver from this aim. To the credit of the Federal Government, it has not wavered, despite criticism and its own concern at the slowness of economic recovery. That Government can rightly point to the slowing down of the inflation rate in the past year to a current annual rate of less than 10 per cent as vindication of its policies.

Sir Charles Court is served by a competent staff of Treasury officials and I believe that he could well have been a Prime Minister of Australia. I also refer briefly to the comments of the Victorian Premier, Mr. Hamer, as follows:

The rate of inflation in Australia has fallen in the last year and now stands at an annual rate of below 10 per cent, a result which reflects great credit on the Federal Government.

Those comments, one of which was made by a Labor Premier and two of which were made by right-wing Premiers, are in complete contradiction to the comments made, inaccurately in my opinion, by the Treasurer of this State. However, I do not wish to refer merely to the comments of people in Australia. I draw the Treasurer's attention to the comments made by people of his own ilk

overseas, people who are in line with him politically. I refer, first, to the comments of Mr. Denis Healey, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer in Mr. Callaghan's Government, who said:

The Government—

and, he is, of course, talking about the British Government—

continues to regard the mastery of inflation as the precondition for success in returning to full employment.

That comment is completely in line with the concept of the Fraser Government over the past two years, and completely contradicts the nonsense stated by the Treasurer in his political diatribe as a preliminary to this Budget. If that is not enough, I refer honourable members opposite to the comments of the Rt. Hon. James Callaghan, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, a good Labour Party supporter, who said:

There is an overwhelming recognition by nearly everybody, including trade unionists and especially their wives, that 20 per cent wage increases are of no lasting benefit—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order. Sit him down, Mr. President!

The PRESIDENT: What is the point of order?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is that the honourable member is not merely referring to copious notes but is reading his speech, which was prepared by someone else. That is against Standing Orders, and we saw an abuse of it yesterday when the Hon. Mr. Cameron read his speech, which was written by someone else. I raised the matter yesterday with the Acting President, and I suggest that the ruling given yesterday should apply also to the Hon. Mr. Dawkins.

The PRESIDENT: That is only a mild point of order. If I prevented honourable members—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Mr. President, we could give him leave to table—

The PRESIDENT: Order! If I prevented honourable members from reading from copious notes, the standard of debate in this place would be even lower than it is now.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a further point of order, Mr. President. I suggest that you make a recommendation to the appropriate committee that that Standing Order be ripped out of the book along with the one referred to by the Hon. Mr. Sumner earlier today.

The PRESIDENT: We will have a look at it.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He's not referring to copious notes: it's a typewritten document.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: In answer to the Hon. Mr. Foster—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I don't want your answer. I want it from the President.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: —I have copious notes, but I have also been speaking off the cuff. Any honourable member, including the Hon. Mr. Foster, who wants to quote what someone else has said, should have the integrity to read exactly what was said. This is exactly what Mr. Callaghan said:

There is an overwhelming recognition by nearly everybody, including trade unionists and especially their wives, that 20 per cent wage increases are of no lasting benefit if they are followed by 20 per cent price increases. Everywhere I go I find widespread acceptance of the view that we must not go back to the madness of two or three years ago.

Surely, to go back to that madness is what the Treasurer is asking us to do. I do not have any particular admiration for the Prime Minister of Great Britain or of his Chancellor of the Exchequer. However, surely they give the lie to the

Premier's remarks. Why cannot Mr. Dunstan see the truth of these pronouncements made from both sides of the political arena by Premiers who have far greater responsibilities than he has? Is it that he wants deliberately to mislead the people? I am inclined to the latter view, because I cannot conceive that Mr. Dunstan is such a fool as to believe the statement which he has churned out in this document or which someone else has churned out for him to read.

I turn now to the arts. I do not wish to go over all that the Hon. Mr. Hill has said, although I congratulate him on drawing attention to the problems that he sees in relation to Government grants to the arts. In the past, I have commended the Premier—in fact, I did so only two or three months ago, in August, during the Address in Reply debate. Although I have examined the matter in detail, I have never commended the Premier's priorities, or should I say lack of priorities, and I cannot and will not commend the profligate spending that is apparent not only in this section but also in so many others. The matters raised by the Hon. Mr. Hill are of much concern indeed, and I commend him for bringing them to the Council's attention.

Another matter that concerns me is the denigration of at least two Ministerial portfolios. The Government now has 12 Ministers, but the denigration and erosion of two departments, in particular, concerns me. The Hon. Mr. Burdett has referred in detail to one and has indicated how the office of Chief Secretary has been eroded, wound down, and awarded to the most junior Minister in another place. I agree with what the Hon. Mr. Burdett has said.

I am also concerned about how this Government has stripped the Minister of Lands of his responsibilities. The Ministry of Lands, Repatriation and Irrigation used to be an important portfolio, and I sympathise with the present Minister of Lands, who is not a bad sort of fellow, although he was once known to have had two bob each way politically. Obviously, at the moment he is on the way out and may be a victim of the political firing squad from behind. The Lands Department, which was a very important department, has been denuded of its responsibility to a degree, and that is a good example of the "importance", or lack of it, that this Government places on rural matters, especially land settlement.

Whilst I am dealing with the Minister of Lands, I must refer briefly to his other portfolio, namely, Tourism, Recreation, and Sport. When I was in the township of Wudinna on the West Coast not long ago, the local people drew my attention to Mount Wudinna, which is about five kilometres from the town centre, and said it was the second biggest rock in Australia, being second only to Ayers Rock. The Western Australian Tourist Bureau and the Queensland Tourist Bureau, I understand, publicise this considerably. I have a report from the Western Australian *Caravan and Camping News*, which is distributed by the Western Australian tourist authority. It refers to the town of Wudinna and Mount Wudinna in some detail and states:

One of Australia's largest rocks, Mount Wudinna, is a geological phenomenon which captures the imagination and is visited by geologists from all over the world. Turtle Rock nearby is a fascinating shape looking like a turtle from every angle. The rocks and those surrounding the neighbourhood are a focal point for students and tourists alike. A climb to the top of Mount Wudinna gives the climber a wonderful view of up to 60 km.

The South Australian Tourist Bureau apparently does not even know that Mount Wudinna exists. People from other States ask where this wonderful rock is and why our Tourist Bureau does not wake up to its possibilities as a

tourist attraction. I draw that to the Minister's attention, because I believe it would be worth while for the department to look at that possibility. If it is worth while to publicise it in other States, surely it is worth while for us to publicise it.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That is publicised not by the Western Australian tourist authority but by the caravan and camping people.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That may be but, as I understand it, the information is distributed by the Western Australian tourist authority and also by the Queensland Tourist Bureau. I refer now to the situation regarding agriculture and to a report by Keith Martyn, the Agriculture Editor of the *Advertiser*, dealing with comments by the Chairman of the Stockowners Association (Mr. K. R. James). The report states:

"Staggering mismanagement" by the South Australian Government is said to have denied drought-affected farmers access to at least \$700 000 in interest-free Federal Government loans. Under relief funding provisions through the Federal Natural Disasters Act, the States had two choices.

They were dollar-for-dollar Federal Government aid in line with State Government spending, or unlimited monetary aid following a specified amount of relief spending by individual State Governments. Under the latter arrangement South Australia had to spend \$1 500 000 in relief in the financial year of the disaster to qualify for blanket Federal Government aid up to \$10 000 000.

Mr. Dunstan, in his document, states that he has allocated \$12 000 000 for drought relief. Why does he not say that most of that will be provided by the Federal Government, which he has lost no opportunity to denigrate? Three weeks ago, I asked the Hon. Mr. Chatterton when the Government would get to the target of \$1 500 000, and he replied on October 6 that more than \$2 200 000 had been paid in drought relief. Those are the honourable gentleman's words.

Two or three days later he got the Hon. Mr. Foster, who is now absent from the Chamber, to ask a Dorothy Dixier to enable him to correct that statement, and he corrected it in some detail. Only yesterday the Hon. Mr. Geddes asked a question following one that I also asked yesterday, requesting the Hon. Mr. Chatterton to state the actual figures of money spent. The Hon. Mr. Chatterton stated:

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 waiting to be paid out. I imagine that many of the other applications would have been processed since October 1.

The Government has paid out between \$1 000 000 and \$1 100 000, which is nowhere near the \$1 500 000 required to bring in Federal aid, and this is quite in contrast to the original statement by the Minister of Agriculture three weeks ago that the Government had paid out about \$2 200 000 in drought relief. The honourable gentleman has given about three different answers to these questions. He says now that he has paid out a little more than \$1 000 000 and that there is \$900 000 to be paid out. I am concerned about how this Government is managing (or mismanaging) the agricultural situation.

We have heard much from the Government about unemployment and about how it is of great concern. We are told that the only thing we have to do is straighten out unemployment. No member would deny that it is a serious problem, but three Australian Premiers, the British Prime Minister, and the British Chancellor of the Exchequer have all said that the pre-condition for solving unemployment is the bringing down of inflation. I ask

those people who are so vocal about unemployment: who took unemployment from about 130 000 in 1972 to nearly 300 000 in 1975? Who took inflation from about 6 per cent in 1972 to 17 per cent in 1975? It was the Whitlam Government. Who has taken inflation from 17 per cent in 1975 down to less than 10 per cent at present? The present Federal Government.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Rubbish!

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The Minister can say that; he will rant and rave in a few minutes, but it is not rubbish.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: He has already spoken in the debate.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: He will no doubt speak in reply. I refer to the recent comments in the Senate by Senator Messner:

In 1975, the total number unemployed was something like 361 000, if we include people employed under the Regional Employment Development scheme. Honourable Senators opposite argue that they should not be included. The figure today is 334 000—a fall of 24 000 compared with the previous figure. That is not the real point. The real point is that since this Government came to office 122 000 new jobs have been created. In fact, there has been an increase of 2 per cent in the work force in that period. These are the demonstrable facts that compare with those of the period immediately preceding the election when, under the Labor Government, the actual number of jobs in the work force declined.

Government members cannot say they are more concerned than the Federal Government or the members of the Liberal Party in this Chamber about unemployment in Australia. Indeed, we agree entirely with Mr. Neilson from Tasmania, with Sir Charles Court, Mr. Hamer, Mr. Callaghan and Mr. Healey that a reduction in inflation is the absolute pre-condition for the arrest of unemployment. That is being achieved by the Federal Government.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That's a significant group that you have mentioned.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It is. This Government should recognise the wisdom of those gentlemen, who represent both sides of politics, especially as all the politicking in this speech by the Premier is so much rubbish.

A great fuss was made yesterday in respect of a reference to the Public Works Committee's report in the *Advertiser*. I have the privilege to be a member of that committee, and I indicate that its report is similar to the reports made in 1975 and in 1976. The problems referred to by the Chairman (the former member for Ross Smith) have been occurring for two or three years. I indicate to the Hon. Mr. Cameron and the Minister that I am surprised that they did not pick that up in 1975 or 1976. The Minister was concerned and disappointed from all accounts, and I am surprised that he was not aware of the situation.

There was nothing contained in the report to which the Minister has not had access since 1975. In view of the *Advertiser* report, the question has been raised about whether the committee Chairman (Mr. Jennings) believed he could speak freely for the first time. I do not believe that such a situation obtained because the Chairman has said the same things before with the complete and unanimous support of the committee, which has comprised four Government members and three Opposition members. Why is the Government only now taking notice of the report? It is because the *Advertiser* referred to the committee's report and made headlines of that matter.

It has been suggested that committees are not of much use. However, as a member who has been privileged to serve on two committees over 10 years (during that time I

served as Chairman of one committee), I believe that committees have been of great use and great help to the appropriate Minister. No committee with any sense would attempt to dictate to its Minister, and no Minister with any sense would try to ride rough-shod over a committee under his care, especially as such committees can be of great assistance to the Minister.

A committee can examine matters in detail and provide considered reports, which the Minister would not otherwise have time to obtain himself and which would otherwise be left entirely to public servants. Provided there is a proper relationship between a committee and a Minister and between a committee and the Government, I believe the committee system is good. Indeed, I commend to the Government the attitude adopted by the Hon. Mr. Kneebone, who was probably one of the finest gentlemen to sit on the Government side.

I was Chairman of a committee during the term of office of a Liberal Government, but my term of office included a long period under a Labor Government, and my Minister then was the Hon. Mr. Kneebone. If Ministers generally had the same sort of relationship with their committees as the Hon. Mr. Kneebone had with my committee, great benefit would flow to both the committee and the Minister as a result of the system. Certainly, I would not like to see anyone denigrate or dismiss the value of the committee system.

The only problem I see arises when committees tend to be ignored and overlooked, as is the case with the present Government. I am concerned about a system of committees under which two committee members resigned from a committee (and I will not refer to the pros and cons of their decision) because they needed to criticise what that committee did. The Government then decided (and I have this on good authority) that those two members will not be accepted for renomination to that committee.

If that is true it is a serious indictment of the Government. Any committee member should have the right to criticise the work of a committee and the Minister should evaluate that criticism. However, if committee members are to be muzzled, if they cannot criticise and say what is wrong, and if they cannot draw the Government's and the Minister's attention to a matter without being ostracised and told they are no longer acceptable as committee members, it is an indictment of the Government. What sort of democracy is it when a committee member cannot criticise his committee, cannot resign from the committee and, because he has made that criticism, he is no longer considered acceptable for reappointment to that committee?

In other words, the Government does not want to accept criticism. That is a serious matter. Any Government, and I do not care how long it has been in office, should listen to criticism. Probably the Minister will soon criticise what I am saying, but he would be the first to admit that a Government should listen to criticism and act on it in a wise manner. I am concerned about the situation, and I underline the fact that it should be realised that the committee system is important. During the recent election we were told that South Australia was a wonderful State.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Do you agree with that?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It was a wonderful State, and it will be again, although there is some stagnation at present. We were told that South Australia was a wonderful State, that nothing was better than South Australia. However, South Australians are taxed more highly than are people in Western Australia, Queensland and Tasmania. This fact is contrary to what the Government told us. Therefore, I refute entirely the inaccurate comments (I say "comments" instead of "lies")

perpetrated by the Labor Party during the recent election, that South Australians pay the lowest per capita taxation on the mainland.

Honourable members know, and I have recently referred to this, that mining royalties accrue to the Government. Even Tasmania receives slightly more from mining revenue than does South Australia. Therefore, to include mining receipts in taxation figures and to alter the figures in that manner amounts to serious misrepresentation. I am very concerned about the financial situation in South Australia and about the misrepresentation of which the Premier is guilty. I support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I join with my colleagues in supporting the second reading of this Bill. I wish to refer in particular to Government expenditure on research for the Flinders University electric car project. I do so because electric cars may play a significant part in our future forms of transportation and because honourable members elected me as one of two representatives to the council of the university, and I am interested in its activities.

The Auditor-General stated in his report for 1976-77 that \$977 000 was paid from Loan funds for purposes of transport research. Of this, \$68 000 was allocated to Flinders University for research into an electric car, bringing the Government contribution for this project to \$170 000 over four years.

The Government should be commended for allocating funds for research and development in South Australia and, in view of an expected petrol shortage in Australia by 1985, the further use of electric power for transportation seems to be a worthwhile project. However, research, like any other item of expense, must be examined regularly to ascertain whether the costs are justified.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Mr. President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: In 1976, the Economic Development Department set up a committee at the request of the Minister of Transport, Mr. Virgo, to review electric vehicle technology, examine the market prospects, and assess its impact on the transport sector. A well qualified committee of eight was chosen from the Government departments involved, the private sector, the Electricity Trust, and Flinders and Adelaide Universities. Their report, which was submitted to Mr. Virgo on June 2 last, was guarded in its acceptance of the Flinders University project. The committee said:

Until a major breakthrough is made in battery technology, the overall performance of electric vehicles when compared with equivalent internal combustion powered vehicles will continue to be poor . . . On a very limited budget, the Flinders University electric vehicle group has achieved impressive results, but there would appear to be a limited market for cars and vans using this technology . . . Further funding by the State Government of the Flinders project should only be made where there is a firm indication that an electric vehicle or related component industry using its technology is to be established in South Australia.

Within two weeks of receiving the report, Mr. Virgo announced that the Government had allocated a further \$50 000 to Flinders University to allow production of two prototype half-tonne all-electric vans. He added that commuter cars and small vans would almost certainly be available "off the shelf" in Adelaide by 1980. He then called for companies interested in manufacturing such vehicles to approach the Government for assistance, but I do not know whether any have responded seriously.

The action and statement by Mr. Virgo is contrary to the recommendations of the committee. Furthermore, his

enthusiastic prophesy of electric cars being bought "off the shelf" in 1980 surprised people in the vehicle industry. I share their surprise because I know, from experience of supplying machine tools and automotive components, that it usually takes years to plan and tool up for a radically new vehicle model.

Subsequently, on September 12, the Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Hudson, announced that, on the recommendation of the newly formed State Energy Research Advisory Committee, 10 grants totalling \$136 000 were to be made and that the largest of these for \$25 000 would go to Flinders University for the evaluation, construction, and testing of electrical storage batteries for vehicle propulsion. I commend this grant unreservedly because it is in line with the committee's views that increasing battery technology is of first priority.

I wish to comment on certain aspects of the committee's report because I suspect that the public at large, without being aware of the problems involved, regard electric cars as a happy solution to the excess pollution caused by internal combustion engines and to the petrol shortage expected in Australia by 1985.

The manufacture of electric vehicles began before the end of last century and there were in fact over 100 different makers by 1910. However, the internal combustion powered vehicle, with its large range and better power capability, soon prevailed. Whilst the electric car has almost disappeared, specialised electric vehicles, such as forklifts, factory runabouts and golf carts, have been accepted and there are about 300 000 at present operating in the world.

The United States, United Kingdom, West Germany and Japanese Governments, large car makers such as General Motors, Ford and Chryslers and others, have spent tens of millions of dollars on research into electric vehicles and, in particular, battery technology.

The lead-acid battery is still the only viable energy source for electric vehicles, and millions of cars also use such batteries for starting, lighting, and ignition purposes. The components are inexpensive and in ready supply, but the low energy density and the weight and bulk of a lead-acid battery limit the power and range of an electric vehicle. Current development work is aimed at reducing its bulk and weight, and an improvement of up to 50 per cent is possible by 1980.

Research teams are also experimenting with other combinations of elements, such as nickel-zinc, zinc-chlorine and lithium-sulphur, which offer a higher energy density ratio than lead-acid, but these alternative types of batteries still have to be produced at commercial cost and prove resistant to self-discharge.

Whereas the conventional battery can be recharged by connection to an appropriate electrical supply and is a true source of energy, research is under way using fuel cells to generate electricity by electrolytic processes.

The fuel cell generates electricity so long as the appropriate chemical components are fed to it, but it does not store energy. Fuel cells using hydrazine, methane or hydrogen with oxygen, have energy density ratios far higher than in batteries, but they are likely to be expensive. A compound like hydrazine is toxic and fuel cells are as yet heavy and too bulky for the power output required. It is significant, however, that the C.S.I.R.O. has announced that it is evaluating various fuel cells to determine their potential as an energy source for electric cars.

In another area of development, Robert Bosch, of West Germany, and others have made impressive advances with a hybrid power source in electric vehicles. These consist of an electric motor with a small internal combustion engine

and this increases the normal range about three times. The internal combustion engine drives a generator which supplies power to the driving motor, as well as to its batteries, thus recharging them. The drawback to the hybrid is its complexity and likely high cost.

In 1972, a research team at Flinders University set out to produce an electric car, having regard to vehicle requirements, the power available from a lead-acid battery, and the need to stabilise range expectancy under a variety of driving conditions. It selected a Fiat 127 car and converted it. To date the team has built two prototypes.

The Flinders team selected a small shunt-wound motor of 5 kilowatts with printed circuit to drive the car. This motor is thin and light, dissipates heat readily and can be built up in multiples by parallel connection. Whereas the prototype Mark 1 had one motor, Mark 2 has two. By running the motors at constant speed, assisted by a standard manual gear box, the team has limited the maximum current taken from the batteries. This procedure has facilitated substantial re-design of the batteries. By reducing the lead content and using weaker acid it has been possible to lessen the weight and the bulk of the power pack by about 35 per cent, but unfortunately it also limited the maximum power output available at any instant.

The Mark 2 prototype is fitted with twelve 12-volt batteries. It has a maximum speed on level ground of 75 kilometres per hour and has a range of 60-80 kilometres for urban driving. Whereas the Fiat 127, with its internal combustion engine, weighs 710 kilos including the driver, and can carry an extra load of 330 kilos, making a total of 1 040, the prototype Mark 2 even with improved batteries weighs 1 000 kilos; with standard springing it can carry an extra load of only 40 kilos. Heavier springs would undoubtedly be needed.

Whatever efficiency these electric vehicle projects achieve they will not advance beyond their present limited uses, such as forklifts, factory runabouts and golf carts, unless they can gain market acceptability. With this in mind, the Director-General of Transport arranged for a group from the S.A. Institute of Technology to undertake a market survey of car usage in Adelaide. These findings are interesting because they indicate that makers of electric cars will find it difficult to take any worthwhile share of the market away from the internal combustion engine car. That is, unless governments intervene and penalise the use of internal combustion engines from 1985 onwards, because of the need to import petroleum and the consequent drain on our foreign exchange reserves.

The present restricted range of an electric vehicle precludes its use for discretionary travel, such as holidays and Sunday drives. Likewise it would not be of use to people living in the country. Its application seems to be restricted, therefore, to the second car of families living in the metropolitan area, and to light urban delivery trucks. There are 850 taxis and about 600 buses operating in the Adelaide area. A survey of their daily mileage indicates that they also have a range well beyond the capacity of the existing electric car. It would appear that the application of the use of the electric car, as presently known, would be restricted to the second car in a family living in the metropolitan area, and to light urban delivery trucks.

The survey indicated that about 35 000 cars in urban multi-car households in South Australia would appear to have a range pattern corresponding to the Flinders prototype Mark 2. Since South Australia accounts for about 10 per cent of car registrations in Australia, the available market in this country would therefore be about 350 000. No figures were produced regarding light delivery trucks.

Fuel costs of the Flinders Mark 2 are much lower than for a comparable size internal combustion powered vehicle. If the batteries are recharged at off-peak hours the electricity costs only 19 cents for 70 kilometres of driving, compared with about 90 cents using super grade petrol in a Fiat 127. Against that, it would take the Mark 2 about 16 seconds to accelerate from 0 kilometres an hour compared to 7 seconds for the standard Fiat 127. The first factor was an attraction to the people interviewed, and the second a drawback.

The survey showed, however, that most multi-car households buy second-hand for their second and subsequent cars, and do not expect to pay more than \$1 500 with or without trade-ins. If one maker in Australia set up to make, say, 50 000 models a year, which is regarded in the car industry as a desirable number in order to achieve economy of scale, it should be possible to produce four passenger electric cars for the same or slightly less cost than the comparable internal combustion car vehicles. However, this price, even after trade-in, would be far beyond the \$1 500 which was mentioned in the survey. It seems, therefore, that the market for electric cars would be quite small unless Governments, as I said before, imposed sanctions against the use of internal combustion engines.

The committee of inquiry stressed that certain factors regarding safety, road construction, supply of materials, and the environment must be resolved before Governments sponsor the large-scale use of electric cars.

First, the Australian Transport Advisory Council would need to set new vehicle safety rules because the higher voltages for traction systems would introduce shock and fire risks. Batteries should not be recharged in confined areas for fear of gassing, and they do of course have corrosive contents.

Secondly, if electric cars appear in large numbers, their low performance could make it necessary for Governments to reduce road gradients on interchanges and flyovers and to widen roads in hill areas, because of the extra time it takes to climb. Their increased weight would increase road wear.

Thirdly, the advent of electric cars *en masse* would cause power stations to consume significantly larger quantities of fuel to provide the electric power needed for recharging the batteries. Since power stations of the future are likely to be coal burning, an air pollution problem will occur, but the authorities could cope with this by installing suitable electrostatic precipitators in the power stations, although these are extremely costly.

Fourthly, if the lead-acid battery is used as the power source and if the electric car appears in large numbers, there could well be a world shortage of lead. There could be a shortage far greater than we envisage in petroleum products in 1985. The known world reserves are 99 000 000 tonnes, but the United States alone would require 71 000 000 tonnes if it converted to electric cars. This would cause the price of lead to escalate, as we have seen happen in regard to commodities like sugar, tea and coffee, and it would have a consequential effect on the cost of batteries. It is therefore essential to develop batteries using components in addition to lead-acid.

Fifthly, although electric cars are less noisy than internal combustion powered vehicles at low speed, the high tyre noise at greater speeds due to the heavier weights suggests that the noise problems on the roads will continue as at present, with a changeover to electric cars from the internal combustion engine.

In conclusion, I congratulate the Government for donating \$25 000 to Flinders University to evaluate and test various new types of battery, and hopefully this will be done in association with the proposed research work of the

C.S.I.R.O. into fuel cells. I do not object to the additional grant of \$50 000 to build two prototype half-tonne vans, because it has been established in the United Kingdom that electric milk delivery vans are cheaper to operate and cause less noise disturbance early in the mornings than conventional vehicles do. There may be, therefore, some market for special vans using the heavy lead-acid batteries of the type that Flinders University has in mind. However I agree with the committee of inquiry that there is a very limited market for electric cars, as distinct from vans, using existing lead-acid batteries.

When an efficient battery or fuel cell is developed at an acceptable cost and the weight and bulk of the power source required are determined, Flinders University should be encouraged immediately with grants from the South Australian Government to develop a prototype four-passenger electric car having due regard to power, speed and range. That I fear may be some years away, despite the enthusiastic prophecy of the Hon. Mr. Virgo that we would have an electric car off the shelf by 1980. However, I think we shall see a dramatic change in the form of vehicular transportation before the end of the next decade, and it may well be by the use of electric cars. I support the second reading of this Bill.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: In speaking to this document, I should like to say, first, that although I do not pretend to be an economic expert, over the last 30 years I would have prepared and formulated more budgets than has the Premier. Unlike the Premier, of course, I have not been able to cloud my own shortcomings with a great deal of palaver about the supposed shortcomings of the Prime Minister. I have not had available the avenues of increasing taxes to alleviate my own budget situation. When we draw up a budget, and especially when we are dealing with other people's money, we should put forward a programme detailing the expenditure of that money and we should also be responsible to accounting for the spending of it. Nowhere in the Budget is there any fully detailed accounting for the money that was spent by the Government during the last year.

As was so ably pointed out last night in the Hon. Mr. Cameron's analysis of the Auditor-General's Report (which was one of the best analyses of a report I have heard in this Chamber and I compliment him on doing just that) this is not the first song and dance or smokescreen that the Premier has laid down to cover his own shortcomings. He seems to be most adept at it. I remind honourable members of his display during the time of the Whitlam Government, when the Premier went to some lengths again to cover up for any South Australian shortcomings and to lay them on the Federal Government.

On that occasion he claimed he was \$25 000 000 short; on this occasion he will be only \$18 000 000 short, which speaks well for Mr. Fraser when we compare the two Governments and their allocations to this State which, despite what the Treasurer says, are considerably better than they have ever been. More money than ever before has been allocated to South Australia by the present Federal Government.

I will show that South Australia has received more per capita than it has received at any stage of its history. It is important that whatever revenue the Government receives by way of grants, loans or taxes is spent to the best of our ability, and that we should be able to account to the people from whom the money is raised regarding exactly how it is spent.

I refer again to the excellent speech made by the Hon. Mr. Cameron. I agree that the Auditor-General should have power to demand investigations where he sees shortcomings and deficiencies. I have in my possession an

article which shows that this is not the only Government that has allowed bureaucracy to control our lives. However, we do nothing about it. The point made in this report applies to South Australia at present. The report, entitled "Strangulation by regulation", is written by Mr. Graham Greenberger, who recently toured the United States of America. He said the following about a situation which has developed in South Australia but which we have done nothing to arrest:

The Consumer Product Safety Commission of Washington DC some years ago ordered 80 000 brightly coloured lapel buttons, intended for distribution prior to Christmas, to remind parents to purchase safety toys for their children. Prior to distribution of the buttons, some obscure inspector in the commission realised that the buttons were coloured with lead paint and, if licked by children, lead poisoning would result. As a consequence, the commission was forced to ban all 80 000 of its own safety buttons.

This revelation was included in an article contained in an airline magazine which I saw during a recent visit to the United States of America. The article, which was entitled "Who's Regulating the Regulators?", continued on to detail some of the problems facing business through legislation administered by a rapidly increasing number of Federal agencies in the U.S.A. The Federal Register—

that is, the United States register— in 1937 contained some 3 450 pages of administration text. In 1975, that figure had increased to 60 200 pages. The annual cost of administering and policing these regulations now stands at \$3 000 000 000 distributed among 24 major agencies which employ a total of 105 000 persons. This administration covers virtually every aspect of American life.

It is contended that the real cost of regulation through lost productivity, business cost and artificially inflated prices adds another \$1 000 000 000 to consumer products every year. The point has now been reached where Government agencies and their regulations are grossly inflating costs and as a result the prices of products.

America is very much a nation which upholds freedom for the individual, and concern has been expressed that, every time the Government intrudes into the decision-making power of the consumer, the economic freedom of the individual is diminished.

As with legislation in this country, broad Statutes are produced by respective Parliaments and it is left to regulatory agencies to determine their detailed operation. However, as the bureaucracy has grown, the control by duly elected representatives has diminished to a point where reforms are now being sought by consumer and business groups and even by Congress and the President himself.

The article was critical of the thousands of non-elected bureaucrats running agencies who had the full force of the law available to them to the extent of gaoling violators, and yet those same bureaucrats did not have to answer to the American public, even though application of the regulations they handled were defined by their own often narrow interests. Along with the wide range of social and economical problems that developed, or were defined over the past 15 years or so, came the agencies created to look after each problem. In some cases the agencies have titles which are paralleled in this country—

meaning Australia—

but, if not, at least their area of concern has similar coverage here. The significant agencies are the Environmental Protection Agency, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Consumer Product Safety Commission and along with them a multitude of sub-agencies. With each agency believing that its crusade was the most important one, interesting examples of resulting problems were quoted.

A meat-processing plant is required to be clean and sanitary according to the food and drug administration. The easiest method of achieving this aim is through the use of tiles or stainless steel. However, the resulting reflected noise often causes the installation to fail the Occupational Safety and Health Administration requirements on noise level. This latter agency regulates that lounge facilities must be provided in the rest rooms of women employees. Immediately the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission says that the employer must provide lounges for men.

Later, the report continues:

Recognising the long-standing problem of bureaucratic inertia—once a job has been created it is extremely difficult to abolish—it is suggested that unless Congress and the President declare that a regulatory agency remain in business, it be abolished, or at least phased out over a five-year period.

This report applies more to South Australia than it does to any other State. We in South Australia are beginning to feel, as illustrated in the Budget, that we are being over-governed and regulated without, as the Hon. Mr. Cameron said, there being any real accounting for what these agencies achieve.

I suppose one can do little more in the Council than comment on the Budget, but it is most unlikely that the Treasurer will take any notice of what we say, anyway.

What a pity it is that this Budget could not have been made available to the people before the last election. One could not be less than concerned about the Treasurer's stupid remarks regarding the amount of money made available to this State by the Federal Government. The Budget, apart from allowing for a deficit of \$18 000 000, also allows an inflation rate of 15 per cent. It is shown that the inflation rate, based on the most recent c.p.i., is running at less than 10 per cent.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: You are extrapolating a whole year from one quarter.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: It could well be below 10 per cent soon. Should inflation drop, we ought to be able to expect a drop in taxation in South Australia. Apart from the need to reduce taxation, this Government needs to take more care of its expenditure. Much more honest accounting is essential in expenditure of taxpayers' money. One would think the money belonged to the Government and the Treasury. The Treasurer says little about the fact that he is spending the taxpayers' money.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: What about Tamie Fraser flying to the Sydney Opera House in a V.I.P. aircraft?

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: I do not know about that, but it is interesting that the honourable member should raise it, because I intended to speak about the \$34 000 allotted from State finances for two people to go overseas studying crafts. Many of these things need accounting for and, if the honourable member likes to take up the case about Tamie Fraser, I may take up the case of people paid by this State to stay in expensive hotels overseas.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Did they stay at the Dorchester in London?

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: I do not know but we should look closely at this matter when we hear so much from the Treasurer about his deficit. In this depressed time, when we would think the State Government would be concerned about the high rate of unemployment (as is everyone else in South Australia), the Government does not seem to act. What is the State Government doing about two extremely important projects for which Commonwealth finance is available? Ever since the present State Government has been in office, it has had Commonwealth money available to it for standardisation of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook railway, but instead of using that it has allowed the cost of

that line to escalate from \$47 000 000 to about \$126 000 000.

It allows time to go on and on without making any attempt to commence the standardisation of that line. Employment would be provided for many people and money could come from the Commonwealth Government, with no strings attached. The same position applies to the Stuart Highway. A project costing millions of dollars is waiting. Environment studies and other studies are still being done. Money has been made available in the past five years to commence the standardisation of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook railway line, but it has been held up because Party politics have been played by the Labor Government in South Australia.

This also applies to the Stuart Highway. The route determined for the highway is well known and all the necessary studies have been made. Regardless of what route is decided on, the Government knows that the road will go at least as far as Woomera, yet it leaves people driving over one of the most dreadful stretches of road in Australia. Likewise, regarding drought relief money, the Minister of Agriculture has made several statements. I believe that he is taking an interest in the matter, but why should there be a delay in spending the money when it is available, with no strings attached?

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: I don't believe it is available.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: The Government has spent \$700 000, and it has to spend \$1 500 000 to qualify for Federal assistance to commence. There is nothing to prevent the Government from doing that, except its own tomfoolery. The money is available.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Rubbish!

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: The position has been confusing, and I do not dispute the Minister's figures but, unless the whole scheme is stepped up, another 12 months will pass without help. We have assistance from the Commonwealth Government, and there is no need for that delay. Contact with Federal authorities shows that the ball is in the State's court to get this drought relief under way. There is an opportunity to employ hundreds of people. The State Government blames unemployment on the Fraser Government, but we do nothing to attract available help.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: They're a pack of bludgers, and you know that.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: The Hon. Mr. Foster was not here when I said that the song and dance man put on a better song and dance about the Whitlam Government than about the Fraser Government. He said that he was short of \$25 000 000.

There is a great need for development in the northern areas of this State. I refer to our mining potential and, while the State Government does nothing about it, South Australia is missing out on millions of dollars. The Government has held up further drilling in the Cooper Basin until it completes negotiations with the Commonwealth Government about the purchase of its share of the field, yet we need to be working in this field immediately. We have heard fresh rumours about development at Redcliff. Every time there is an election we hear about this. We know it was a hoax in the first place, in any case, because we have not even had a proven field large enough to operate Redcliff, anyway. We are talking about Redcliff again, yet we have held up further exploration activities and further tests determining how much gas South Australia has to feed such a complex as foreseen by the Dow Chemical Company. It is pointless the Treasurer's filling pages with condemnation of other people for the shortcomings of this State.

Finally, I make the plea that the Government assists

South Australia, its economy and its people by taking definite steps to avail itself of the Commonwealth funds on offer and put in motion some of the projects that can be achieved. I support the Bill.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I thank honourable members for the attention they have given the Bill. There are a couple of aspects I must answer. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris stated:

I have already criticised the Treasurer's preamble to the Budget. Although my analysis of the Budget is not as extensive as usual, the time scale hardly allows for it to be done this year.

I appreciate that the Bill was officially introduced in this Council only this week. However, let there not be any misunderstanding about this: let the public know that these documents were laid on the table in this Council at the same time as they were laid on the table in another place, and that was nearly three weeks ago. Therefore, for the Leader to say that he has not had an opportunity to analyse the Budget is stretching the truth just a little. The Leader finished by stating:

My plea to the Government is to forget about constant division and confrontation and to try to provide Parliament with facts and information, not political claptrap.

Although I appreciate the Leader's comments, all the political claptrap was spoken by him. Over the years it is unfortunate that this aspect has developed, but it has developed only from members on both sides of the Chamber trying to obtain political advantage. If the Leader wants to get back to first base, let all honourable members concentrate on the Budget, without trying to make political capital, without talking political claptrap, and we might have a better discussion on the Budget.

Not that many questions was raised during debate, but much claptrap was spoken. In reviewing the questions raised, there is not much at this stage that I can reply to. The Leader referred to inflation. It is implied by members opposite that inflation is now below 10 per cent merely because there was one quarter showing, I think, a 2 per cent increase. The facts are that in September, 1977, at the end of 12 months the inflation rate nationally was 13.1 per cent.

How can members opposite say that inflation is now down to a single-digit level? They will be interested to know that in September, 1975, the annual rate of inflation was 12.1 per cent—two years ago. Now, in September, 1977, inflation is running at 13.1 per cent. Members opposite are telling us how they have reduced inflation—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How did you compute that rate?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am telling the Council what the rate was. Now members opposite, when they are talking about inflation, forget to say that the Commonwealth Government took certain figures out of the inflation rate calculations. The Medibank charges were taken out, as were other charges, in order to obtain a figure that the public would accept. True, the Government is pleased about any reduction in the rate of inflation. We want to solve this problem for the benefit of the country, but what price have we paid for it? What price have workers paid?

Despite Mr. Fraser's saying that he would support indexation, he supported it at a much lower rate as it turned out. What was the cost to the worker? Workers are now worse off than they were, despite Mr. Fraser's promise to support wage indexation. This is all in the name of fighting inflation. There are almost 250 000 more unemployed people in Australia than there were two years ago: all in the name of fighting inflation! That is the price the little man is paying.

What about profits? How have profits suffered in the past two years? Members opposite should look at their daily newspaper to see how profits have increased and to see who is paying for the deflation rate. The Leader asked whether the additional \$1 750 000 for brucellosis and tuberculosis eradication was coming from the taxpayers' purse or from the Commonwealth or the Cattle Compensation Fund. On page 16 of the Treasurer's statement the following explanation appeared:

The State will continue to play its part in the important national programme for the eradication of bovine brucellosis and tuberculosis in the cattle industry. Previously this programme has been handled through a trust account but, to comply with accepted accounting procedures, it is now proposed, from July 1, 1977, to show total receipts and total payments in the Revenue Budget. \$1 800 000 has been provided for this programme in 1977-78 of which \$1 300 000 is expected to be recouped from the Commonwealth. Compensation to cattle owners for the slaughter of affected stock is paid from the Cattle Compensation Fund.

The Hon. Mr. Hill referred to an increase of 17.4 per cent in untied grants and went on to imply that reductions in special purpose grants were largely offset by this increase. The honourable member has examined only one element of the funds situation. An examination of the whole would reflect the position more accurately. At page 10 of the Treasurer's statement, the following passage appears under "State Taxation":

The increase in the aggregate of Commonwealth payments to South Australia between 1975-76 and 1977-78 is about 20 per cent. An annual increase of about 10 per cent is well below the rate of inflation and in that two years we have lost in real terms something like 7 per cent principally as a result of Commonwealth cuts in allocations for hospitals, transport, water filtration and a host of other community services.

Yesterday the Hon. Mr. Hill, supported by some other honourable members, slammed two people who went overseas at their own expense.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: At their what?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: At their own expense to purchase prints. The Hon. Mr. Hill implied that this was done at Government expense.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What about the \$34 000?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member did not raise that question at the time I have in mind. He spoke about these people going overseas and purchasing prints. This is the sort of innuendo of which honourable members opposite have been guilty. The main conclusion one can draw from the speeches of members opposite is that there is considerable in-fighting in the Liberal Party for the Leadership. It was capped off by the young Liberal Movement recruit, now back in the fold, trying to frighten public servants by threatening to call them before the Bar of this Council. When the Hon. Mr. Foster suggested that the proposition was handed to the Hon. Mr. Cameron by someone from the press, the suggestion was heatedly denied, and we accept the Hon. Mr. Cameron's explanation. However, we must point out what brought about our suspicion. First, the reporter had never before been seen in this Council at 5.45 p.m. Secondly, communication was going on between the two people: this is it! The Hon. Mr. Cameron admitted that it was unusual for him to read from copious notes. I accept the honourable member's word that this was not given to him by the press; it was pretty difficult for me to accept his explanation, but I would not doubt it.

The Hon. Mr. Hill wanted to know when a report would be available in relation to the two people from the Craft Authority who went overseas. The Treasurer has indicated that this report will be available shortly, and he will table

it. I will endeavour to see that the report is tabled here. I will also endeavour to obtain as soon as possible replies to specific questions raised today and to any questions to which I have not yet been able to obtain complete replies.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

Schedule.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Regarding the Premier's Department, \$3 500 was voted last year for terminal leave payments, but the Government actually paid \$34 785. This is holding Parliament up to ridicule.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Only a small sum was allocated last year for controlling locusts, but much more was spent, because of the plague.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Everyone would agree with that kind of increased expenditure, but not everyone approves the increased expenditure to which I am referring. It was only because the Opposition asked questions that information was given to the Hon. Mr. Cameron. I am echoing criticism from the public on this matter.

The Government has been completely unreasonable, because it should never have paid retrenchment money of this kind to the officers involved. I understand that the Government's reason is that these people were employed under the journalists award, which makes allowance for terminal leave payments of about three months salary on termination of employment. Mr. Kevin Crease, whom I know and admire, was paid \$4 924. Was he employed as a journalist? In fact, he was not. He was employed as the officer in charge of the monitoring unit. He did other work for the Premier.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Do you think that is covered by the Carpenters and Joiners Award?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I would like to know whether his services were terminated or whether he left the Government by mutual arrangement with the Premier.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: On what basis was he employed?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I noticed in the press that when Mr. Crease decided to leave the Premier's service the Premier complimented him on the service he had given to the Premier and his department. He wished him well in future. Those are hardly the remarks of a genuine and sincere employer, after he has dismissed an employee. Those complimentary remarks were in the press; I was pleased to see them. We hear that the Premier has handed out almost \$5 000 because it is the correct payment to a journalist when a journalist's employment is terminated. That is an irresponsible payment by the Government.

In the papers before the Council, the Government seeks approval for a further \$34 000 to be paid out. The pattern has been established. The course is set and it will recur. If that is so, I condemn the Government for its policy on this matter, as does everyone outside this place. For instance, Mr. Templeton was given \$8 379, some of which was annual leave with a 17½ per cent loading. I am concerned about the matter of the three months termination, on the basis that this man's services were terminated. In effect, there was a dismissal. I read press reports in which the Premier praised this officer and wished him well in the future. The taxpayers' money is being spent. The Hon. Mr. Dunford should be interested in this—there are hundreds of thousands of people in South Australia—

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: How do you know that Mr. Templeton is not entitled to that payment? I am satisfied that he is.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I want to know whether he is entitled to it or not.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: You feel he is guilty and should not receive it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I echo complaints from outside this Council that this kind of hand-out is scandalous.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: How do you know it is a hand-out?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: How do you know it is not?

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: It might be a condition under the award.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Was Mr. Crease employed as a journalist? The Hon. Mr. Dunford knows that he was not.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: The Public Service Board has agreements with the Australian Journalists Association.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Why does not the honourable member ask his Minister about the conditions of employment of these people? He cannot have it all ways. I do not believe Mr. Templeton's services were terminated. I believe he left the service of the Premier amicably. It was not a dismissal. The golden hand-shake was given by the Premier. If one is friendly with certain people the Premier's cheque book is open; it is the Government's cheque book but the money of the taxpayer is being spent. We are asked to accept this pattern, to approve \$34 000 to be paid out in the same way this year. That is one line from the Premier's allocation about which I would like an explanation.

At page 13 of Parliamentary Paper No. 9, reference is made to the Arts Development Section of the Premier's Department. Last year, \$74 846 was spent in this section, and this year the Government asks Parliament to approve an allocation of \$119 600. I ask the Minister representing the Premier if he would tell me about the officers concerned in this section, and their respective salaries, so that I can assess this figure of \$119 600 which I am being asked to vote for on this occasion.

On page 14, there is this heading "Unit for Industrial Democracy". The allocation being sought for this year is about double that which was spent last year. The figure last year was \$111 442, and we are now being asked to allocate \$212 100. On page 16 there is further reference to the Unit for Industrial Democracy, and on page 21 in two places there are further allocations dealing with that section; one is the international conference on Industrial Democracy for which Parliament is asked to allocate \$40 000 this year.

On that same page there is an item for oversea visits on industrial democracy initiatives, \$11 000. The total sum we are being asked to spend on industrial democracy unit is about \$271 000. Over a quarter of a million dollars is to be spent by the Government this year to implement its policies on industrial democracy. We have heard much about these policies, which ought to be introduced on a voluntary basis, moderately and slowly, to gain the best results.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That is what we are doing.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If the Government is doing that, why does it want \$271 000 next year? We have unemployment and public works which should be started. The Hon. Mr. Whyte spoke about that today. We could find useful areas in which money could be spent. South Australia has not funds available for many areas, so we are told. We say that we are cut short of money from the Commonwealth Government, but there is this figure of \$271 000 for industrial democracy, which is far too high.

On page 14 there is a new area of ethnic affairs. For the first time, Parliament is asked to make an allocation for this branch of \$83 600. There is an ethnic affairs adviser, clerical staff, and community interpreting listed. Would the Minister provide more details about this item? What will be the proposed staff, and what salaries are to be

paid? How does the Government calculate the figure of \$83 600? Parliament should know detailed plans in regard to this matter.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You are not happy with the ethnic affairs branch being set up?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I have no objection, in principle, to it. I think an ethnic affairs commission would be far better, as proposed by the Liberal Party. However, the Government has come in and, in the shadow of the Liberal Party's initiative, has proposed this branch; I hope ultimately that it will see fit to improve its plans further and make it a commission.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Would not a commission cost more money?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: No.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You would have the same staff.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: There is a line "Charges for publicity and design services, \$250 000". That is an increase on what was spent in the previous year, \$56 843. I should like further details of how that \$250 000 is to be spent. Could the Minister forward that information to me?

This is the first time we are being asked to approve \$50 000 for the publication of a quarterly magazine. What will the magazine be about? Will it be a Government magazine publicising Government activities? Will it be of benefit to the State?

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: The first issue is already out.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Magazines are put out in this way. I do not know whether this is the result of a gentleman who came from Macao some time ago (I cannot recall his name) to assist the Premier and other departments, including the Tourist Bureau, in publicising tourism. I should like further details of the Government's plan about this magazine and what the Government's objects and purposes are in printing that magazine, which of course is a new promotion in this current year.

Under the Department of Economic Development, which comes under the Premier, we are being asked to approve \$62 000 for statutory corporations—executive, trainee directors, project and research staff. Last year, \$23 763 was spent. I am particularly interested to find out what is meant by "trainee directors". Could the Minister in due course by letter tell me who these trainee directors are and for what purpose they are being trained as directors, whether they are to find their place on the boards of statutory bodies or whether they would be Government nominees and move on to the boards of private companies in this State?

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: A good idea.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The honourable member says it is a good idea. Under these proposed expenditure lines, the Government is already providing for the training of directors. Perhaps the Minister could help me by giving me more information on that in due course.

Under the heading "Miscellaneous" there is an appropriation of \$24 000, for which approval is being sought, against an expenditure in the previous year of \$238 on "Advisory Council for Inter-Governmental Relations, contributions towards cost of". Apparently, this was established in the previous year; for some reason or other it was not proceeded with, and this year \$24 000 is proposed. I ask for more details of that in due course.

I cannot help referring to the item regarding North Malaysia Week in Adelaide. In 1976-77, actual expenditure on this was \$198 215, against an allocation of \$50 000, which was approved by Parliament. In other words, last year Parliament was asked to approve \$50 000 to assist in the promotion of North Malaysia Week in Adelaide, but \$198 215 was spent. The Hon. Mr. Dunford would be

interested in this item because the representatives from North Malaysia to whom I talked during that week told me, "The main purpose of our visit is to see whether we can interest any of your industrialists in going over to Malaysia, where we have got cheap labour, and extending their operations over there." The Hon. Mr. Dunford in this debate commented on the cheap labour that capitalists are making use of and he decried that as a principle; yet he has the effrontery to stand by while the Premier spends nearly \$200 000 on that kind of promotion. It is a shocking state of affairs; it is wasteful expenditure.

There is a basket of outgoings totalling \$1 715 800 for "Grants and provisions for the arts". I know the Minister would not have this detail now but on other occasions when questions have been asked the Premier or someone in the other place has been kind enough to forward a separate list of the various items that make up that \$1 715 000. We come now to the Jam Factory workshops, on which \$570 000 was spent last year, and we are being asked to approve \$585 000 this year. I have already referred to this matter. The press saw fit to publish some report about it.

Since then I have been inundated with calls from craftsmen who had not been in touch with me previously about it; but I bring home to the Government how true it is that craftsmen and in fact all responsible citizens in this State look upon this matter as an utter scandal. First, the Government is providing in grants, according to the Auditor-General, over \$1 000 000 to this craft authority, the "Jam Factory", as it is now known. It is a shocking waste of money because, in effect, most individual craftsmen in this State are not benefiting from that expenditure, and the purpose of this authority was to assist them.

I listened with interest to the Minister. I thought the one item he would have been able to bring down some reply about was the oversea trip of the consultants, which has been reported to Parliament by the Auditor-General. I remind honourable members that \$34 800 was paid to two persons who went overseas for about nine weeks, and that sum included the figure of \$14 300 to one of them as a consultancy fee. In other words, \$20 500 was the cost of their fares and accommodation.

I would have thought that, after this information had been discussed in this Council, the Minister would bring down some further information from his Premier about this scandalous matter, that the report that the people made would ultimately be brought into Parliament. Towards the end of last year and all during this year, I have been asking questions about reports from the authority.

If these people, on their return, made a report before leaving the craft authority, why cannot Parliament see it? Is it because the Council will be rising soon and it will be tabled on the last day? This is a scandal.

I noticed in the lines that the Government paid about \$11 000 for the Governor to go overseas last year. These people have been paid \$20 500 for this trip as well as a consultancy fee.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Do you know where they stayed?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I understand that the Premier gave them permission to stay at the Dorchester Hotel in London, but that is not all: when they went to Paris they stayed at the Plaza Athenee, at 25 Avenue Montaigne, which has been described to me as one of the most grand palaces in Paris.

I would have no objection to anyone's staying there at his own expense. However, I object to persons staying there with the blessing of the Premier of this State and at

the expense of the little people of this State, who must pay the taxes. That concerns me, and I hope that it will concern the Minister. I hope, too, that it will at some stage concern the Premier, because this is an intolerable situation.

Not only did these people stay there but also they went off on other trips. The Premier gave them permission to take a trip to Persepolis, the old capital of Persia. I know, too, that they went to Isphahan, although I do not mind that, because they would have studied there the ancient art of carpet making.

I should like to know whether the Premier approved of their trip to Persepolis, as it is fair to say that these people would not have assisted their knowledge of the craft industry by doing so. I stress, as I did recently, that I am concerned with this incident only as the cheque book in the Premier's Department was open for these people. The Premier should never have given one of them this consultancy fee.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: How much was it?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It was \$1 100 a week, and it totalled \$14 300. These people were away for only nine weeks, so that the fee for a few weeks were added on to make up the total of \$14 300. In this matter, I am critical not only of the Premier but also of the Public Service Board, because it approved the payment of this consultancy fee. However, that is another story. That enters the realm of criticising the Premier, as he is now in a position to influence the Public Service Board. Gone are the days when the senior officers who controlled the Public Service Board Department exercised that great dedicated independence and strength in regard to the approval of allocations of this kind.

In the old days, the Public Service Board or the Public Service Commissioner would never have approved the payment of a fee like this one. However, after consultations with the Premier, his officers and the Commissioner, this is the kind of scandalous thing that happens. I do not wish to pursue this matter any further. However, the Premier should never have approved this allocation for this cause.

Did the Craft Authority vote on this matter? Of course it did not. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman merely came to the authority and said, "We are going overseas". The matter was never discussed. The authority then paid out its cheques as the accounts came in, and it was immediately reimbursed by the Premier's Department. Never before have I known of such a scandal. I regret that two private individuals are involved. However, one has not been able to avoid reference to them.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You don't like it very much, do you?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I do not like the practice; that is the thing about which I am concerned. I am indeed concerned with the Premier's wastefulness and extravagance in this matter. This is only the tip of the iceberg in relation to the way in which money is being splashed about by the Premier to his friends in the arts world and in the promotion of art in this State. The time has come for this to stop. I am sorry that I did not hear the Minister put the Government's point of view today, and at least try to defend the Premier or give the Council a full explanation.

I am indeed concerned about the Premier's approving the payment of this huge sum of money for a purpose that did not do the craft industry in this State any good at all. I was told today by someone in the industry that all publications which come in from overseas are available here and that one can read about what is happening in other countries.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That's stupid.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I am merely telling the Committee what sincere, genuine craft people have told me. Those people want help from the Government. When I told the lady who telephoned me today that we were allocating \$558 000 for the Jam Factory, she nearly dropped the telephone. She could not believe it.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Who was it?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The honourable member would not want me to say who it was. Otherwise the person would get the same treatment as the executive officer of the board got. When he was dismissed, they said to him, "You be quiet, or you will never get another job with this Government."

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Who did?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I can tell you, but I have never spoken to this gentleman. I do not know him but I have spoken to people who know him very well.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: It's hearsay.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Yes, and it is quite reliable. This is what has been going on at the craft authority, with the blessing of the Premier. He has known all about it; his department had officers there. The whole thing should be exposed. When Parliament, comprising the representatives of the people, is asked to allocate more than \$500 000 for this purpose, we ought to have an explanation in regard to this whole matter. I am disappointed that we have not had this and I ask the Minister to make representations to the Premier.

In the Miscellaneous columns there is an item "Small Business Advisory Unit, reimbursement to consultants, \$250 000". Parliament ought to be told who the consultants are and what they have done for that money. If the Minister has not the information at his fingertips, I ask that he forward it in due course. I have an obligation to raise these matters here because of representations made to me. It must be a place of open government and free discussion. Otherwise, democracy is going down the drain, and no-one wants that. If I cannot get the information today, I hope in due course to get replies by correspondence.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: I will not delay the Committee by asking a long series of questions, because I put questions yesterday and have not received any replies. I am not reflecting on the Minister, because he has not had time, and I realise that the information has to be got from the Public Service. That is why I described this debate as somewhat of a farce. I could ask about the increase of \$130 000 above actual payments for terminal leave payments in the Public Buildings Department. How did this increase by nearly 300 per cent on the original vote?

Further, I refer to the item for administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries, where the provision is about \$200 000 more than actual payments last year. I should like to know what this item includes and what expenses are covered.

I refer now to the provision for equipment materials, services, grants, general education expenses, and cost of operation and maintenance, which is under the heading "General" in the Education Department estimates. Last year, an amount of \$277 150 was voted and \$751 837 was paid. We have no information on the detail of these amounts and on why there was an increase in the amount voted. It would be proper to have this information before we pass a Budget. I could ask again the questions I asked in the second reading debate, but I do not believe that we will get anywhere in these debates until the people who know the details are available to us.

In committees, we should closely examine all expenditure with the public servants who can give us all the details. These people would know that each year they

would be accountable for expenditure of taxpayers' money. Until we have that system, we will not get any result from these debates. It is fair enough for the Minister to say soon that he will get replies. That is all that anyone can do. However, I said yesterday that I believed that this Government needs to give Parliament more information, and I ask that more time is allowed to study details in the Committee stages of these debates in future.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I was keeping up fairly well with the Hon. Mr. Hill. The only thing that surprised me was that he asked for explanations and then, before he got the explanations, said that something was scandalous! He mentioned the word "scandal" several times.

Schedule passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

I would remind members that on August 16, 1977, the day before Parliament was prorogued, I introduced such a Bill and the accompanying Loan Estimates. During the intervening period the Government has seen little reason to change either the strategy or the content of its Loan programme for 1977-78. Assumptions made in respect of Commonwealth support for various programmes have proved to be reasonably in line with the recently-announced Commonwealth Budget, although I should perhaps make some comment in respect of schools, urban public transport, and housing.

As to the school building programme, the Loan Estimates anticipated a Commonwealth contribution of \$14 500 000. The Commonwealth Budget estimate is almost \$16 000 000 for South Australia, but only \$13 700 000 of this amount is available for Government schools. However, the Government's school building programme could expect to attract some of the allowance of \$2 000 000 provided in the Commonwealth Budget for cost escalation in all areas of education capital works in South Australia.

In regard to urban public transport, the Loan Estimates were framed in the expectation that Commonwealth support might not be forthcoming in 1977-78. However, the Commonwealth Budget includes an estimate of \$3 500 000 which, in the main, will be subject to negotiation in respect to cost escalation and acceptance of approved projects. It is unlikely to have a significant effect on the planned works in the 1977-78 financial year. To the extent that we are able to make a case for all or part of the \$3 500 000, it is likely to increase the cash balance of the State Transport Authority at June 30 next and to ease the considerable problems of 1978-79.

For housing, the Commonwealth has provided \$58 500 000 for 1977-78 and of this sum \$34 800 000 has been allocated to the Housing Trust, and \$23 700 000 to the State Bank. The total amount provided for 1977-78 is only \$2 100 000 or 3.7 per cent above the amount provided in 1976-77, which itself was the same money amount as for 1975-76 and 1974-75. The small increase will have no effect on allocations from Loan Account and little effect in relieving the problems of the housing industry or of people on low incomes seeking houses or housing finance.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.35 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, November 1, at 2.15 p.m.