

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 20, 1972

The SPEAKER (Hon. R. E. Hurst) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS**MURRAY RIVER**

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Works initiate a comprehensive hydrographic study of the Murray River to determine whether fears held by a growing number of people in the River districts that the Murray is choking itself with silt are correct and, if these fears are substantiated, will the Minister take urgent action to prevent any further deterioration and thus protect South Australia's vital water life-line? On recent visits to areas along the reaches of the Murray River I have been informed that there are indications that many sections of the river are becoming dangerously shallow as a direct result of the lock system. It has been suggested to me that the locks, which were constructed about 50 years ago (we appreciate why they were constructed and the benefit that they have provided), are having a serious effect in respect of major silting and that in recent years this effect has become more obvious, to the extent that many parts of the river are almost innavigable. The instance was cited of the tug *Nalta Yuki*, which draws only about 2ft. 6in. of water, being held up about 17 miles north of Morgan when on its way to correct a ferry system, and members of the work gang had to be taken by power boat from that point to their destination. I point out that South Australian industries rely on obtaining their water supply from this river, which may not have as large a volume of water as has been previously thought, and I include these facets in my question about this problem.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will give no undertaking at this stage that the survey requested by the Leader will be carried out. I have not had any indication from the Engineer-in-Chief that there is any need for alarm about this matter. In fact, the matter has been only vaguely raised with me, and I am rather surprised that the Leader, although not making too much of it, is raising the matter at all, because, as I understand the position, it is not serious at all.

Dr. Eastick: It is almost possible to wade in parts of the river.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At times the river is fairly high, and at such times we are

able to open the locks and flush out the water, so to speak. This is not an unusual incident, but I shall be pleased to have officers of my department (people who are experts in this matter) comment on the Leader's observations and the points he has raised.

Dr. Eastick: They are the observations of other people.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: They are the observations of other people, but the Leader has seen fit to raise them, so he must give them some credence. I shall be pleased to have the matter examined and bring down a considered reply for him.

McNALLY TRAINING CENTRE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say how Mr. Stewart Cockburn came to spend two days at the McNally Training Centre last week?

Mr. Jennings: And why he writes such rubbish about it?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham has asked for leave to explain his question. Interjections are out of order, and he must ignore them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: From an article in the *Advertiser* of last Saturday it seems that Mr. Cockburn had a free run of the training centre last week, talking to staff and boys. I remind the Minister of Community Welfare that on August 15 last I asked the Minister of Works, in the absence of the Minister, whether members of this place could visit Vaughan House and Windana Remand Home, two other institutions under the control of the Minister of Community Welfare. On August 17, in reply to my question (the Minister of Community Welfare having returned to the House) he agreed, but made one stipulation, saying:

However, regarding the suggestion that the staff members in those institutions should be exposed to interrogation by the member for Mitcham or anyone else, I have not the slightest intention of exposing them to that sort of experience.

That was after I had asked whether members could talk to the staff of those two institutions. It was not until last Friday, after further prodding and after more than a month had elapsed, that the visit was arranged, and a group of members from both sides was able to visit Vaughan House and Windana. The treatment accorded to members seems to have been in stark contrast to that accorded to Mr. Cockburn, and I therefore ask the Minister how Mr. Cockburn came to spend two days at McNally last week.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member was accorded the facility of inspecting Vaughan House and Windana in company with other members. He was given the fullest opportunity to do that, but I suppose it would be too much to expect that he would acknowledge the courtesy extended to him in that way. I suppose, too, that it would be too much to expect that he would acknowledge that the appointment was arranged at a time that met his convenience, and that other members were told that the tour would take place at the time arranged with the member for Mitcham, and that if they wished to attend at the time nominated by him they could be members of the party. The honourable member was given every consideration and, in asking this question, I think he could have seen fit to acknowledge that. Mr. Cockburn sought permission to go to McNally and be present at a sitting of the Treatment Review Board, which handles the management of the children at McNally, decides the period for which they will remain there, their programmes, and so on. Whilst he was there he was permitted by the Superintendent to speak to some of the staff and I think some boys. There was no question of Mr. Cockburn's having been authorized to interrogate members of the staff.

Mr. Millhouse: This was the word you used originally. I did not.

The Hon. L. J. KING: There was no question of his being authorized to interrogate members of the staff or of members of the staff being subjected to that sort of treatment by Mr. Cockburn. Whether they would have been subjected to that kind of treatment at the hands of the member for Mitcham had he been granted that facility, he would know and the House can judge. The position is that members of the House were given the fullest opportunity to inspect the two institutions nominated by the member for Mitcham. The arrangements were made to suit his convenience. Any suggestion that in some way he was delayed or that the visit was deferred is absolute nonsense. The sequence of events was that the member for Mitcham sought the opportunity to make the visit. He was told that this opportunity would be made available to him, but that it was desired that any other members of his Party who wished to attend should indicate their desire to do so, so that a single tour could be arranged. A time was allowed to elapse for members of his Party to indicate whether or not they wished to make this visit. Certain events in the Liberal and Country League seemed to be occupying

their minds at that stage, no response being received until those events were disposed of.

Mr. Millhouse: You must be—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: The appointment was then arranged to suit the convenience of the member for Mitcham. He has no reason to complain about what took place.

MISTLETOE

Mr. ALLEN: If the subject of my question has any similarity to the Liberal Movement, it is only a matter of coincidence. My question relates to mistletoe.

Mr. Clark: That's a parasite, too.

The SPEAKER: Order! I shall be pleased if honourable members will cease interjecting so that I can listen to the question by the honourable member for Frome and make sure that it complies with Standing Orders.

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether any research has been carried out recently in relation to mistletoe and whether he will have an inspection made of mistletoe in the North-East of the State? You, Mr. Speaker, will be particularly interested in this question, as the area concerned is only a short distance from your old home at Oodlawirra. On a recent tour of this area, I had my attention drawn to this mistletoe by a local resident, who showed me many dead trees and several more that would die. I point out that the Oxford Dictionary defines "mistletoe" as a parasitic white-berried plant. This resident explained to me the life cycle of mistletoe, saying that it commences its growth on the parent tree, and derives all its nourishment from that tree; eventually the parent tree dies, the mistletoe dying as well. I remarked that this was very similar to the Liberal Movement. Ever since, the Liberal Movement has been known as the mistletoe movement.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to comment.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I appreciate the honourable member's concern. Mistletoe has had romantic implications in the past.

Mr. Clark: They could kiss and make up.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Although the honourable member's suggestion may be a solution to the problem, the course of kissing under the mistletoe is unlikely to be taken in this case. I appreciate the comparison that the honourable member has made between mistletoe and a political movement in this State. However, as I assume that he has asked his question with some degree of seriousness, I undertake

to see whether an investigation can be made in this case, and I will obtain a report on any previous research carried out.

FAIRVIEW PARK SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on September 12 about the stage reached in extending the sewerage system into the Fairview Park area to sewer new subdivisions and provide discharge points for common effluent schemes in the area that at present discharge into oxidation lagoons?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have been told that the Tea Tree Gully council has diverted the common effluent system into the connection points provided. The oxidation lagoons are now being by-passed, with the effluent being discharged into the sewerage system.

STUDENTS' HOSTELS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education say whether consideration has been given to providing residential hostels for secondary students requiring higher education in South Australia? A letter that I have received from a constituent states:

I have been asked to write to you on behalf of the Coomandook Welfare Club regarding Government-run hostels for secondary students. We feel that there is a need for suitable accommodation at realistic cost, with some supervision for country children who wish to further their education beyond the level of their local schools. Could you please tell us if there is anything available along these lines? If not, what is planned and when can we expect to have something or somewhere our children can board?

I think the Minister knows that this type of accommodation is provided in Tasmania and, although I appreciate the country scholarships that are being provided, I am wondering whether consideration has been given to providing hostels similar to those in Tasmania and, if this is not being considered, whether it will be considered, in view of the desirability of enabling children to come to centres and be accommodated under supervision. I think this is extremely important in the present context.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There are Government-conducted hostels for students in several States but not in South Australia. The department has considered the matter consequent on the Karmel report recommendation that such hostels be constructed, and that recommendation has been rejected specifically. Indeed, the introduction of the rural secondary scholarships was an alternative to the construct-

ion of hostels. I point out to the honourable member that hostels are extremely expensive to build: residential accommodation for students at the tertiary level costs about \$5,000 a student place to provide. I suppose that one could provide something reasonable for secondary students at a cost of about \$3,000 a student place, but—

Mr. Nankivell: It is not that expensive in Tasmania.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am referring to the capital cost of providing the accommodation. I think that, if the honourable member checks, he will find that that is about the cost here. Otherwise, something second rate would be provided. Secondly, hostels are extremely expensive to conduct. It would be difficult to conduct a hostel at a charge of about \$20 a week without a substantial subsidy, whereas private board could be arranged for much less than that. We hope to be able eventually to extend the secondary scholarships for those students who have not the appropriate education facilities available for them in the country area so that the scholarships will cease to be such and will become a means-tested allowance over and above the boarding allowance to which every student is entitled. As I have said previously, the first extension towards making the scholarship a universal entitlement has been made for outback students. They will automatically be entitled to assistance in this way. It seems that it would not be possible to get any kind of complete coverage of secondary students in the country areas by providing hostels, whilst it is within the bounds of financial feasibility to put every secondary student in a country area who has not appropriate secondary education facilities available to him locally in the position where the costs of moving away from home, boarding somewhere else, and attending a Government school can be met.

As I have previously indicated, there is no requirement that Government schools should be attended by scholarship holders, but that is the basis on which the allowance has been fixed. If parents that have difficulty in arranging private boarding accommodation care to contact their local school and indicate the secondary school they want their children to attend, I am sure this problem can be solved. For example, if parents at Coomandook stipulate Murray Bridge and the department cannot arrange for suitable boarding accommodation there or at another suitable centre, I am sure that, if they nominate Murray Bridge High

School, accommodation will be arranged through the Headmaster of the school or the school council for the student concerned and, if that accommodation involves some measure of supervision or some degree of responsibility, I believe that this system will be a much more effective method of providing suitable accommodation and a far more economic policy as well.

HINDMARSH SCHOOL

Mr. SIMMONS: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Education Department has decided to purchase a house at 58 Ormond Street, Hindmarsh, for use by Hindmarsh Primary School? If it has, will the Minister consider the demolition of the old house now standing on the property and the provision of a basketball court and learners' swimming pool as an unemployment relief project? Last year the previous Headmaster asked the department to acquire this property, which was then for sale, to provide urgently needed additional space for the school. This property, which has since been inspected by Government officials, adjoins a small part of the school across the road from the main school and is contiguous to the area referred to in a question I asked yesterday. The parents of children attending the school are mainly migrants on low incomes, and obviously it will be difficult to pay the cost of a learners' swimming pool of the type that the Minister is keen to see provided in primary schools. This project would provide a good opportunity to make a contribution towards equalizing educational facilities outside the normal departmental budget while, at the same time, providing a considerable amount of labour. If the labour content of a swimming pool is not sufficiently high, could at least the house demolition, site clearing and the laying of a basketball court be approved?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not sure whether or not this property has been purchased, and I will have to check to find out. However, I hope that we shall be informing metropolitan schools that, if they have any special projects they wish to promote, they should approach their local council and get its support in putting a proposition to the Lands Department. Several country schools have taken this kind of initiative and have had significant work done as a result of that approach through local councils using Commonwealth rural unemployment relief money. Indeed, at Lucindale, a learners' pool was built under this kind of arrangement. I hope that we shall be able to encourage

schools to adopt this approach and that local councils will listen carefully to the propositions submitted by the schools, because these projects can absorb labour and provide much constructive work that will be of permanent value to the local community. Some projects may be organized through the Public Buildings Department and, where that is possible, it will be done. I will look specifically at the honourable member's suggestion.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): I move:

That in the opinion of this House, the State Government should be congratulated on its action in making available \$2,000,000 for a programme of labour-intensive projects in the Adelaide metropolitan area; and, further, this House views with grave concern the legacy of the 1970 and 1971 Commonwealth Budgets, which is the high rate of unemployment in Australia today, and calls upon the Commonwealth Government to—

- (a) provide a \$1 for \$1 subsidy on this State's expenditure in this field;
- (b) convene an urgent Premiers' Conference at which a national programme for the creation of job opportunities can be formulated; and
- (c) join this House in urging similar programmes for the urban unemployed on other State Governments.

All members are aware of the background of this situation. First, there is a worsening situation of employment in Australia at present, despite the Commonwealth Budget which was recently introduced. Secondly, some time ago the Commonwealth Government introduced a programme for the relief of the rural unemployed, and then last week the State Government announced a programme for the relief of urban unemployment. A little later, I will quote figures to show the extent of the problem we are facing at present. I wonder whether anyone really needs to be reminded of the evils and the problems of unemployment. One would like to think that this was not so, yet when we look around the world today we see figures of fairly high unemployment in some of the Western countries, those figures having remained fairly stable now for a considerable time. Therefore, we seem to be getting back to the situation in which the Western capitalist and neo-capitalist societies are regarding a pool of unemployed as a permanent feature of the economic landscape.

Referring just briefly to the problems of unemployment, I should like to quote from a book which, in its way was a landmark; I refer to *Christianity and Social Order*, by

William Temple (Archbishop of Canterbury until he died in, I think, 1942). This book was regarded in its time as being a little pink and that, of course, is one of the attractions that it has for me. It certainly had a considerable impact in its day. The book states:

The worst evil of such unemployment, whether due to cyclical or to more permanent conditions, is its creating in the unemployed a sense that they have fallen out of the common life. However much their physical needs may be supplied (and before the war this supply was in many cases inadequate) the gravest part of the trouble remains; they are not wanted! That is the thing that has power to corrupt the soul of any man not already far advanced in saintliness. Because the man has no opportunity of service, he is turned in upon himself and becomes, according to his temperament, a contented loafer or an embittered self-seeker. It has not been sufficiently appreciated that this moral isolation is the heaviest burden and most corrosive poison associated with unemployment: not bodily hunger but social futility. Consequently it is no remedy to pay the unemployed man as much as the employed; unless he has intellectual interests with which to occupy his leisure and is able to turn these into a means of service by study resulting in books or lectures, this will only make him content with idleness; and we have enough people suffering from that form of deadly sin (technically called sloth) at the other end of the social scale. Nothing will touch the real need except to enable the man to do something which is needed by the community. For it is part of the principle of personality that we should live for one another.

Much depends on the history and experience of the particular individuals concerned. A recent inquiry disclosed the disquieting fact that in a town where long-term unemployment was rife, the older men, who had formerly had experience of full employment, preferred to go back to work even at a wage less than their unemployment benefit, while the younger, who had never had regular employment, preferred to be idle "on the dole" even if they could earn a larger weekly sum. This does not mean that they were happy in idleness; most of them were conscious of futility and frustration (though they would not use those words about it), and they were bitter against a world which had no use for them and made no room for them; but they had a strong distaste for the drudgery of regular work. They were degraded into a condition of universal dissatisfaction. The only real cure for unemployment is employment—beginning from the time when school education is complete and continuing, with no longer intervals than can be appreciated as holidays, till strength begins to fail. In other words we are challenged to find a social order which provides employment, steadily and generally, and our consciences should be restive till we succeed.

That is the writing of Archbishop Temple in the early years of the war. There are those

people who say we have a satisfactory sort of employment situation if the number of registered job vacancies exceeds the number of registered unemployed but, of course, there is little comfort for the unemployed steel worker to be told that I.B.M. Australia Limited has vacancies for people to work on computers, and this is one of the problems that we face today. But, even if that argument could be granted, if we look at unemployment figures and job vacancies over a three-year period we find that there has only been one quarter (at the beginning of 1970) when the number of registered vacancies has exceeded the number of those registered as unemployed throughout Australia.

In February, 1970, for example, 52,456 were registered as unemployed, and there were 53,943 vacancies, both of these figures being seasonally adjusted. By March of that year, the unemployed figure stood at 49,473, and the number of vacancies had risen to 55,393. But by June of that year unemployment had caught up again (51,900 registered as unemployed, and 50,801 job vacancies). That was the last time; from then on there has been a steady increase in unemployment and a steady decline in job vacancies. This situation has developed into something of a rush, particularly since the 1971 Budget. Many people told the Commonwealth Government at that time that, in adopting the type of Budget strategy it had adopted, it had wrongly diagnosed the ills of this country. The Government stated that it was concerned with inflation and its problems. Twelve months before, in the 1970 Budget, the Government had introduced tax cuts that may well have contributed to this inflationary trend.

Be that as it may, there is little doubt that the 1971 Commonwealth Budget dampened down activity considerably, even though we already had a situation of growing unemployment. The effect of the Budget added to a trend that already existed. By September, 1971 (and I do not wish to bore members by going through all the figures), the figure stood at 84,279 with job vacancies down to 36,429. By December, 1971, unemployment had risen to 90,549, while job vacancies remained pretty well around the September figure. During this year, although there have been one or two monthly fluctuations, generally the sad pattern has been for a trend upwards in unemployment figures and either a stationary or a downward trend in job vacancies. In June of this year, 104,929 people were

unemployed and there were 31,354 registered job vacancies.

We read in the *Advertiser* only yesterday morning the headline "Jobless the most for eleven years", and we were told the seasonally adjusted total of 120,053 people registered as unemployed represented 2.14 per cent of the work force, compared to 112,290 or 2 per cent at the end of July. It was also stated that this was the highest figure for any month since 1961. We are well aware that the large total of unemployed persons at the beginning of the 1960's was similarly related to the budgetary policies and the so-called credit squeeze of the Commonwealth Government.

I make perfectly clear that I regard all central Governments as having considerable responsibility in respect of the employment position. Since the days of Curtin and Chifley we have tried in Australia to follow policies of full employment. At least this is what, on the surface, the Liberal and Country Party Governments in Canberra since 1949 said that they were trying to do. There has been a declared commitment to the policy of full employment, but it must be said that we have been in a fortunate position in Australia because we have been able to manage fairly low unemployment figures except when errors of judgment by the Commonwealth Government have produced a drop in the demand for labour. We saw this at the beginning of the 1960's and to a lesser extent in the middle 1960's, and we have seen it again resulting from last year's Commonwealth Budget. I do not think there is much point in Commonwealth Liberal Ministers and other members saying, "Well, if you look at Canada, the United States of America, and some of the countries of Western Europe, you must realize that our record of employment is extremely good."

The yardstick by which we have to measure our record of unemployment is generally the Australian record since the Second World War. We should judge our unemployment figures not on what is the norm for Canada or for the United States but on what is the norm for post-war Australia, over the period since there has been a conscious attempt to introduce full employment policies and also the knowledge of how to go about doing this. We must realize that, whatever the commitment may have been in respect of pre-war Governments, they did not fully understand how to go about generating or stimulating full employment. If they did have an inkling of it (as Scullin and Theodore did in 1930

and 1931) they faced a hostile Senate, which blocked many measures that would have eased the situation at that time.

Mr. Millhouse: They had a hostile Party, as I have read.

Mr. HOPGOOD: True, the Labor Party at that time ran into internal difficulties that were directly related to the fact that the Government of the day was hamstrung by the limitations placed on it by a hostile Senate. It is interesting to note that most of what Theodore tried to introduce at that time was eventually introduced by Curtin and Chifley when they had the Senate on their side. We digress into history, but that does not do us much harm.

What should be done for the unemployment situation today? First, the State Government is showing the way by introducing schemes that are directly related to providing employment. Of course, budgetary measures can only be indirect: some money is thrown into the pool and it is hoped that the circulation of this money will generate employment. It will do so, but it has only an indirect effect. Money is not being spent directly towards employment (it is a spin-off if you like), so the State Government has introduced a scheme whereby money will be directly made available to provide employment for those who are now out of work.

Another reason why budgetary benefits may not directly affect the employment situation is that it largely depends upon who is receiving the benefits. Some people in the community have a fairly satisfactory standard of living, and when they receive additional benefits they do not spend them but save them. They do not need to spend the extra money; in fact, the uncertain situation of the economy may induce them to save rather than spend, because they do not know what is around the corner. I speak, for example, of the middle-aged executive who enjoys a good income for as long as he is employed. In a situation where there is a large pool of unemployed people, who knows that he may be rendered redundant one way or another by his firm? He salts it away and puts it in the bank as a protection against an uncertain future, even though he has an executive position. That type of benefit, which usually flows to this sort of person by way of a tax cut, has little effect in generating employment. This seems to me to be the present situation. The benefits for low-income earners arising out of the Budget have not bitten as yet (and we do not know the extent to which they will bite),

but we hope that they will as time goes by and as more legislation is passed by the Commonwealth Parliament. However, many of these benefits have gone into private banking accounts.

The other thing that Governments can do, apart from financing labour-intensive works, is to provide real cash benefits for low-income earners, the people who will of necessity spend the money as soon as they receive it, because they have so many needs. This is something that successive L.C.P. Governments in Canberra have not been willing to do. The result is that, from being in the forefront of social welfare in the world, Australia has slumped sadly indeed to lag far behind some countries which, until I saw some of these figures, I would have regarded as being fairly reactionary in the social field.

I refer to Mr. Bill Hayden's article, "New Horizons in Health and Welfare Services", which appears in the Fabian pamphlet *Towards a New Australia Under a Labor Government*. I recommend this booklet to members opposite. I imagine that the member for Eyre may be referring to it now so that he can check the accuracy of the figures as I read them from page 214, on which appears a table which was compiled by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Legislative Research Section and which was quoted in Parliamentary debates in March, 1971. This table sets out general Government expenditure on health and welfare expressed as a proportion of gross national product for the year 1968, although for Austria and Sweden the figures are for the year 1967. It is interesting to see the percentage of G.N.P. actually expended by Governments on health and welfare. Of the countries listed, the leading country in this respect is Denmark, which spent 20.48 per cent of its G.N.P. on health and welfare. The Federal Republic of Germany spent 17.95 per cent; Sweden spent 17.45 per cent; and France (France!) spent 16.8 per cent.

Mr. Millhouse: What's the matter with France?

Mr. HOPGOOD: I always regarded France as having one of the most reactionary Governments of Western Europe.

Mr. Millhouse: It depends on your point of view.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Precisely, and on the sort of indicator one is looking at. In the case of this index, I extend credit where it is certainly due. The table shows that in 1968 Italy spent 15.83 per cent of its G.N.P.

on health and welfare; in 1967 Austria spent 15.48 per cent; the Netherlands spent 13.34 per cent; Belgium spent 12.21 per cent; and the United Kingdom spent 11.2 per cent. Therefore, the United Kingdom lags a long way behind, despite what is said about the welfare State by the member for Glenelg and others.

Mr. Mathwin: Don't forget that the unemployed are working as well.

Mr. HOPGOOD: On that point, I will not comment.

Mr. Mathwin: You can take my word for it.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I do not think I should really take the honourable member's word, because, as far as I can see, he is extremely biased with regard to any form of social welfare experiment practised in the United Kingdom. He seems to have brought this prejudice to this country. To give him his due, he does not seem so biased about some types of social welfare programmes in Australia but, on the other hand, we do not have them to the same extent. The honourable member will have his opportunity to speak later in this debate. In 1968 Norway spent 10.22 per cent of its G.N.P. on health and welfare; and Switzerland spent 7.83 per cent. In North America, in 1968, Canada spent 10.69 per cent and the United States of America spent 6.74 per cent. Australia in that year spent 7.09 per cent of its G.N.P. on health and welfare. In other words, in this list of so-called advanced Western countries, the only country whose performance we exceed is the U.S.A.

Mr. Payne: I thought you'd say Iceland.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Iceland is not included, but it may be doing considerably better than we are doing in this respect. Obviously, this is not an exhaustive list. The point I want to make out of these figures is that Australia (or what used to be called the Australasian democracies, because New Zealand was always included) was once regarded as a social laboratory. After 20 years of Liberal and Country Party Governments, the social welfare system constructed by Curtin and Chifley has been allowed to sadly atrophy. This has ramifications not only in the realm of social welfare but also in the realm of employment. If we are to provide employment, we must provide purchasing power, and that means putting money in people's pockets. Where a significant proportion of the population is denied the good life that others share and is denied this purchasing power, this means that money is

simply not going into the community. It means that there is money in other people's bank accounts, rather than money being expended by those who so badly need to make this sort of expenditure. These are two of the types of action I believe we should be taking.

I do not want to be accused of merely criticizing the Commonwealth Government. I believe that any critic has the responsibility not only of criticizing but also of putting up viable alternatives. In this State the Labor Government has indicated one such viable alternative which, in a limited sphere, the Commonwealth Government has also been prepared to countenance, and I refer to the rural sphere. Now we seek to extend that scheme to the city. I also believe that it is incumbent on all Governments, especially the Commonwealth Government because of its monopoly in income tax collection, to provide adequate health and social welfare, because of the real benefits this has not only in direct human terms in relieving suffering but also in respect of the spin-off it has in providing employment.

Moreover, there must be some real restructuring of the economy. For as long as the Commonwealth Constitution has the blinkers which the present Commonwealth Government has placed on it, it will prevent any real attack being made on the problem of inflation. We will always get inflation as a result of the phoney budgetary methods we saw in 1971. Until the Commonwealth Government is willing to act along the lines that the all-Party committee on the review of the Constitution recommended as far back as the late 1950's, no Government will have all of the adequate controls that it must have if it is to control inflation. It is important that we control inflation. This problem must be solved or we will have this continual credit squeeze type of situation in a futile attempt to cure inflation. This only has the unfortunate effect of throwing more men on to the labour market.

The latter part of my motion also asks the Commonwealth Government to provide a \$1 for \$1 subsidy on this State's expenditure in this field. I believe that this is entirely reasonable, as this is a situation that has largely been produced by the budgetary policy of the Commonwealth Government. In addition, the more men who are in employment the fewer that have to be assisted by the Commonwealth Government out of its Treasury by means of unemployment benefits. Therefore, it is not a question of spending \$X

in this field; it is in part \$Y that was spent on unemployment benefits. I believe the Commonwealth Government should consider this fact. There should be an urgent Premiers' Conference convened so that a national programme for the creation of job opportunities can be formulated.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think that before that is held someone should draw up a plan so that there is something for them to discuss?

Mr. HOPGOOD: All State Governments should go along with a policy of exactly what they want to do. I cannot conceive of any Premiers' Conference where each contingent would go along with an empty satchel and ask what was going to happen. I assure the honourable member that our own Premier will go there with a full submission indeed as to what should be done.

Mr. Millhouse: Will he tell us about it this afternoon?

Mr. HOPGOOD: He can tell us in his own time, as he does from time to time to great effect. Finally, because this problem affects not only this State but all the other States as well, I ask the Commonwealth Government to join us in urging, on other State Governments, similar programmes for the urban unemployed. I think it appropriate that this Government has taken this action. As a Labor Government, it is always concerned with problems of unemployment and wants to give employment to all who desire it. Secondly, this State is affected peculiarly, along with other small States, by any downdrift in the economy, because in common with those States it relies on markets beyond our borders. When purchasing power drops in Sydney and Melbourne, the commodities that we produce are not purchased.

Therefore, South Australians are being thrown out of work, and it is appropriate that this Government, for the two reasons that I have given, has taken this action. I urge all members to support the motion. It is important to present a united front to the Commonwealth Government. I do not think the penny has dropped yet as far as the Commonwealth Government is concerned. That Government introduced its Budget in the certain expectation of an election this year and in the face of a poor showing in popularity polls. This is not good enough. We must have something that lasts for longer than a pre-election period, and the motion embodies this idea.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I second the motion so ably moved by the member for Mawson. The proposal to provide \$2,000,000 for a programme of labour-intensive projects in the metropolitan area to relieve the problem of urban unemployment must be commended. The latest figures show just how serious the unemployment problem has become, with more than 9,000 people now registered as unemployed in the Adelaide metropolitan area. This motion congratulates the State Labor Government for providing something definite, tangible and positive to alleviate unemployment.

The State Government also asks the Commonwealth Government to accept its responsibility by providing a \$1 for \$1 subsidy, on the grounds that the Commonwealth Government will save the payment of unemployment benefits (meagre though they may be to the person receiving them) and, in addition, will gain the income tax paid by people who are employed gainfully. The Premier has also requested a Premiers' Conference, to discuss ways to reduce unemployment. I think most people understand that the Commonwealth Government has lacked concern and understanding about unemployment. The Commonwealth Budgets of 1970, 1971 and even of 1972 have done little or nothing to help.

Mr. Gunn: Who wrote this for you?

Mr. SLATER: I wrote it. For the benefit of the member for Eyre—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre had better cease interjecting or he will not be here.

Mr. Venning: Fair go!

The SPEAKER: My statement applies to the honourable member for Rocky River, too.

Mr. SLATER: The Prime Minister said in the Commonwealth Parliament yesterday that the Commonwealth Budget introduced on August 15 was deliberately designed to affect unemployment.

Mr. Jennings: Which way?

Mr. SLATER: That is the point I am trying to make. It has affected unemployment in the reverse way. A newspaper report states:

Mr. McMahon and the Minister for Labour and National Service (Mr. Lynch) replied to questions on unemployment from both sides of the House yesterday, following publication of the latest unemployment statistics. The figures, issued on Monday night, showed that, after seasonal adjustment, 120,053 people, or 2.14 per cent of the work force, were unemployed. This was the highest seasonally adjusted unemployment level since October, 1961.

Yet a further report states:

The Prime Minister (Mr. McMahon) and the Labour Minister (Mr. Lynch) told Parliament today that the latest figures on Australia's employment situation had shown a fall in the level of unemployment. Mr. Lynch said that at present Australia's record in relation to employment levels was incomparably superior to those of most other industrialized countries around the world.

The member for Mawson has dealt with this aspect, and we consider that this is not a situation in which to make comparisons with other countries about our position in Australia. The newspaper report further states:

Mr. Lynch repeated his statement that the present level of unemployment was unacceptably high for the Government, but measures had been taken to correct it.

What measures have been taken? If the Commonwealth Government is genuine in its concern about the unemployment situation, it will agree to the proposals that this State Labor Government has put forward. Unemployment figures or statistics do not mean much or give much consolation to the unemployed person, particularly if he is a breadwinner. Being unemployed has a degrading and demoralizing effect, not only on the breadwinner but on the whole family and, consequently, on society in general.

Unfortunately, the persons most affected by unemployment are unskilled or semi-skilled people, the low-income earners. These people have not had the opportunity to set aside financial reserves to assist them through any period of unemployment. Another section of the community affected is that comprising the younger persons. The school leavers have been affected greatly by the down-turn in job opportunity. Unfortunately, this position will be accentuated even further soon, when other school leavers come on the labour market. The Commonwealth Government must accept its responsibility in relation to the hardship of unemployment. I have read in today's newspaper that there will be no more Commonwealth Government aid for the jobless. The report states:

The Federal Government had no intention of providing more assistance for the unemployed, the Minister for Labour and National Service (Mr. Lynch) said today.

That is indeed unfortunate when this State Labor Government is proposing that we receive assistance from the Commonwealth Government on this matter. I and other members on the Government side consider that every person in this country has the undeniable right to earn a livelihood and to have the opportunity

to be employed gainfully instead of being subject to the demoralizing effect of unemployment.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I rise to take part in a debate that obviously shows only feigned concern by members opposite. The situation has been forced on this House by members opposite who are trying to embarrass the Commonwealth Government, which has done a magnificent job for all States, and which has made available (as I will show) a considerably greater sum for the benefit of the States than has been made available in past years. This debate is an attempt by members opposite to boost the position of the temporary Commonwealth members for Adelaide, Kingston and Sturt, and members opposite know that this is the situation.

The motion before the House is impracticable, even though it contains some items of merit, and I ask the House to urgently consider an amendment I shall move. I believe that my amendment enhances the value of this debate. No purpose can be achieved, other than an attempt to gain politically, by supporting the motion. The motion refers to the 1970 and 1971 Commonwealth Budgets, but it does not refer to the 1972 Commonwealth Budget, which is aimed at improving the situation not only in South Australia but throughout the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth Government has made available through the Budget several measures that will be to the advantage of the people of Australia, but what has the Commonwealth Labor Party done at this time to ensure that the Budget is passed quickly? Has it forgone its right to debate the various issues in the Commonwealth Parliament? Has the Commonwealth Labor Party stood back and indicated the value that the Budget will be in reducing unemployment? Has it given the Commonwealth Government the opportunity to pass these measures so that the unemployment situation in many areas will be improved? Indeed, on this basis I suggest that this debate shows feigned concern by members opposite.

Reference has been made to \$2,000,000 allocated by this Government to reduce unemployment in urban areas. Members on this side give full support to that expenditure, as I said when this project was first announced. However, I cannot accept the pronouncements of the Government, through the member for Mawson, concerning the motion now under consideration. The Government has failed to look firmly at the matter and to put before this House today a meaningful motion which

could receive the full support of all members and which could have been carried this afternoon. Instead, the Government has put forward a theoretical measure aimed at embarrassing the Commonwealth Government. This motion has no hope of getting the complete support of the House. If members opposite were not concerned with creating political embarrassment, this motion would not have been drafted as it has been.

Mention has been made of the need for support for the unemployed in urban areas. The member for Mawson indicated that the Commonwealth Government's attitude towards providing funds for rural areas as distinct from urban areas is not to be commended and is not acceptable. Measures have been taken over a long period to make these funds available and the distribution of these funds has been left to the State Governments. Measures currently exist whereby many people resident in metropolitan council areas are obtaining employment through rural grants. Indeed, we need look only at the situation relating to the District Councils of Munno Para, Meadows, Noarlunga and other areas where there is a component of urban living to see what is being provided because, where these councils have qualified for funds from the rural assistance grant, the opportunity has been given and has continued to be given for improved employment in those areas.

Mr. McAnaney: What about Port Pirie?

Dr. EASTICK: And Port Pirie, Millicent, Mount Gambier and Whyalla. True, many areas are benefiting, and rightly so, from funds made available by the Commonwealth Government. I now refer to the comments of the Prime Minister on June 28, 1972, after attending the Premiers' Conference, when he said:

Now let me sum up briefly the main results of the Conference. First the Commonwealth will provide the States in 1972-73 with \$128,000,000 more in revenue grants than they received before. This will take the total amount the States will get from us in the new financial year to over \$1,600,000,000. In addition, the Commonwealth will provide as grants for nearly \$250,000,000 of the States' programme for works and housing, which we agreed will be \$982,000,000, and we guarantee that they will receive the remaining part of the programme if it cannot be borrowed. These are pretty big sums. In total the State Governments and their authorities will have available from Commonwealth sources and from borrowing approved by the Loan Council something over \$3,000,000,000 in the next year. That, I believe, spells progress.

Does any member opposite suggest that this does not spell progress? I hear not a word.

Mr. Payne: It's not enough.

Dr. EASTICK: The Prime Minister continued—

Mr. Payne: We are putting our money up.

Dr. EASTICK: Members on this side are prepared to support a meaningful and proper motion.

Mr. Payne: You could have fooled me. So far you have opposed it.

Dr. EASTICK: The honourable member is trying to prevent the speedy passage of this motion by pretending that, in its present form, it is a meaningful motion. In June this year, the Prime Minister referred to two other matters, as follows:

I mention two other matters. We are still keeping a very watchful eye on unemployment. As you know, we have already acted promptly to get the numbers down. At the Premiers' Conference we decided to do more. The Commonwealth agreed to increase the money to be spent up to the end of 1972 from \$4,500,000 a month to \$6,000,000 a month for the relief of non-metropolitan unemployment. The States will, of course, decide for themselves in what non-metropolitan areas and in what way they will spend this money. They, like us, are pledged to a policy of full employment.

As I pointed out a short time ago, but for the activities of the Labor Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament many of these suggestions could have been implemented already. I am not denying the rights of the Commonwealth Labor Opposition or suggesting that it should not debate the issues but, if it is really as concerned as it makes out it is, there should be much less politicking than is taking place at present, such as is taking place in respect of this motion, and we would then be more advanced towards remedying the situation. The Prime Minister went on to say:

We also talked about urban problems. The Commonwealth shares the concern of the States at the plight of some of our cities and their services. How can we ease the traffic snarls?

There were discussions about urban problems, and we are aware that this Government's ability to provide \$2,000,000 referred to in the motion arises from a major increase in the amount of Commonwealth funds made available to this State, including the sums referred to in the announcement that I just quoted, plus the \$21,000,000 announced late in July (the \$7,500,000 completion grant for 1970-71 and the \$13,500,000 advanced for 1972-73). A sum is still expected to be forthcoming as

a completion grant in respect of 1971-72 and, as I have said, it is because this money has been forthcoming from the Commonwealth Government that this Government is able to provide the sum referred to in the motion. We accept responsibility regarding the expenditure of this money, knowing that the need to provide for unemployment at present would have been greater had it not been for the scheme introduced in December, 1971, to improve the position of people in rural areas.

Another matter to which I refer is the announcement by the Government that permanent works will be undertaken as a result of the provision of this \$2,000,000. One accepts that it is important to ensure that value is obtained for money spent, and I do not deny (nor do I believe that people of both political persuasions in the community deny) that some of the money being spent under the rural grants system—

The Hon. L. J. King: What is the other political persuasion apart from the Labor Party?

Dr. EASTICK: The far left, the Communist Party or the Democratic Labor Party. Has the Attorney-General heard of those?

Mr. Burden: What about the far right—the Liberal Movement?

Dr. EASTICK: I should be surprised if the shirt the Premier wears today really reflects his alignment with the purple people.

Mr. Millhouse: It's an improvement, though.

Dr. EASTICK: The money provided by the Commonwealth Government for rural work has not necessarily been used in the best interests of the community, but it has provided employment for many people in the unskilled sector. I believe that the measures outlined so far by the Premier in respect of this grant will prevent the expenditure of funds in an area where the money is most required, namely, that of unskilled labour. I think we accept that in respect of permanent works the percentage of skilled and semi-skilled labour required is much greater than in the case of short-term undertakings. Of course, money is not being made available for cutting lawns, and we are told that it will not be used for transporting, say, a load of dirt from one place to another.

This is basically a sound approach to which I agree but, if we are going to engage in meaningful capital long-term works, we will require basically the services of skilled and semi-skilled workers, leaving the unskilled workers disadvantaged under this proposal. That is a matter of machinery which will have

to be resolved. It is a matter to be determined individually by whatever officers are involved, in order to ensure that we get the greatest value for the money spent. However, we cannot escape the fact that under this measure we will still not necessarily be helping in the areas where the greatest help is required at present. Therefore, I suggest that the motion be amended so as to fulfil the real requirements under the situation which exists temporarily and which cannot be completely resolved until the Commonwealth Budget undertakings have had a chance to function. I move:

To strike out all words after "That" and insert:

this House supports the expenditure of \$2,000,000 for a programme of labour-intensive projects in the Adelaide metropolitan area to complement the non-metropolitan unemployment relief scheme which has been operative since December 2, 1971, and congratulates the Commonwealth Government on the provisions made in the 1972 Budget to strengthen the Australian economy.

The SPEAKER: Is the amendment seconded?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir.

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): I make clear that I support the original motion and congratulate the member for Mawson and the member for Gilles on their initiative in sponsoring it. I do not, of course, agree to the amendment.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They don't want a Commonwealth subsidy, and they don't want a Premiers' Conference.

Mr. JENNINGS: The Opposition supports the expenditure of \$2,000,000 but it does not want a Premiers' Conference, and it is going to congratulate the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They only want the subsidy, from the Commonwealth Government for rural unemployment.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. I think we shall go into this matter a little more deeply. In the State Budget that is currently being discussed—

Mr. Venning: Your colleague in another place is in trouble at present.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River will be in trouble if he does not stop interjecting.

Mr. JENNINGS: He will be in trouble if he stays here not interjecting, too. The honourable member should be willing to listen and learn; at least, he should be willing to listen, but I do not know whether he is capable of learning. Under the Budget currently being discussed, one of the matters that received

many plaudits was what we are doing in this State regarding community welfare, for example. Under the Constitution this is purely a Commonwealth responsibility. A referendum on this matter was held in my lifetime and in yours, Mr. Speaker, as well as in that of most of us in this place, and as far as I know the only member who opposed it was the late Archie Cameron. Of course, the referendum was carried. This Government now has to spend millions of dollars a year caring for deserted wives, adopted children, unmarried mothers, and in providing transport concessions for pensioners.

Mr. McAnaney: Half of it is wasted.

Mr. JENNINGS: The money is not wasted, but it should be coming from the Commonwealth Government: it is the Commonwealth Government's constitutional responsibility to provide this money, but because it has been so niggardly and so parsimonious in its attitude—

Mr. McAnaney: You nearly choked on that word.

Mr. JENNINGS: No, I did not, but I think the honourable member would choke on the word "sanctimonious". I said "parsimonious", and the honourable member should not get his parsons mixed up with his saints, because a parson is not necessarily a saint.

Mr. Mathwin: And you should know that.

Mr. McAnaney: What are you?

Mr. JENNINGS: I am neither: perhaps I am closer to the devil. In the State Budget we have provided these things for many years, and we have done so in many other respects. As far as possible we encourage councils to do the same things. I think that a pension should be adequate (we can call it a pension or whatever we like)—

Mr. Evans: Call it a handout.

Mr. JENNINGS: —to provide a person with all the reasonable requirements of life without having to carry a permit that has to be shown to a bus conductor or someone else because he wants a concession rate. More recently all Parties supported an amendment to make Aboriginal welfare the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government. I do not know what has happened since that time about the welfare of Aborigines, except that there is a Department of Aboriginal Welfare in the Commonwealth's jurisdiction now—

Mr. Millhouse: There is not, you know. It is an office.

Mr. JENNINGS: Well, it is an office or a branch, but apart from that nothing has been

done for Aborigines by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Payne: It can't even protect

Aboriginal land rights properly.

Mr. JENNINGS: That Government cannot look after an attempt made by a brother of a President of the Liberal Party, who wants to sell—

Mr. Gunn: That is a deliberate untruth, and you know it.

Mr. JENNINGS: I have not said it yet: the honourable member is anticipating me.

Mr. Clark: He may know something about it already.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think the honourable member has a guilty conscience.

Mr. Mathwin: At least we are the only Party with an Aboriginal member, and that is more than the Labor Party has.

Mr. Harrison: The honourable member hasn't a Party: his colleagues are having a bun fight.

Mr. Mathwin: If it were a bun fight, you would be the first in it.

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members must not interject.

Mr. JENNINGS: The member for Glenelg is a bit shirty. Yesterday, a report was tabled from Judge Marshall about the Juvenile Court, and I quote an adequate excerpt that was contained in a newspaper article, as follows:

A total of 1,904 were children who had left school, of whom 869 were unemployed. This confirms an impression formed in court that unemployment is a relevant and substantial factor to be considered when endeavouring to pinpoint the causes of juvenile delinquency in children above the age of 15 years, the report says.

I think that quotation is relevant to the matter we are discussing. Surely everyone knows that, if a child leaves school at 15 (and I think at 15 years of age he leaves with an inadequate education) and cannot find a secure job, and gets kicked from one job to another, sooner or later he will finish up in the court, unless he has a good stable background or receives help from somewhere. This situation should be considered in this motion. I am disappointed in the Leader: I know that he has had many difficulties lately, but we expected big things from him. We have not expected much from him in the short period that he has been Leader, particularly with the troubles that have confronted him, but in a matter like this surely he is capable of taking a more statesman-like attitude than he exemplified today.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's your opinion.

Mr. JENNINGS: I express my opinion: I speak for myself and not for other people. My opinions seem to be different from the opinions expressed from the other side, but they conform to the opinions of most members on this side. Apparently, this is how I manage to stay here. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I speak for you when you are in a less elevated position.

Mr. Mathwin: And you vote the same way.

Mr. JENNINGS: Of course we agree to.

Dr. Tonkin: You are on thin ice now, Jack!

Mr. JENNINGS: The Leader spoke about urban areas, but we are also concerned with inner metropolitan areas. In my district and in the districts of many members on this side who represent highly industrialized areas, there are at present many unemployed people, particularly unskilled workers. This situation will become worse unless money is made available to get the ball rolling towards employment.

Mr. McAnaney: Why don't you do something about it?

Mr. JENNINGS: The \$2,000,000 will help; it is designed to help, and it will. Undoubtedly, this motion will be carried in its original form, and I hope—

Mr. McAnaney: Why not do something about the employment situation by encouraging industries to come here?

Mr. JENNINGS: —that it will be carried unanimously. I can never understand the member for Heysen when he has the floor, so I cannot understand him when he is interjecting. I shall not try to reply to his interjection.

Mr. McAnaney: You can't!

Mr. Payne: He can't, because it's too stupid.

Mr. JENNINGS: I cannot understand the member for Heysen's gobbledegook. When he talks about the matters he frequently talks about in the House, we find out, if we read *Hansard*, that he has made the same speech for about 10 years in a row, but has dressed it up slightly differently.

Mr. McAnaney: I agree.

Mr. Clark: It wasn't a good one the first time.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You could never make a speech without a paper in your hand.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I draw the attention of the honourable member for Kavel to the fact that it is out of order for an honourable member to interject other than from his seat. If the honourable member for

Kavel persists in doing that, I shall have no hesitation in naming him.

Mr. JENNINGS: I had hoped that the motion would be carried unanimously in its original form. Apparently now that will not happen, but nevertheless the motion will be carried, and I am pleased about that. I am pleased that the result will be the same and that \$2,000,000 will be available so that beginning can be made on providing urban employment.

Mr. McAnaney: You got it from the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. JENNINGS: The Leader made a point about that throughout his speech on the Budget and he has made the point in all the speeches he has made since he has been Leader. Many of his echoes also say that we use Commonwealth money. It is not Commonwealth money: it is the money of the taxpayers of Australia. South Australians pay tax to the Commonwealth Government. All of us in this place pay tax to that Government. However, this is our money. This Government wants the money back so that it can do the things for this State that it has a constitutional obligation to do. We do not want the money for defence or foreign affairs, because that is not our responsibility, but we want money for education, health, law and order, and so on. The Commonwealth Government has the responsibility to provide for full employment, even though Mr. McMahon referred to unemployment—another slip of the tongue.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He might have meant it.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, but he altered it later, with the permission of the House. One of the peculiar things that members opposite keep saying is that the Commonwealth Government is handing over its money. When he was Prime Minister, Mr. Gorton told our Premier that, if he was not satisfied with what the Commonwealth gave the State, he could go to the Grants Commission. Mr. Gorton found out that he was dealing with the wrong sort of bloke, because our Premier went to the Grants Commission, calling Mr. Gorton's bluff. As a result, South Australia has been immensely better off ever since. We could have been going to the Grants Commission all along, except for the fact that Sir Thomas Playford thought it was nearly time that South Australia was grown up and that it did not need handouts from the Grants Commission.

Mr. McAnaney: If we hadn't got landed with a Labor Government, it would never have happened.

Mr. JENNINGS: At one stage when the Playford Government was in office, we had much worse unemployment. The reference to the Prime Minister's slip of the tongue reminds me of a recent incident. When I went to my letterbox here I found a letter from someone in my district asking me to try to get him a job. A Liberal member came to his letterbox about the same time. I said to him, "This unemployment business is getting a bit troublesome. Are you finding any problems?" He said, "It is better. We do not have to take anyone now: we can pick and choose." I suddenly realized that he was looking at the situation from a completely different point of view. He wanted a pool of unemployed, whereas I was trying to get a man a job. I can see that members opposite and members on this side look at these matters differently.

Mr. Millhouse: I think you'd better name the member so that he can defend himself.

Mr. JENNINGS: He knows to whom I am referring.

Mr. Evans: Speak to the member for Adelaide and find out how Liberal members are concerned about jobs.

Mr. JENNINGS: The member for Adelaide is not here.

Mr. McAnaney: Why have we got worse unemployment now than we had in 1968?

Mr. JENNINGS: We have not; that is a lot of nonsense.

Mr. Gunn: You're talking a lot of nonsense.

Mr. JENNINGS: The honourable member does not understand what I am saying, because he has never had to deal with people who have had no source of employment. The only people who have worked for him have been people who have been glad to get a few dollars a week and to sleep out in the barn somewhere. That is the kind of employment given by members such as the members for Eyre and Rocky River, and people such as that.

Mr. Gunn: With a reputation like yours, you should be the last to talk about other people.

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not know what that is supposed to mean. I have not found jobs in the country very attractive, but perhaps that is because I do not like some of the members I meet in the country at times. I am pleased to see that \$2,000,000 will be spent in this way. I am certain that this will be the means

of getting something rolling in the way of employment for skilled and semi-skilled Workers in the urban area. I am pleased to support the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This is the most blatant piece of electioneering we have seen in the House, certainly during this Parliament. The mover of this motion and his Party have only one object in moving the motion, and that is to help their colleagues at the forthcoming Commonwealth election.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It's to help the unemployed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Members opposite have no more intention of helping the unemployed by moving this motion than they have of flying to the moon. The only reason for the motion is that members opposite hope to get a bit of publicity for what they have done in making available \$2,000,000 for urban unemployment relief, and to sling a bit more mud at the Commonwealth Government, hoping they can make it stick. There is no other reason for the motion. The motion does not mention the recent Commonwealth Budget but it refers back to 1970 and 1971, studiously avoiding the 1972 Budget, and that shows that what I am saying is correct. The fact that members opposite have omitted to mention the 1972 Budget, which they know will stimulate the economy of the country and reduce unemployment, is the sincerest compliment any of them can pay to the Commonwealth Government. Their ignoring the measures taken by the Commonwealth Government to stimulate the economy shows a lack of sincerity and it shows that they know that the Commonwealth Budget will be most effective.

Mr. Clark: It's just bribery.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is not quite what the Leader of the honourable member's Party in the Commonwealth Parliament has said about the Budget. If it is bribery, let the honourable member show how it is and how he thinks it ought to be altered. He and his colleagues have studiously avoided mentioning that Budget in this debate.

Mr. Clark: What about getting on to the unemployed?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was replying to the honourable member's earlier interjection.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, the member for Elizabeth is the one interjecting. He followed one interjection up with another and said,

"What about getting on to the unemployed?" I expected that the member for Ross Smith would have deferred to the Premier, allowing the Premier to speak before him, as the Premier tried to rise when the member for Ross Smith rose. While the honourable member was speaking at length, my Leader was kind enough to jot down the various percentages of unemployed in the Australian States.

Mr. Clark: Are they true?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They are the latest figures.

Mr. Clark: Where did you get them?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They come from the *Monthly Review of the Employment Situation*, August, 1972, issued by the Department of Labour and National Service, so I hope the honourable member accepts their authenticity and accuracy.

Mr. Clark: But they are not the latest figures.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They are the figures up to the end of August. I do not know whether the honourable member has any later figures.

Mr. Clark: Yes. They have been published in the press, and you should mention them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know why the member for Elizabeth is so keen to prevent my getting the figures out of my mouth. Let me point to some significance in these figures. My Leader points out, in regard to the interjection by the member for Elizabeth that these are not the latest figures, that this information was embargoed until 9 p.m. on Monday, September 18, only two days ago. I wonder whether the member for Elizabeth will listen now.

Mr. Clark: I am not sure: it depends on how rubbishing you get.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the three Labor-governed States, the percentage of unemployment is highest. The figures for those States are as follows:

	Percentage unemployed
South Australia-Northern Territory .	2.49
<u>Western Australia.....</u>	<u>2.89</u>
<u>Tasmania.....</u>	<u>2.36</u>

The Australian average is 1.73 per cent. I do not know whether members opposite think there is any significance in that position. The Premier was blocked from speaking previously but perhaps later he will explain to the House the significance of those figures. I think they speak for themselves and I support the Government's action in making the \$2,000,000 available. I point out, as I did in another debate

last week, that already nearly 40 per cent of our revenue in South Australia comes directly from the Commonwealth Government.

It is easy for the Premier to say, as he said last week, that we should have a \$1 for \$1 subsidy on money for this purpose. It would not matter if the Commonwealth Government did give that: he would still have said that that was not enough. Why did he not make it \$2 for \$1 and ask the Commonwealth Government for \$4,000,000? This Government has done well indeed out of the Commonwealth Government this year and, to a lesser extent, in previous years. The Government must stand up to its own responsibilities, and this is one of them.

The Premier knows that it is utter nonsense for the head of one Government to say, without warning, to another Government, "You must suddenly find me \$2,000,000 because I am asking for it." That cannot be done, as the Premier knows, and he was electioneering. The Premier said, as the member for Ross Smith got up, that we were not asking for the Commonwealth subsidy. I hope I have made clear that, in our view, it is the responsibility of the State, and the Commonwealth Government is already doing much through the Budget and in many other ways to improve the economy.

The Premier also said that we did not want a Premiers' Conference. He may have forgotten, but I remind him that a report appeared in the newspaper only four days ago, when comments were sought from other States regarding a Premiers' Conference on unemployment. I remind the Premier of what Sir Robert Askin (Premier of New South Wales) said about this matter. This report appears in the *Advertiser* of September 16:

In Sydney the New South Wales Premier said that the Premiers could not agree on the need for an immediate conference on unemployment when he had asked them in July.

That was two months ago. The report continues:

He had sought their views after an approach by the Tasmanian Premier (Mr. Reece). It was decided to defer the question of a special Premiers' Conference for further consideration until later in the year if there had not been a significant improvement in the overall employment situation by then, Sir Robert said.

Last week the Premier brought forward this suggestion as though it was his original suggestion, when the matter had been discussed by him (I presume he had his say) and his colleagues in July. When Sir Robert Askin, the senior State Premier, canvassed the other

Premiers, a Premiers' Conference was not agreeable to a majority of them. These are some of the pertinent facts which need to be put before the people of this State and which have been completely lacking in the speech made by the member for Mawson in support of the motion. I listened with great attention to the member for Mawson and I agree with much of the early theoretical part of his speech. Nobody in this day and age, whatever the position may have been in the 1940's, would agree with Archbishop Temple. Indeed, I do not know whether the honourable member thinks that any person would agree.

Mr. Jennings: The member for Glenelg doesn't agree with the "Red Dean".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Glenelg may have made that mistake, but I am sure that he, like any other member in this House, would agree with the sentiments expressed by the Archbishop. However, those sentiments are not really relevant to the matter under consideration. I strongly support the amendment moved by the Leader, which I have seconded, because it includes what every member opposite knows should have been included in the original motion—a praiseworthy reference to the 1972 Commonwealth Budget. That members opposite deliberately omitted this reference is the most sincere comment that could have been made. This amendment redresses that omission because it congratulates the Commonwealth Government on the steps taken in its Budget, and it also does what the member for Mawson wants us to do: it supports this Government in action it has taken. However, it does cut out these piffling and trifling suggestions that this Government has put in its motion regarding the subsidy and the Premiers' Conference (and this is perhaps the biggest piece of effrontery) to a point where it is suggested that this House should call on the Commonwealth Government to urge other States to implement similar programmes to that which the Premier has announced here but about which we have been given no details. I have looked at press reports in vain for any concrete proposals that this Government has submitted on this matter, yet we are to urge the Commonwealth Government to urge, in turn, the other States to implement similar programmes.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Do you oppose it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course I oppose it. I oppose it strongly: first, because it is none of our business what happens in the other

States; and secondly, because we do not know yet what this Government intends to do. We have only the most vague and the most airy-fairy suggestions about what the Government will do. We have had promises from the Premier that his programme will not mean moving mounds of dirt from one point to another, but we do not know what is involved. The amendment before us is a proper statement because it goes as far as we can go in the light of present information from the Government. The amendment restores a little fairness and takes out of the motion what is so obviously in it at present as an attempt by this Labor Government to help its colleagues in the Commonwealth sphere.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I should have thought that, if members opposite had any real concern for providing money in sufficiently significant proportions to make a real inroad into the plight of about 9,000 unemployed persons in the Adelaide metropolitan area, they would support the motion.

Dr. Eastick: Only if its proposals were properly put.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The proposals in the motion are designed to provide the moneys that the State Government has promised by further stretching its deficit. I point out that this is stretching our deficit and that we, in this State, do not have large sums to spend. Members opposite have been urging me not to spend money but to reduce taxation, but I point out that these proposals will spread our deficit further. I should have thought that, if there were real concern for the unemployed in their misery and plight (and it is a misery and plight), members opposite would be enthusiastic in supporting a plea to the Commonwealth Government in this area. The member for Mitcham says that a plea to the Commonwealth Government is purely a political ploy.

Mr. Millhouse: Of course it is.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let us just see about that. I notice that the honourable member has not said to the Commonwealth Government that it is not the Commonwealth Government's responsibility to produce moneys to assist the unemployed in rural areas. Apparently, it is perfectly all right for the Commonwealth Government to pay out money in relation to the unemployed outside the metropolitan area, but apparently the plight and misery of unemployed people in the metropolitan area is of a different quality. It

is not the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government, according to the honourable member.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What is the difference? Where is the basic difference in principle between assisting people unemployed outside the metropolitan area and assisting people unemployed in the metropolitan area? This is not the first time that this situation has been raised.

Dr. Tonkin: You have used that technique too often.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has used his technique a little too often. Let me instruct him about recent events which have occurred in Canberra and about which he knows nothing. At the last Premiers' Conference and at the conference earlier this year, the most bitter attack on the Prime Minister over his refusal to provide money for urban unemployment relief came not from the Labor Premiers: it came from Sir Gordon Chalk. The appeal made in February this year and the appeal he made backing up the applications of Mr. Tonkin, Mr. Reece and me in June of this year was from the Queensland Treasurer.

Mr. Clark: Was he being political?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No; the fact was that he had seen, in relation to his own electoral situation this year, that his biggest problem was in respect of the metropolitan unemployed, and he made a plea on the same basis to the Commonwealth Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Treasurer: that it was vital for the Commonwealth Government to involve itself in providing assistance to create jobs for metropolitan and urban employment and that it was unfair of that Government to ignore this problem. In June this year the matter was again taken up by the Labor Premiers, who pointed out that in the smaller States the problem of urban unemployment was greater than in the eastern industrialized States where industries were more diverse and closer to markets, and that, therefore, the specific problems of those industrialized areas which were far from their markets had to be given special consideration by the Commonwealth Government. The Prime Minister adamantly refused. He said that, although help was to be given to the rural unemployed, there was to be no special programme of the Commonwealth Government in relation to urban unemployed.

Dr. Eastick: But he did discuss it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: But he did not discuss it for long. He simply said that his Government was not going to do anything about it.

Mr. Millhouse: You're asking us to accept all this through your eyes, and that is rather weak.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member was not there. I suggest that he take this up with his colleagues in the other States and check with the Prime Minister if he wishes. I am telling him what happened at the Premiers' Conference. When the honourable member hears about anything happening at the Premiers' Conference that he does not like, he says he cannot believe it, because it is someone on the other political side of the fence who was there and who is telling him. These matters were listed, and they were raised. The problem was referred to, and the Prime Minister said that the measures that had been taken at that time, before the Commonwealth Budget, would cope with the position of metropolitan unemployed. He was confident, as Mr. Lynch has now said that he is confident (and as he has been saying for some time that he is confident), that the problem of unemployed would steadily disappear. Well, it has not disappeared: it is here with us, and it is here in real and large measure.

In simple human terms, it is a problem of sheer misery for the people involved. The Government has provided \$2,000,000, and the member for Mitcham has said that we have not told him much about the programme. I can tell him, as I have said publicly, that it is on the same basis as that of the programme that we have administered in relation to rural unemployed, and we have made exactly the same statements of principle in relation to the matter as were made by his Commonwealth colleagues when they announced their programme of rural unemployment aid.

Dr. Eastick: You haven't projected it that way.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have said that the basis of administration will be the same; the only major difference is that in some cases we shall be able to use direct Government employment instead of local government employment. However, the major part of it will be undertaken through local government the same as in the case of rural unemployment.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you worked out the allocations yet?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They will depend on the applications, as has happened

concerning the other programme and, until we get applications from local government, we can hardly allocate the money.

Mr. Millhouse: What about Government departments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They have made their submissions, which are now being processed.

Dr. Eastick: What will be the extent of the employment of skilled and semi-skilled?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Naturally, we are concentrating on the employment of unskilled.

Dr. Eastick: Does this involve permanent works?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. We expect to be able to use some of this money on foreshore work where we shall be able to use unskilled labour, and the work will be of permanent and lasting value. That is the sort of thing we are examining. The Commonwealth Government has a duty in this area. The overall economic policies of this country are, because of the position under the Loan Council, involving the Financial Agreement and the uniform income tax system, in the hands of the Commonwealth Government. Economic policy is basically formulated there, and the results of economic policy to this nation are the results of policies in Canberra. Members know perfectly well that what we can effect in the way of economic policy through measures we implement within this State is only marginal.

The responsibility for the maintenance of full employment is basically that of the Commonwealth, involving its economic policy, and it is nonsense to say that it is not the Commonwealth Government's responsibility to cope with the position of people who are unemployed at present. The Opposition says that we are forgetting all about the recently passed Budget: we are not forgetting about it, but has it had any marked results yet?

Dr. Eastick: Have you let it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not believe in waiting to let it have results when members of the Commonwealth Government themselves say that it will be months before it has any results. In the meantime, what happens about the unemployed?

Dr. Eastick: What about spending \$2,000,000 without waiting for a subsidy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have said that I am going ahead with the expenditure of \$2,000,000, and I have not made it a condition that I get a subsidy from the Commonwealth Government. I am asking members to support this Government's spending

\$2,000,000, and to support our asking the Commonwealth Government to grant another \$2,000,000. While the member for Mitcham talks about the number of people unemployed in this State compared to that in other States, he apparently overlooks the fact that the number of rural unemployed in this State is the smallest in Australia. Does he say that that is the result of the existence of a Labor Government in this State? He has to make up his mind one way or the other; he cannot have his cake and eat it too.

Dr. Eastick: Many people have to come to the city.

Mr. Coumbe: That's what the member for Peake was suggesting last night.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position a few moments ago was that the member for Mitcham said people were going out of the city to get employment in the rural areas.

Dr. Eastick: No he didn't.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We were told that part of the rural unemployment relief programme applied to people in urban areas—

Dr. Eastick: That's so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —and from urban areas.

Dr. Eastick: They're an integral part of it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reason for the small number of rural unemployed in South Australia is the specific configuration of industry in South Australia; we have a far smaller proportion of unemployed and, consequently, a far smaller proportion of Commonwealth moneys than the proportion of our population to the population of Australia is being paid here in unemployment relief.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, what conclusion do you draw?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I draw two conclusions: first, what the honourable member was suggesting a few moments ago about the responsibility of the Labor Government in South Australia regarding the proportion of unemployed is nonsense; and, secondly, the Commonwealth Government is not making its contribution to the overall unemployment situation in South Australia the same as it is doing in respect of the larger States.

Mr. Millhouse: I'm afraid I can't follow that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member would not want to. Obviously, if we were to take the sum being paid in relation to the total unemployed in the larger States, we would see that they are getting

more than we are getting, because they have a higher proportion of rural unemployed.

Mr. Evans: Haven't they a higher proportion of population? Are they getting any more per capita?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They are getting more per capita. If the honourable member looks at the figures in relation to rural unemployment provisions, we are getting the smallest sum per capita of any State.

Mr. Millhouse: I think you're drifting into deep water now.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members are trying to crayfish—

Mr. Millhouse: To what?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: To crayfish!

Mr. Millhouse: I think "crawfish" is the expression.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sorry; I do not agree with the honourable member's pronunciation. With respect to him, I think I am as much of an authority on this as he is.

Mr. Millhouse: Look at it in *Hansard* tomorrow!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Next year perhaps! In this matter, members opposite do not want to face up to the responsibility of asking their Commonwealth colleagues for money, which so far those Commonwealth colleagues have not been willing to pay in relation to a problem which is their responsibility and to which they are not yet facing up. According to members' own Commonwealth colleagues for some time now, the unemployment figures will improve. In the meantime, what happens about the people who are unemployed? The \$2,000,000 will not employ them all. Is there no reason to ask the Commonwealth Government to bear its responsibility in relation to urban unemployment, as it has seen fit to believe it should assume it in relation to rural unemployment? Where is the difference in responsibility? Where is the difference in human misery? Why do Opposition members not believe that it is proper to say to the Commonwealth Government that this is something for which it has a responsibility, at least as much as we have. I believe it has very much more than we have as a State Government. As to calling a Premiers' Conference, a conference was asked for by Mr. Reece in July, and I supported him. The Liberal Premiers were not willing to proceed to a conference then, and the Prime Minister was not willing to hold one, but the point of view expressed by Sir Robert Askin in his statement to newspapers earlier this week was that

there was no point in holding a Premiers' Conference immediately to deal with the unemployment situation, because we had to see what happened to the unemployment figures. We have seen what has happened: they have become no better but, in fact, have become worse, and on present indications (and this is the advice to me by the economists to this Government) there will be 170,000 unemployed persons in Australia at the end of January.

Mr. Harrison: And the position will be worse.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I make that prediction with some confidence, because it was on the same advice that I made earlier predictions about what would happen this year in relation to the unemployment situation and, unhappily, they have proved to be true.

Mr. McAnaney: For three years you have been wrong most of the time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member believes that everything said by this side is wrong and, when it is correct, he ignores it. The fact is that a Premiers' Conference, even on Sir Robert Askin's own statement of the basis of his postponing the request in July, should now be held, and to refuse to hold a conference at this stage to cope with a most grievous human problem shows a callous disregard of people who are unemployed.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you a plan to put before the conference?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certainly I have.

Mr. Millhouse: What is it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Apparently, the honourable member has not been reading the things I have been releasing at Premiers' Conferences for the last three years.

Dr. Eastick: Isn't the passing of the Budget important?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is important. Some of the measures that I had previously advocated were included in the Commonwealth Budget, and I welcomed those measures at the time. However, it has taken so long for the Commonwealth Government to react to the situation facing it economically that it now needs to do far more to over-compensate for its last year's budgetary policy than it has done in its most recent Budget. As a result of this Budget, money has not been released but is going into bank accounts. Reports indicate that money is not being spent on things we produce in this State, but is going to bank accounts, which are now stand-

ing at the highest level in the history of the Commonwealth. We should tackle this problem honestly and together. We are doing our bit, and we are asking the Commonwealth Government to confer so that we can introduce measures to cope with this situation.

Dr. Eastick: They asked you to come in on Dartmouth, but how long did it take you to get there?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader is now introducing red herrings.

The Hon. L. J. King: They are getting desperate when they have to change the topic.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course. This tactic unhappily exposes the lengths to which Opposition members are willing to go politically, because of the forthcoming Commonwealth election.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If Opposition members were concerned with the situation of unemployed people in South Australia instead of making political points, they would support the request to the Commonwealth Government to assist in supplying moneys for urban unemployment relief which this State needs and which we cannot do without, if we are now to employ people in the short term. Opposition members cannot suggest that the short-term unemployment position will be any different from the present position.

Mr. McAnaney: Why not encourage the people to spend money?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If Opposition members believe in a federal system and believe in obtaining a concerted plan to cope with the situation, they will support the calling of a Premiers' Conference to get together with Commonwealth and State authorities in order to introduce measures to ensure that we tackle the problem effectively.

Mr. SIMMONS (Peake): I, too, support the motion. We have a situation in which the skies over Canberra are black with chickens coming home to roost. The Commonwealth Liberal Government is now reaping the harvest it sowed, and the immediate cause of the trouble in which it finds itself (and which is affecting the economy of Australia) is the stupid financial policy that was followed by the various Commonwealth Governments that held office in Canberra last year. The motion refers to the Budgets of 1970 and 1971. I shall not deal with the 1970 Budget, except to say in passing that in 1970 we saw the stupid excise tax of 50c. a gallon on wine, a tax that did little to help the South Australian economy. In 1971, we had two

financial policies enunciated, because we had two Prime Ministers in Canberra, and the present situation of the economy has been caused by the schizophrenia, in the Commonwealth Liberal Party. To refresh the memory of members, I remind them that the then Prime Minister, Mr. J. G. Gorton (who in some areas is now considered to have been good compared with the present incumbent), said on January 29, 1971:

Although in some ways the matter has been perhaps a little overdramatised, there is a very real problem for discussion on the problems of inflation—the problem of present rises in costs and prices and the prospects for the future. In considering what action should be taken, Cabinet sought first to discover the areas in which demand seemed to be growing most strongly. It appeared that consumer spending was not growing strongly.

I shall return to that statement, but in January last year Mr. Gorton thought that consumer spending was not growing strongly. Of course, he has to be right some times. Mr. Gorton continued:

The areas in which demand is growing strongly are in the public sector—that is, spending by Governments, in private investment in new plant and machinery, and in non-dwelling building construction. The first line of attack, therefore, should be to ensure not only a restraint on Government expenditure, but a reduction this financial year. All departments have been instructed to restrain the growth in the number of public servants, and reductions in other directions of the Government's budgeted expenditure are being worked on.

The rate of growth of new private investment in plant, equipment and machinery must also be reduced, as also must the rate of growth and the demand pressures of new non-dwelling building construction. As a considerable proportion of the latter demand is said to be due to the inflow of overseas capital for the specific purpose of building such buildings, the Government wishes it to be known that it would prefer overseas investors of this kind not to finance such construction until they have discussed with the Treasury their plans and the dates on which they propose to begin construction.

How did he implement this suggestion? First, the States went to the Prime Minister, but at a conference on February 4, the then Prime Minister (Mr. Gorton) refused requests by the six State Premiers for assistance towards meeting their 1970-71 Revenue Budget deficits of more than \$120,000,000 additional to that being provided under the revised revenue assistance arrangements settled at the Premiers' Conference on June 25 and 26, 1970. In addition, at about the same time the taxation allowance on plant was suspended,

because the Commonwealth Government had the idea that the rate of growth of private investment on new plant and machinery had to be reduced. At that stage, the Commonwealth Government's view was that the problem was caused by over-Government spending and not by excessive consumer spending. However, fortunately for Australia (in one sense at least) there was a change of Prime Minister in the next two or three months. The incoming Prime Minister had to show how different he was from his predecessor, so there was a further Premiers' Conference on April 5. The present Prime Minister, wishing to make himself a good boy, said at that further conference that additional Commonwealth assistance to the States of \$43,000,000 for 1970-71, divided in proportion to their 1970-71 financial assistance grants, would be agreed to. Mr. McMahon, said that there had been agreement about the need for continued strong resistance to the inflationary trends in public expenditures on goods and services, but there was recognition by the Commonwealth Government of the difficulties confronting the States in financing their prospective Budget deficits for 1970-71.

When Mr. McMahon took office, he gave to the States \$43,000,000 of the \$120,000,000 that was urgently needed, this need having forced this Government to introduce certain taxation measures that were criticized yesterday by Opposition members. The next action by the Commonwealth Government was taken in its Budget of August, 1971, about which the *Advertiser* headline stated "Snedden Budget is Belt-Tightener". This article stated:

An anti-inflationary Budget designed to tighten the belts of most Australians—

it certainly succeeded in doing that—

was handed down by the Commonwealth Treasurer last night during a stormy Parliamentary session.

It would have been stormier if the people had fully realized what was coming. The present Commonwealth Treasurer had an idea that even Gorton did not accept and, in August last year, he decided that the problem was being caused by demand inflation (excessive demand), so he took action (logical action, if his original premise was right) to reduce that demand. He increased personal income tax by 21 per cent; he increased the price of petrol, cigarettes, and prescribed medicines; he imposed a steep rise in radio and television fees; he provided for increases in telephone call charges and rentals; and he increased the postal rate to 7c. As a result of all this,

he was able to provide a Budget surplus of \$630,000,000.

The whole effect of that Budget was to reduce consumer spending. The member for Heysen spoke about urging people to spend their bank balances. Spending was really stopped in August last year by the present Prime Minister and Commonwealth Treasurer. At that time, it was necessary to take action against cost inflation, but the policy adopted by the Commonwealth Government was directly opposed to reducing cost inflation. It is axiomatic that, if charges are increased (and telephone and postal charges, petrol prices, and so on were increased by that Government), this will cause prices to rise still further and costs to rise. Last year, we had two separate policies diametrically opposed. As a result, in the last year we have seen a marked falling off in consumer spending, and this has hit this State as hard as it has hit any other State in the Commonwealth.

Mr. McAnaney: You've put up taxes on cars, and so on.

Mr. SIMMONS: All the tax increases made by this Government in the last year or two have been as a result of the Commonwealth Government's refusing to accept its responsibility last year. It has belatedly come to terms with the situation this year because there is an election coming up. At the time of the Commonwealth Budget last year, the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition said that it was a perfect recipe for stagflation, growing inflation and growing unemployment. He also predicted that that Budget would cause widespread increases in prices. What he said was much closer to what happened than was what the present Treasurer and the Prime Minister said. Therefore, the immediate cause of the present unemployment has been the policy of the Commonwealth Government in August last year. The recent Commonwealth Budget has belatedly recognized that there was, rather than excess demand, a grave shortage of demand, but it is doubtful whether that Budget's provisions will take effect for some time.

The other major chicken coming home to roost in relation to this problem is the matter of structural unemployment. This is long-term hard-core unemployment that I believe makes up a significant part of the present problem. One of the groups affected by structural unemployment is the young. On September 2, the *Australian* contained the following article under the heading "New Class of Hard-Core Unemployed":

Thousands of school and university leavers are forming a new hard-core group of unemployed throughout Australia. Figures released yesterday show that 25,000 school and university leavers were out of work in February, and by August there were still 3,500 school leavers alone out of work. They have been on the dole for nearly 10 months since leaving school. Many hundreds of ex-university and college students are still hunting for a job. This new jobless class is still strong in numbers eight weeks before another 200,000 more students are about to leave schools, universities and colleges in search of work.

The jobless situation for school leavers has been so bad this year that a senior official of the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service said: "Significant numbers of young people went back to school because they couldn't get a job. The premise of the Budget is that it will create many more jobs, but it is not known when this will begin to happen."

The position is that many of those who left school last year are still unemployed and, in a short time, another large group of school and university leavers will come on to the labour market seeking non-existent jobs.

Dr. Eastick: Doesn't that happen annually?

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes, but in one year we normally get rid of the residue of school leavers of that year. The present Commonwealth Government will be faced with the situation where it will still be trying to find jobs for school leavers from last year while at the same time 200,000 new school leavers will come on to the labour market.

Mr. Evans: Has any country in the world achieved the object you're talking about?

Mr. SIMMONS: For most of the post-war years, even though we have had Commonwealth Liberal Governments in power, we have had a relatively low number of unemployed, so judged on the performances of those previous Commonwealth Liberal Governments alone the present Commonwealth Government stands condemned.

Mr. Evans: We still do better than any other country.

Mr. SIMMONS: If the honourable member wants us to reach the stage of the United States, which has 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 unemployed all the time, that is his choice. We see a non-socialist Government in Britain, but Britain has nearly 1,000,000 unemployed. That is also an example I do not want to see Australia emulate.

Another group affected by strikes or long-term unemployment comprises the unskilled. I am delighted to see this move by the Government, the subject of this motion, paying attention to the plight of these people. We often find that several of these categories coalesce

in the one person; if that person is young and unskilled and a migrant, he is in an especially unhappy position. A growing group of structural unemployment is made up from semi-skilled and unskilled persons. No body stands condemned for this more than the present Commonwealth Government.

In September, 1967, I attended a seminar at the University of Sydney, a symposium on "Automation: Threat or Promise?" Several speakers commented on the level of activity and preparedness in Australia for automation and other forms of technological change. The only people satisfied with what was going on were two politicians who addressed the seminar—the New South Wales Minister of Labour and Industry and the Hon. Leslie Bury, at that time Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service. Of course, he, with a number of his colleagues, has been buried in the upheavals of the past year or two. They were happy about what was going on. Mr. Bury said:

The Department of Labour and National Service has been concerned with various aspects of technological change, and research conducted by the Technological Change Section has been quite wide ranging. They have done quite a lot of work on electronic computer installations, and have published a report on employment associated with E.D.P. We have had a working party employed on research into technological change in the printing industry, and are presently working on two projects in that industry. Other areas of research include questionnaire-cum-interview studies of the employment of technicians in industry; the mechanization of sugar cane harvesting; numerically controlled machine tools; industrial instrumentation; and brick making.

I suggest that this is simply playing with the problem. Although he announced the need for suitable initial training, Mr. Bury hardly referred to a training scheme such as the one that occupies so much attention in the United States of America. At the same symposium Mr. G. E. Ford (Senior Lecturer in Industrial Relations at the University of New South Wales) gave a paper pointing out that retraining is not a solution to the many problems arising out of the increasing pace of technological change. Retraining is one of the major problems. Therefore, it must be studied as one of the problems and not merely regarded as one of the elixirs for the problems of automation and technical change. In other words, it is absolutely necessary that we have adequate retraining schemes, but a tremendous amount of research must go into the schemes themselves before they can be

made to work. The Commonwealth Government at that time was simply playing with the problem, looking into the matter of mechanization of sugar cane harvesting, technological changes in the printing industry, and so on.

So much for what was being done five years ago. What is happening at present? It may be said that things have improved in the meantime and that the Commonwealth Government has begun to recognize the problem that was recognized in America many years ago. In 1965 a paper was presented at a conference in Melbourne. Also, in *New Society* of May, 1963, Mr. Howard Coughlin (President of the Office Employees International) said that the unemployment of clerical and kindred workers in the United States had risen as follows:

January, 1957, 263,000 or 2.8 per cent of the total.

January, 1960, 381,000 or 3.8 per cent of the total.

January, 1961, 438,000 or 4.2 per cent of the total.

January, 1962, 466,300, or 4.6 per cent of the total.

The figure had increased by 200,000 people in this sector of employment over a period of five years; and those figures related to periods more than 10 years ago. That period began at about the time of the introduction of computers in the United States. By 1962 the process was well under way, and official investigations into the effects of computers on office employment were being carried out by the U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics.

That was the position in America 10 years ago, and anyone who wished could have seen it. In March of this year Dr. Gun (Australian Labor Party member for Kingston in the Commonwealth Parliament) said that it was not often we got a chance to examine schemes of the Commonwealth Liberal Government. He went on to say:

This is because it is so unusual for it actually to do anything. The Liberal Party philosophy being what it is, to leave people and events to be overrun by blind market forces, it is rare for any proposals to be presented which intervene and try to help people.

Dr. Gun continued:

As the Opposition has pointed out on a number of occasions, there is a need for a lot of attention to be given to the problems of re-education for workers made redundant, but this present so-called scheme of the Government is nothing but a hollow gesture. It is a total failure and the Minister for Labour and National Service (Mr. Lynch) knows it. For the benefit of those who are not already aware

of the fact, I point out that I have received the astounding information from the Minister for Labour and National Service that a total of two people throughout Australia are receiving help under this employment retraining scheme and, furthermore, that a further two people have been approved for training assistance in the near future. Surely this must be the greatest fraud ever inflicted on the working men and women of Australia.

Dr. Gun also referred to problems in the vehicle building industry. He said:

Apparently the car manufacturers have made a decision to reduce the frequency of vehicle design from two-yearly intervals to five-yearly intervals. The effect of this has been to reduce the need for certain tradesmen within the industry, tradesmen such as pattern makers and tool makers, I would have thought that these men would have benefited from retraining.

Yet such men are precluded from retraining. That is the type of retraining scheme the Commonwealth Government has put into operation, after having been warned since 1965 at the Melbourne conference run by the Victorian Chamber of Manufactures. The matter was thoroughly thrashed out at that time, it was thrashed out again at the Sydney symposium in September, 1967 and now, in 1972, the Commonwealth Government has a scheme which has retrained four people in the face of unemployment running into six figures. That is why this motion draws attention to the lack of activity and the mistakes made by the Commonwealth Government, and it is also why the Commonwealth Government has a very definite responsibility to accept some of the burden of relieving this problem.

Another group especially affected by structural unemployment consists of migrants. It is significant that the Commonwealth Government has conducted a survey of the economics of migration and has refused to make the resultant White Paper available, although surely this is a field in which the public should be informed of the effects of a major Commonwealth policy. Coming closer to home, yesterday I had an interview with a constituent of mine, a migrant who has been in Adelaide for five months. Having come from Melbourne with a wife and three young children, he has been out of work for the past three months. He is receiving \$38.50 a week and is paying \$24 a week in rent. He does not know what to do about a letter he has received from the landlord regarding his being two weeks in arrears of rent. Last evening I met a social worker and her husband who were working in the Hindmarsh and Brompton area. They told me that in one group 54 Greek fathers were out

of work, yet the Commonwealth Minister for Immigration blindly pushes on with a migration programme in which the migrants are the main victims of unemployment brought about by the inactivity and ineffectiveness of the Commonwealth Government. There is also much unemployment in the rural industries, a matter with which I dealt last evening.

The Commonwealth Government, because its existence depends on getting votes from country areas, has started to do something this year. However, I have shown that that Government cannot be trusted to deal with the matter properly. All its desperate activity in the last couple of months will not get it out of trouble before the election that it fears so much. What confidence can be derived from the statement made by the Commonwealth Treasurer about two weeks ago? A pertinent report states:

Australia will enjoy full employment within 12 months, the Federal Treasurer (Mr. Snedden) said yesterday. But he had no magic wand to end unemployment immediately, he said. Mr. Snedden's statement, at a Brisbane luncheon for the Liberal Party candidate for Bowman (Mr. K. Chichoni) took many Liberals by surprise. Mr. Snedden said he believed there would be a great improvement in the general employment situation in the next month as the regeneration of the economy gathered pace. In 12 months, in anyone's language, we will have full employment, he said.

About 13 months ago that man wrongly diagnosed the cause of inflation as excess demand and he did his best to ruin demand so that we have the present under-demand in Australia. As the Premier has said, any activity by a State Government is marginal. We have not the resources to make available \$2,000,000 every month. The prime responsibility for this rests with the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Venning: What about the State Government?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time expired long ago.

Mr. SIMMONS: Obviously, the assistance that the State Government can give cannot be permanent. We hope that in a few months we will have a Commonwealth Government that will take effective action on unemployment. In the meantime, our Government cannot callously sit back as the member for Mitcham suggests and hope that the Budget will do the trick. Unemployment means deprivation, misery and want amongst many people, and this Government will not let that go on without taking action to combat it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The Government has mounted several speakers but, once again, we are being nauseated by the political exercises that the Government will embark on at the drop of a hat to gain political kudos from ulterior motives. The way the motion is worded shows that this is another in the endless line of tilts at the Commonwealth Government. It is about time the State Government recognized and accepted its responsibility.

It has been said previously that this Government has had available to it more money than has any other Government in the history of this State. It has had that sort of increase this year, as shown in the Loan Estimates and in its revenue. This is a blatant political exercise to throw the blame on the Commonwealth Government, when this State Government should be taking the blame. In the period between 1965 and 1968, when the Labor Party was in Government, it was said that this State was an island of poverty in a sea of prosperity.

It is significant that at present the three Labor States have not just a marginal increase in unemployment but a significantly higher rate of unemployment than have the other States. For unemployment to decrease there must be confidence in the private sector, such as the people who operate factories and have many employees. Under a Labor Government, these business people do not have confidence. If this Government did more to co-operate with the Commonwealth Government and if it behaved responsibly, we might get somewhere.

The Labor Party has been casting around since the Commonwealth Budget was introduced to get an election gimmick and has seized on unemployment figures, hoping to build them up and throw the blame on the Commonwealth Government. The percentage figures, when taken State by State, show that this matter is the responsibility of State Governments. We should support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition and place the matter on a realistic footing. The Premier and his Government stick their noses into matters over which they have no control, such as migration, and have no substantial material to back them up. The Government has engaged in this debate this afternoon to try to embarrass the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): I thank members for the consideration they have given to this debate. I remind the member for Kavel

that the motion is not about how the Commonwealth treats the States but about how it treats the unemployed. His talk of confidence is nonsense. There have been times in the past 24 years when the unemployment rate in South Australia has been lower than the rate in any other State. Inevitably, however, as unemployment increases, the immaturity of our industrial base must show up. It was shown up in 1960, in the middle 1960's, and at present. Similar things can be said about the other two small States, as I have said in moving the motion.

I cannot accept the amendment, because clearly it implies that basically things are all right. It accepts that there is a problem but assumes that all that can reasonably be done is being done. The amendment shows that the Opposition is happy with the \$2,000,000 from this Government, but apparently it does not want the \$1 for \$1 Commonwealth subsidy; it does not want the Premiers' Conference, which would give a long and hard look at this problem; nor does it think it is appropriate that this Parliament should call on the Commonwealth to put pressure on other State Governments to take the steps that we are taking here. If, in fact, it does want these things, why are they not in the amendment? In fact, the member for Mitcham called these "piffling", as I recall. We cannot exaggerate the extent of this problem. Certain administrative measures taken with the most laudable objects are at present suppressing the unemployment figures in this country. I am led to believe that the Commonwealth Employment Office is putting a large amount of its energy and its work force into finding jobs for those who register (and that we can perfectly understand) but in doing so, of course, it takes the work force away from the counters where the people actually register. I have been told that people who come away after waiting for a long time to register are not satisfied, and that they do not bother to register. I have it on good authority that this administrative measure, which one can well understand, is responsible for the published figures being considerably less than the actual rate of unemployment that we face.

The Leader complained that no reference was made in my motion to the Commonwealth Government's scheme for rural relief. I did, of course, mention it in my speech. I said, in effect, that we were following the Commonwealth's lead here in extending to the metropolitan area something it had done in rural areas, so it seems to me that I gave

some credit there to the steps that the Commonwealth had taken; but the whole point of this motion is simply that not enough is being done and that those things that have been done are not sufficient to meet the situation that we face today.

What, in fact, is causing the abnormally high rate of unemployment in Australia? Is it automation? Is it migration? Is it Commonwealth budgetary policy? Is it the rural slump? What is it? According to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, his Commonwealth colleagues do not seem to know, nor do they seem to want to know. They are not prepared to have the sort of inquiry that the Premiers could carry out, which would give a clear indication of the way in which the Commonwealth-State policy should go; or else, as I say, they are simply supremely confident that the measures taken so far are sufficient and no more needs to be done. In fact, we read in this evening's *News* that Mr. Lynch (Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service) has said, "No more federal aid for the jobless".

I want to be fair to him. From reading the article, it is not clear whether he means simply that there will be no extension of the rural scheme or that there will be no further schemes. That is not absolutely clear, but I assume the *News*, when it put that headline there, believed it was clear on the importance of the Commonwealth Minister's statement—"No more federal aid for the jobless". That is the criticism that I and members on this side make of members opposite and their Commonwealth colleagues: they are supremely confident that the measures taken so far will be sufficient. We do not agree with them: hence, this motion. We in the Labor Party have a diagnosis and a cure—not, of course, that it can completely eliminate unemployment. There are always those who cannot be employed, who do not want employment or who are temporarily unemployed because of what is called "frictional unemployment".

Dr. Eastick: Have you ever heard of a cure being certain?

Mr. HOPGOOD: The point which I make and which I thought the member for Peake made in answer to an interjection from the member for Stuart is that the cure is one that has been implemented in the past; but what we are looking for from the present Commonwealth Government is the sort of performance we have seen from it on occasion

in the post-war years or from the Chifley Government after the war. That is the yardstick by which we measure the present performance of the Commonwealth Government—the performance of its predecessors.

We cannot just sit tight and allow the situation to blow over. The member for Mitcham took umbrage at this motion. (I believe it is a watered-down form of hemlock; in his case, I would not mind too much if it was!) He said that we had no solicitude for the unemployed but were trying to assist our colleagues in the forthcoming election to bring about a Commonwealth Labor Government. I would regard the Commonwealth Labor Party as home and hosed in the Commonwealth election, but I should like to see a Commonwealth Labor Government come into office with this problem largely eliminated. If one has to put a tremendous amount of one's resources into simply taking up the slack in unemployment, it is that much harder to implement the real programme that one wants—social welfare and education programmes, and so on. So, to that extent, I agree with the honourable member that we are trying to do something about unemployment to assist our Commonwealth colleagues to be that much more effective a Commonwealth Government when they become a Commonwealth Government, as they will in early December.

I go on and say more. The honourable member also said that we did it to get publicity. Of course we did it for that purpose. A Government does not announce a programme in the interests of the unemployed in the State and then be quiet about it; it does not announce a programme designed to get a \$1 for \$1 subsidy from a Commonwealth Government that allows one of its Ministers to say, "No more aid for the jobless" and then sit back and say, "Let us be quiet." A Government does not do that if it has any guts: it makes as much noise as possible, because making noise is the most effective political pressure that can be exerted in a democracy. Clearly, that is what we are trying to do. We are trying to force the Commonwealth Government into a course of action that we regard as satisfactory in the interests of the unemployed of this country.

I did not ignore the present Commonwealth Budget in my speech. I said that too many of the benefits in that Budget were going in directions that would not stimulate greater employment; that was my criticism of the present Commonwealth Budget. It cannot be said that that Budget was ignored in my

remarks or in the remarks made by my colleagues. It would be difficult but for the fact that, when the 1971 Budget, which we regard as the real devil at work here, was introduced, the Commonwealth Leader of the Australian Labor Party, Gough Whitlam, made certain predictions that have been carried out to the tee. I do not want to go over this ground, because it was adequately covered by the member for Peake but, when the Commonwealth Government does something and the Leader of the Commonwealth Opposition says, "This will be the effect of your action" and, in fact, that is exactly what happens, people have to go to extraordinary lengths not to accept the criticisms that were made of that action at that time. I remind honourable members that that is the situation that has developed.

Mr. Snedden's Budget was at the time called a "belt-tightener". A cartoon appeared in the *Advertiser* that referred to the "Great Australian Bite" and about postal charges being up, telephone charges being up, prescription charges being up, tobacco prices being up, petrol prices being up, television and radio licence fees being up, and the tax levy being up. Some of these things have subsequently been reduced, of course, and this in itself is somewhat of an indictment on Commonwealth budgetary policy. It is the sort of thing we have seen from year to year: charges are increased one year and reduced the next, and there just seems to be no overall scheme concerning what is going on.

I remind members opposite that their colleagues in Canberra have had 22 or 23 years to do something about the overall structure of the Australian economy. Are they now coming to us and saying, in effect, "We don't really know why from time to time these problems arise; all we know is that it's not really our fault"? Do they really think that we are willing to accept this, when they come to us and say, "Yes, we've been in office all these years but we haven't been prepared to make the structural changes which would give us effective control over inflation and unemployment"? That is exactly what we face at present. There are ways and means whereby inflation can be controlled and whereby unemployment can be kept down to something that is close to a humanly acceptable level, but these things have never been countenanced by the Commonwealth Liberal Government.

Ever since that fateful election in 1949 when Robert Menzies promised to put value

back into the pound and to remove controls, the ideology of the Commonwealth Liberal Government has been along the line that is neatly summoned up in these words by Sir Arthur Fadden: "the living death of Socialist regimentation". That was his description of life under a Labor Government that is prepared to do something to control the economy in the interests of others who otherwise from time to time will be thrown out of work. The Commonwealth Liberal attitude is a do-nothing attitude or, rather, a do-as-little-as-one-can-get-away-with-electorally attitude; a sit-on-the-backside attitude—the Buddha on Capitol Hill!

The Commonwealth Government has less central economic control than has practically any other Western-style Government. Australia has paddled around in a backwater and let the rest of the world go by. In Australia at present land sales and prices boom, the Gold Coast sprouts boatels and high-priced American entertainers; the television paints a picture of the high-living Burgess jetting around on Caltex and lighting up a Viscount, or perhaps Noel Brophy strolling out of a \$30,000 house and zipping on the doo-dah. But the grim reality is 120,000 unemployed and 1,000,000 at or near the poverty level. I urge all members to support the motion.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood (teller), Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, and Virgo.

Pairs—Ayes—Mr. Brookman and Mrs. Steele. Noes—Messrs. Wells and Wright.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Motion carried.

NATIONAL PARKS

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Leader of the Opposition:

That the regulations (general) under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972, made on June 29, 1972, and laid on the table of this House on July 18, 1972, be disallowed.

(Continued from September 13. Page 1275.)

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): I oppose

the motion. The first regulation to which the Leader objected was that which placed the princess parrot on the rare species list, and the second dealt with the labelling of packages containing protected animals or carcasses. The Leader may have been badly advised in connection with this motion, because I think he would agree that the prime reason for it was that the Government had decided to declare scarlet-chested parrots and princess parrots rare species. I point out that it is not the regulations that declare these two birds to be rare species: the National Parks and Wildlife Act, passed earlier this year, added those two types of bird to the list of rare species. All that the regulations do is lay down conditions under which people may keep these birds in their possession. So, disallowing the regulations would not have the effect that the mover intended. Some people have approached the department since the legislation has been operating and, generally speaking, people who keep birds fully support the legislation and the regulations. Some people have objected to the fact that they will not be able to sell scarlet-chested parrots and princess parrots; they claim, as the Leader claims, that those species are capable of aviary breeding and that therefore restrictions should not be placed on them. However, the overwhelming majority of those who have contacted me support the regulations. The Leader did not make it clear whether he had been approached by many people or by representatives of keepers of birds, but I point out that the President of the South Australian Ornithological Association contacted me after he had read a newspaper report of the Leader's motion. The association made the following submission:

We contend that the regulations are aimed at the conservation of native fauna, and that ethical aviculturists have nothing to fear from these regulations.

Here we have a responsible body of people—

Dr. Eastick: The Avicultural Society is responsible, too.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I have not suggested that it is not responsible. The South Australian Ornithological Association says that the regulations should remain as they are. This is not the first time that we have placed a species of bird on the schedule of rare species. There are 30 species listed in the eighth schedule, and we added these two species early this year, because of their rarity. Generally speaking, the Leader's remarks last week indicated that the species were rare. His point was that, simply because people had

been able in the past to breed and sell the birds, it was now a mistake to declare them rare. However, I point out that there are very few birds in either category in the wild. The National Parks and Wildlife Department (formerly the Fisheries and Game Department) has clear evidence of attempts to trap these birds. It is also clear that most people who keep these species act responsibly. Nevertheless, there is always a temptation for unscrupulous people to want to introduce into their aviaries species from the wild to keep up their breeding; if that was not done for an extended period, there would be detrimental effects on aviary breeding. It is therefore necessary for people to maintain the standard of the aviary birds by introducing wild birds from time to time. The department has evidence of attempts that have been made to trap wild birds.

Dr. Eastick: Can you substantiate that?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Whether I can substantiate it or not would not alter my argument. Where a rare species is threatened with extinction, it would be improper for us not to take the step we have taken. By taking this step we are acting in a way that gives the community the opportunity to breed these species in captivity. This is not the case in most other countries. During the debate earlier this year on the National Parks and Wildlife Bill I said that America, Canada and some other countries made it an offence for anyone to keep a bird under any conditions once it has been declared rare, but we have not taken that step. We believe that, if people have such birds in aviaries, if they are restricted, if the opportunity to sell them is removed and if people cannot trap them, the possibility of financial gain that could come from unscrupulous dealings is taken away. This is basically the concept behind our National Parks and Wildlife Act and the regulations under it. It is for this basic reason that we have included them in the schedule. However, I am not satisfied with the reasons put by the Leader in moving this motion. If he recognizes (and I believe from the comments he has made that he does) that these birds are rare in the wild, he should be supporting the proposal that they should not be removed from the rare species schedule and that they should not be traded in any way and should not be sold. This bird was included in the schedule for that reason.

Regarding labelling, I believe that I can summarize the Leader's argument by saying that he objected to the provision in regulation 56 that a minimum standard label measuring

16 cm by 20 cm must be placed on any package even if it contains only an egg or any other object set down in those regulations. The Leader suggested that this labelling would create many difficulties for the people concerned. He said:

That regulation also applies to the despatch of birds by public transport. There is no argument about that. It applies whether the transport is by road, rail or air. It also applies to the conveying of birds locally by the owner from one suburb to another, or from one property to the next. It applies to any transfer, whether it be on public transport or otherwise and whether it be between breeders living on contiguous properties.

I think that the Leader meant that regulation 56 applies only to dealers. However, regulation 56 (i) (a) clearly states that it relates to a place of business. Regulation 56 (i) (b) refers to a permit to keep and sell protected animals, which again refers only to commercial dealers. Therefore the regulations subject to the disallowance motion refer purely to those persons who operate a business and who are forwarding such animals or birds by some method of conveyance. They do not refer to any amateur who may be forwarding such birds or animals or purchasing them from a shop. I believe that the Leader might have misunderstood the intent of that regulation and, by taking away the argument that he put forward regarding amateurs, simply transferring from one property to another or from one suburb to another, he will realize that the object of providing this labelling system is to ensure that there are no improper dealings (and I do not believe that the Leader would deny that improper dealings take place with our native fauna, because the evidence is overwhelming and proves that this is a matter about which the Government should be concerned). It is not a hardship for an honest dealer to provide proper labelling. Accordingly, I believe that the regulations should stand.

The Leader made another point concerning labelling when he referred to the transportation of even an egg in a small box and said that this labelling procedure applied to the box. I think that members appreciate that, if it were an egg that came within these regulations, it would be properly packed and protected. However, it is unlikely that many parcels of that kind would be transported. If that condition applies and if that situation were evident, I see no reason why, despite this, the proper provision within the regulation should not apply and that a label of that size should not be attached.

Dr. Eastick: It would hardly be a receptacle that we are contemplating.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I made the point that this would be the extreme situation to which the Leader could refer, whereas the great bulk of transportations would involve much larger receptacles. The other point was in relation to monthly returns and the fees. Once again, the objection was based on the inconvenience to those persons who would be required to forward the return and the \$10 annual fee. We believe we are doing all we can as a Government to ensure that the community is given the opportunity to keep rare species in aviaries, without taking the drastic steps that have been taken elsewhere in the world by completely preventing people from having any rare species in their possession.

By doing this, we expect the community, which has been given the right to keep rare species, to appreciate the need for firm control so that this practice is not abused, and such abuse has taken place over the years. However, the unscrupulous dealings to which I have referred were evident in only a small number of cases. Nevertheless, it can be a profitable venture for anyone so inclined, and it is necessary to impose this restriction on everyone, to fully protect the situation. That is unfortunate, but it is a situation we must accept if we are to provide the community with the opportunity of keeping a rare species. It is important that we have sufficient control over the rare species that are kept, by way of sufficient information coming into the Department of National Parks and Wildlife.

The Leader said that the breeding period for birds occurred only during certain months of the year, and that therefore it was unnecessary at other periods of the year for returns to be forwarded. Although that is generally the case, it is possible for birds to breed in any month of the year. Therefore, the situation that has caused concern to the department in the past has been that persons have claimed, when there was doubt about the history of fauna in their possession, that they had been bred out of season. In those circumstances, the obligation is always on the department to prove that that is not the case but, obviously, it is virtually impossible to prove that. It is necessary for those people who come under this category, and who are given the privilege of keeping rare species of bird in captivity, to forward a monthly report so that it can be proved beyond doubt that the birds were not bred in captivity.

Many people have falsely claimed that their birds were bred in captivity simply to cover their illegal actions in taking them from the wild. One point the Leader mentioned was that of a person who might have a single Major Mitchell cockatoo kept as a pet and, under the terms of the current regulations, he would be required not only to pay the \$10 fee but also to forward a monthly return. In those circumstances, I have already announced that, under the provisions of the legislation, I am able to make special provisions in such cases that we will not require people who keep a single Major Mitchell cockatoo to lodge a return with the department and to pay the \$10 annual fee. Such people will be required to pay a \$1 annual fee and to inform the department if the bird dies or escapes; pensioner owners will be exempted from that requirement.

The other matter I should make clear is that the department is doing all it can to make the furnishing of annual reports as easy as possible. The department has printed booklets of simple forms so that people will not have the work of writing down all the changes that may occur in the number of rare species they keep. The form will be printed in such a way that it will be reasonably easy to complete. Obviously, if a person has completed a return for a certain month and there is no change in the number of birds he has from month to month, the reproduction of that form will not create any great inconvenience but should take only a couple of minutes to complete. The only inconvenience is that the person must pay 7c to post in the return. I repeat what I said earlier, namely, that by adding to the legislation itself a schedule that clearly spells out that these rare species are in danger of extinction, we ensure that these birds are fully protected, and it is in the public interest to ensure that the community will be able to enjoy these rare birds in the years to come. We will provide the proper policing powers so that those areas previously open to abuse (where birds have been taken from the wild and the department was unable to provide evidence for a conviction) will be reduced as much as possible.

The only other aspect to which I wish to refer is the matter raised by the member for Heysen, who said that a person he knew had found two rare species in the wild. The honourable member did not give me complete details of the case, but I should be interested to have them.

Mr. McAnaney: You have the letter.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I do not have it now. The department is aware of

some people who have found birds in a distraught condition and, in nearly all cases, it allowed the finders to keep them in captivity. The department is sympathetic in such cases. However, there have been cases where, obviously, some people have taken advantage of this: they have obtained birds that were illegally trapped, and claimed to have found them in an injured state. When in doubt, the department requests that the birds be freed, where practicable, or given into its care. It could be true that in some instances birds are taken from people, but where there is any doubt the department tries to prevent the extensive taking of our fauna from the wild. The comments of the honourable member were noted by the Ornithological Association and, in fairness to the department, I should tell the House of the association's comments about this matter, because they support what I have said. I quote a letter from the association that states:

The honourable member also mentions the difficulty of his constituent who picked up two birds of an extremely rare species and took them to his aviary to care for them. Our association is very keen to know about verifiable records of rare birds, and we would be most interested to learn what species they were. Perhaps he would reveal this to the Minister. Nevertheless, if his constituent's only interest was to care for them, we cannot help but wonder why he objected to their being released or given into the care of the department. This would, after all, have relieved him of a somewhat tiresome responsibility. We might add that the alternatives offered by the inspector are common practice in all other States and elsewhere in the world. Some of our own members have also had the experience of finding injured birds or having them brought to them. They have had no difficulties in explaining the circumstances (by post), and receiving a permit in return until the bird was fit to be released or donated to the zoo or Cleland Conservation Park. We have not experienced officiousness or impractical attitudes from fauna officers in such cases. In asking the House to reject the motion, I once again use the words of that association, as follows:

We contend that the regulations are aimed at the conservation of native fauna, and that ethical aviculturists have nothing to fear from these regulations.

Mr. WARDLE secured the adjournment of the debate.

BILL OF RIGHTS

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 13. Page 1280.)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): This Bill seeks to introduce into the law of South Australia a concept which, in many ways, is foreign to the traditions and the

approach of the common law, which we have inherited, in the matter of human rights. The common law shied away from the idea of formulating human rights in general and abstract terms, and the rights to which we have become accustomed were founded in our law upon specific rights created by law and specific remedies given to the citizen to enforce those rights. For instance, the right to be free of arbitrary imprisonment in our law is not a general principle formulated in the law: it is simply a remedy of *habeas corpus*, which the law provides to enable a person who has been taken away arbitrarily to assert his right to freedom by requiring those who hold him captive to bring him before a court where he can demand the legal basis on which he is imprisoned.

The idea of a Bill of Rights is new to a country like ours that has inherited common law traditions. That is not to say that the idea of a Bill of Rights is wrong and that, because it is something we have not had in the past, we should never have in future. Many people in this country share the opinion of the member for Mitcham that the time has come to adopt some general constitutional guarantees in the form of a Bill of Rights: indeed, it is the policy of the Australian Labor Party. However, it is important that we should recognize that we are treading new ground, that we are trying (if we adopt this kind of Bill) to superimpose on the common law traditions and principles the idea of constitutional guarantees formulated in the form of a Bill of Rights, and that this will produce complexity and difficulty.

In my opinion (and in the opinion of the Government) the present proposals demand most careful and searching examination, and the only way possible in which we can deal with them is by a Select Committee of the House, which can examine the implications of the proposals, and hear submissions from those in the community who are interested in this question, in order first to decide whether (if the Select Committee so recommends to the House) there should be a Bill of Rights and, if there should be, the form it should take. Perhaps two things can be said generally of the proposals in the Bill. First, attempts have been made for at least 300 or perhaps 400 years to formulate charters of human rights, and so long as they are in the form of philosophical principles, the difficulty is not great.

However, when an attempt is made to translate those principles into actual constitutional

guarantees, having legally binding force and against which the legislation that passes through Parliament has to be tested for its constitutional validity, the problem becomes much more difficult and complex. One example is the fact that the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights was formulated in a relatively short time. When attention was turned to the task of converting it into something that could become a legislative force, it took about eight years of preparation, and it has never been adopted in that form by any country as part of its domestic Constitution. This Bill, generally, is based on the Canadian Act, and several comments should be made about it.

For instance, we should examine the provision that a period of two years would elapse before antecedent laws of the State would be affected as to their validity by the Bill of Rights. To examine all the Statute law of this State in order to determine whether it would be affected by this Bill would be an enormous task, and it may well be that it could not be accomplished in two years. However, it is something that needs to be considered.

Some provisions in clause 4 need careful examination: they are stated in a general way but when we bear in mind that any law passed by Parliament has to be tested for its validity against the statements in clause 4, it will be realized how important it is to ensure that we are not adopting a measure that will make effective legislation impossible in this State.

One wonders at first glance what the effect of paragraph (e) of clause 4 would be, for instance, on the law of defamation and the law relating to indecent publications. What would be the implications of paragraph (f), the right to freedom of religion and related rights, on the powers of this Parliament? Paragraph (g) relates to the right to freedom of peaceful assembly, a right which, all of us would agree, ought to be protected, but stated in that form, as a constitutional guarantee, what are its implications as regards traffic regulations, which might have an effect on assembly in the streets and the power of police to give appropriate directions, on the regulatory provisions of the law relating to public assembly, which was passed in this Parliament in the last session, and, of course, on the principle of preference to unionists in employment, which in many ways can be regarded as the basis of industrial order?

Clause 5 also follows section 2 of the Canadian Act. It provides for the reading down of the legislation that was passed in the

Parliament so as to conform to the principles contained in the Bill of Rights. This is, of course, all right where the Parliamentary Counsel realizes that the Bill he is drafting may be affected by the provisions of the Bill of Rights. The difficulty with this type of legislation is that the Parliamentary Counsel may not realize this and that laws passed by this Parliament may be struck down, as so many have been, for infringing the American Bill of Rights.

The danger of this type of legislation that we must recognize and protect ourselves against is that it may result in a proliferation of litigation that will have the effect of involving the courts more and more in the process that has hitherto been reserved to Parliament. We could get a situation in which the courts, because they were called upon to examine each law against the Bill of Rights and to read it down to the extent required by the Bill of Rights, might actually become involved in what amounted to a legislative function.

Some of the paragraphs in clause 5 also require careful examination. The question arises, for instance, whether paragraph (b) would impinge upon the right of this Parliament to make its own decision on the question of capital punishment. Paragraph (c) (iii), which relates to one's right to have one's counsel present at any interrogation or hearing, is an interesting provision that will require some consideration. So far as I can see, it does not appear in the Canadian Act. It goes beyond the Judges' Rules that have been adopted in the United Kingdom for the code covering the interrogation of suspect persons, and it goes beyond any of the rules followed by the courts in this country. One of the aspects that would have to be considered is whether, expressed in its present form, it would mean that no interrogation could be conducted unless counsel was present or, at any rate, that any answers given in the absence of counsel would not be admissible in evidence—and that could occur whether or not the suspect person had requested counsel to be present.

I refer to these things because they are the things that a Select Committee ought to consider before making a recommendation to this House. Similarly, does the paragraph which relates to the independence of tribunals have the same effect upon our system under which magistrates are members of the Public Service? Of course, paragraph (i) would certainly deprive this Parliament of the right to retain a restricted franchise for one House of Parliament. In view of the American decision,

paragraph (j) raises some interesting questions—whether this Parliament would be deprived of the right to legislate for the provision of financial assistance to schools in which religion is taught, and whether it would have the effect of depriving this Parliament of the right to authorize religious instruction in State schools.

There are, therefore, many provisions in the Bill the implications of which need to be carefully considered. By raising these questions, I have intended not to express an opinion whether some of the implications to which I have referred are good or bad but only to point out that a Bill of Rights of this kind may have implications for the legislative process in this State which have perhaps not been fully considered by the honourable member who introduced the Bill and which certainly have not been fully considered by this House. Indeed, they could not be fully considered by this House without a full investigation. For that reason, I will in due course seek the appointment of a Select Committee. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COMMERCIAL VEHICLES)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 13. Page 1281.)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): I am delighted that the member for Bragg, who explained this Bill, is now present in the Chamber. This Bill has emanated from what one of the honourable member's colleagues described as "that geriatric home".

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We call them troglodytes.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: They are not my words but those of a member of the same political complexion as the member who sponsored this Bill. Although I will in time seek to comment on many points associated with the Bill, it is pointless for me now to develop the case that must be stated in relation to it. Accordingly, as the member for Bragg has now seen fit to leave the Chamber, the only thing I can do is seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

RIVER TORRENS ACQUISITION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill

for an Act to amend the River Torrens Acquisition Act, 1970. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is intended to invest the Minister with power to require a survey to be made delineating the boundaries of land for the purpose of acquisition under the River Torrens Acquisition Act. Under section 2 of the Act, the top of the river bank is defined as a point that is, in the opinion of the Surveyor-General, the top of the bank of the river. To reach this opinion, a survey must be undertaken. In section 3 a similar situation arises. Under this section the Minister of Works, when he has decided to acquire certain land, is required to cause a plan to be prepared delineating the land that is to be subject to the acquisition. At times the Minister may require a survey to be made before he has reached a decision about the acquisition.

The Surveyor-General does have powers of entry for the purpose of survey under section 27 (1) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1969, and section 31 of the Surveyors Act, 1935-1961. In order to remove any doubt as to the applicability of these powers, a specific right is given to the Minister to require the preparation of the appropriate plan of survey. A metric amendment is also made to the principal Act.

Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill are formal. Clause 3 enacts a new section 2a to the principal Act. This empowers the Minister to direct the preparation of a plan delineating the top of the river bank. It further provides that the provisions of Part V of the Land Acquisition Act, 1969, which concerns rights of entry, shall apply to all such surveys. Clause 4 amends section 3 of the principal Act by inserting "sixty metres" in the place of "two hundred feet".

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

In Committee.

(Continued from September 19. Page 1422.)
Schedule.

Legislative Council, \$62,045—passed.
House of Assembly, \$141,200.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the provision for the Speaker of \$14,200. The Speaker is appointed from the members of this Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no provision for the Speaker. This line deals with the House of Assembly staff.

Mr. EVANS: I just want to say that I have always believed that an independent person should be Speaker rather than a member of this Chamber.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): It is to be noted that for 1971-72 over \$10,500 above the sum voted was actually paid under the line "Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms, Clerical and General Staff". We appreciate that this was partly the result of an increase in the number of staff and in the clerical assistance, and so on, provided to members. I think that we all agree that there has been an improvement in the assistance provided for members. For 1972-73, the sum proposed is \$108,296, as against actual payments of \$92,842 last year. Is this increase to provide for the salaries and wages of the increased staff?

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): The actual expenditure above the estimate for 1971-72 was due to increases in salaries granted during the year and to the higher duty payment made while the Second Clerk Assistant was overseas. In addition, the Parliamentary Officer was appointed during the year, and typing assistance was required as relief for staff on holidays. The provision made for 1972-73 is to cover for a full year the increases in salaries made in 1971-72, and also to cover the employment of an additional two steno-secretaries.

Line passed.

Parliamentary Library, \$38,081; Joint House Committee \$69,012—passed.

Electoral, \$386,034.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the line "Fees for elections and referenda—\$151,748". As this is markedly greater than the sum provided in the past, does it include provision for a referendum in addition to the forthcoming State election?

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Attorney-General figures available for the expenditure incurred in the campaign to enrol voters for the Legislative Council? Has the campaign been concluded? If not, when will it be concluded?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain the figures; I do not have them at the moment.

Line passed.

Government Reporting, \$325,551; Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, \$14,046; Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement, \$4,100—passed.

Legislature, Miscellaneous, \$338,500.

Dr. EASTICK: I note that the allocation for "Miscellaneous" is almost \$100,000 greater than was estimated for 1971-72. Can the

Attorney-General give the reason for the marked increase in the allocation for office expenses, travelling expenses, etc.?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The increase is due to the large volume of printing of Parliamentary papers as a result of long sessions. The cost of printing rose by about 10 per cent for labour and 5 per cent for materials. Progress charges on reports paid in June were exceptionally high. That, of course, relates to the line dealing with office expenses, etc., where there is a substantial increase in the money voted. In the next line, dealing with Parliament House, there is no significant increase in the allocation for maintenance expenses. There is an increase in travelling facilities available to members and relatives of members.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Attorney-General say what the telephone expenses were during the year?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I cannot offhand but I will obtain the information.

Line passed.

Premier and Development, \$1,574,366.

Mr. CARNIE: In the Estimates of Expenditure for last year, the proposed allocation for the Premier's Department was \$1,166,067. I see that \$1,456,128 is shown here as having been voted last year for the Department of the Premier and Development. The inclusion of "Development" may account for the allocation last year being about \$300,000 greater than the amount shown in the 1971-72 Estimates. Can the Treasurer explain this?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have not last year's Estimates of Expenditure with me at the moment, but I point out that some other appropriations and Supplementary Estimates were passed in addition to the original Estimates.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Treasurer say how many inspectors are engaged on carrying out inspections under the Builders Licensing Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know the exact figure but, from memory, I think it is either two or three; I do not have here the numbers of staff. Amounts of money have been provided for clerical and inspectorial staff. There is provision for a full-time Secretary and Public Service and automatic increases. Previously, the Secretary to the board was the Assistant Secretary of the Premier's Department. We now have a full-time Secretary to the Builders Licensing Board, and Mr. Holland has been released to do his normal work in the Premier's Department.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Does the Director of the Tourist Bureau entertain many distinguished

visitors from overseas? If so, does the Treasurer consider \$50 an adequate allowance?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Director entertains certain people but, in addition to the sum shown here for his private entertainment allowance, expenditure is involved in his day-to-day work within the tourist industry.

Mr. Nankivell: It wouldn't buy too many drinks or meals.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not designed to do that. The situation is similar to that existing in respect of other officers who have to take people out to lunch or dinner and who submit a voucher for a specific sum; that voucher is approved by the accountant where it is a proper expenditure in the course of the job in question.

Dr. EASTICK: Although I notice and do not challenge a sizable increase in respect of the salary of the Director of Industrial Development, I notice that the sum provided for "Engineering, Technical, Promotion, Research and Clerical Staff" is considerably less than the sum provided last year, although it is not so much less than the sum actually spent. Can the Treasurer explain the reason for a decrease in this area, which is of vital importance to the industrial future of the State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The transfer of the engineer and his assistant to another department has caused this slight decrease. The department is not as fully staffed as some of the calls on it might demand. Despite things that have been said about an increase in the size of the Premier's Department, much frugality has occurred concerning increases in this area of our work, where we have a much smaller staff than comparable staffs in States governed by Liberal Governments. For instance, the staff employed in connection with this line comprises 10 males and two females.

Mr. WARDLE: In regard to "Publicity and information for industrial promotion", I notice that considerably less was spent last year than was voted and much less is allocated this year. Bearing in mind the possibility of promoting industry in the new town to be established, I am rather disturbed about this.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We find that the placing of advertisements in newspapers throughout the world and in certain financial journals, which run supplements and which ask, in order to feature South Australia in their supplements, that we take a certain quantity of advertising from them, has not always provided us with a satisfactory economic return. We have had a careful reappraisal of the sums spent in this area previously; the sum provided

in last year's Estimates was to cover an entirely prestige publication for South Australia, given the views expressed to us by people in other States and overseas on the contents required of a publication, and in fact we have prepared and printed one. The cost of that printing, which was considerable, will not need to be repeated this year, and the sum left for advertisements seems to us to be sufficient in relation to the area where we can get some really effective return for our money.

I think one has to be careful, in connection with industrial development advertising, not to get carried away without seeing exactly what results will accrue from that expenditure. Newspaper advertisements, which have previously been the major avenue of expenditure, seem to have a pretty minimal result. It is much better to establish, through research, specific targets in industrial development and to go after those targets directly by way of personal approach and letter. The only alternative to that is, of course, to spend vast sums far beyond the capacity of this State which would have some effect because of saturation advertising, but I really do not think we can afford that sort of thing. I think, therefore, that the reappraisal of the amount that we have previously budgeted was a sensible and economic course of action.

Mr. VENNING: I refer to subsidies towards swimming pools. Last year \$42,000 was voted and over \$35,000 was spent, yet only \$21,000 is budgeted this year. Why has there been this reduction?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is not the only swimming pool subsidy now offered, the subsidy for major swimming pools being provided under other lines. This is the reason for the reduction. A new policy was announced by the Government in the year before last concerning joint projects between the Education Department and locally interested bodies for the provision of Olympic swimming pools, and that has reduced the requirement in respect of the subsidy for smaller pools on a restricted subsidy basis.

Mr. COUMBE: The line concerning industrial promotion caters for help for industries to have a specific problem. I regret that, from the Treasurer's statement there is not apparently sufficient work for the consulting engineers, although I take it that these officers will still be available for this work even though they may be located in another department. An industry often needs assistance, and at the fiscal level it is easy to get an accountant or some other administrative officer to give

advice, whereas engineering advice is not so easy to obtain. Having a knowledge of the working of this section, I know that when such advice was available many industries in the State took advantage of the service. Although I regret that this assistance will not be so readily available in the future, I should be happy to receive an assurance that technical advice will still be available.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. NANKIVELL: What further work is to be done with respect to the Aboriginal culture centre?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A report was prepared and submitted to the Commonwealth Government asking for assistance in the establishment of an Aboriginal culture centre. The Commonwealth objected to the site on the Coorong. First, it thought that the centre was not placed on a sufficiently good tourist route, with which we disagree and, secondly, it said there was not a sufficient guarantee of water quality over a long period, as we could not guarantee the water quality beyond 25 years. As a result, the Commonwealth expressed unhappiness about subscribing to the project. As a result, further work has been done to choose another site (also within the honourable member's district), which will be satisfactory and which includes Aboriginal reserve land. That is currently under consideration and is the reason for the provision for continuing work to be done.

Mr. Nankivell: Where will it be?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Bordering the lakes.

Dr. TONKIN: What studies were carried out by consultants on the feasibility of projects, and why is it considered necessary to provide only a third of the sum budgeted last year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The preparation of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariff study on South Australia's industry by a firm of consultants was undertaken under a steering committee established by the department and the Industrial Development Advisory Council. The study has been completed and the report submitted, but it has not been published because it contains much confidential information concerning certain companies and targets of the State. The Industrial Development Division of the Department of the Premier and of Development is now preparing briefs, a number of which have been completed, as a result of the G.A.T.T. study. Mr. Belchamber has already been overseas interviewing several companies described as potential investors, and Mr. Scriven is to leave shortly to

complete other approaches relating to material reported to the Government from the study. As the study has been completed, we no longer need to engage outside consultants because we can work on this basis with officers in the department. We do not need to spend the money that we previously spent to complete the study.

Dr. EASTICK: Under Publicity and Tourist Bureau, \$11,300 is granted to local tourist associations. Will this be allocated as the result of applications and will it be a continuing annual entitlement or a grant made in respect of specific projects? The sum of \$4,000 is allocated for the Murray Valley Development League. Through its Executive Director, the league has been interested in the balanced development. Has the Government considered participating in this Commonwealth committee on balanced development, which is an off-shoot of the Murray Valley Development League?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are providing grants as in previous years to local tourist associations and these are direct grants, based on applications, and on our assessment of the work of the specific association, plus an allowance in respect of regional tourist advertising. The Murray Valley Development League approached the Government for increased funds. We pay more to the league than any other State Government has paid. The league asked for an increase in its grant to \$5,000, because of its interest in the balanced development activity. After studying the matter carefully, I considered that, given the general Budget situation, we could not go above \$4,000 but could give a significantly increased grant this year. The member for Murray will recall that I announced this at a meeting of the league in Murray Bridge.

Mr. FERGUSON: Regarding the proposed Aboriginal cultural centre, has the Treasurer considered the tourist potential of Wardang Island?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The grant in this case applies to the Aboriginal cultural centre, with an associated tourist resort to be established in the region of the Lower Murray and the lakes, but that does not rule out tourist development on Wardang Island. Tourist development on the island will be the work of the Aboriginal Lands Trust, and grants and assistance will be given by the Government to the trust to establish a tourist industry and a venture employing Aborigines on the island. A feasibility study is being undertaken by the trust for which we are

seeking Commonwealth assistance in relation to development on the island as an extension of the Point Pearce project. However, that is separate from this line and is not covered by it.

Dr. TONKIN: What does the \$1,000 for a Cornish festival represent?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has from time to time been promoting, as a major tourist venture within the State, a Cornish festival in the three mining towns of Moonta, Wallaroo and Kadina and, after some initial difficulties, apparently the festival will be held next May. A joint committee, consisting of representatives from the three towns and supported by officers of the Premier's department and the Tourist Bureau, has been appointed and plans are well under way with local organizations for the establishment of the festival which, in future, will be held over the May long weekend.

Mr. EVANS: Regarding the Windy Point restaurant, will the Treasurer explain the provision of \$1,000?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The \$1,000 this year is the consultant fee of Mr. Oliver Shaull, who conducted a feasibility study with officers of the Premier's department on the establishment of a restaurant at Windy Point. This sum includes an additional consultant fee for revisions to the plan. In order to plan a building of satisfactory size within the limits of finance specified by the Government, it may be necessary to modify Mr. Shaull's original plan. Mr. Shaull has been asked to report further, given the limitations set down for the project.

Mr. MATHWIN: Regarding subsidies towards development of tourist resorts, the sum this year is the same as last year's sum, which was underspent by about \$3,000. Does this mean that applicants for subsidies last year were about \$3,000 short and that more money could have been spent for this purpose?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: More could have been approved but, given the nature of the applications and the way we dealt with them, we did not spend the full amount, because some applications had to be referred back for additional information or for certain conditions to be met. Sometimes there is a carry-over in this way, but we try to get as close to the sum as we can in any year. It is a \$1 for \$1 subsidy on approved tourist projects.

Mr. RODDA: The line "Advertising the State" provides \$170,000, which is a considerable increase over last year's provision of \$135,000. The advertising the Treasurer has

done on the projected international hotel will no doubt create considerable interest among certain tycoons in other parts of the world who might want to use this hotel's facilities. However, there are people in the district I represent who wish to assist and avail themselves of the presence of these tycoons.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not allow the honourable member to proceed, unless the information he seeks is relevant to the line he is discussing. I will not allow an open debate on international hotels, unless it is connected with the line "Advertising the State".

Mr. RODDA: I will link up my remarks. Obviously, advertising on behalf of the State has been successful, but can the Treasurer say whether what has happened as a result of advertising by his department on behalf of the Tourist Bureau, which has interested some of my constituents in setting up plans for accommodation in my area, would entice these people to use the golf course in my area and the one across the border, at Hamilton? Is the amount of \$170,000 to be spent on tourism or to provide satisfactory facilities?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It will be spent on tourist advertising. It is not as much as was recommended to the Government, but it is within what we thought we could provide as a reasonable increase this year. Next year I expect a marked increase in tourist advertising, because then an entirely new series of facilities will be available to advertising. Also, the Film Corporation will be operating and will urgently undertake a complete review of all tourist films about South Australia. This amount relates to advertising in journals recommended by our surveys of the market for tourism. It does not relate to the international hotel: we expect final submissions from the consortium that has been negotiating with the Government as the approved submitters of a proposal. When we have received that submission and it has been appraised by the Government, I shall be pleased to give the honourable member further details.

Mr. FERGUSON: Can the Treasurer say on what the \$2,000 allocated to the National Trust of South Australia for maintenance will be spent?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It will be spent on maintaining trust properties. The major allocation to the trust this year will be the money spent at Ayers House, as we will completely refurbish it in a way that the trust could not afford. The total cost will be more than \$200,000, but the trust's only expenditure will be concerned with the collection and dis-

position of furniture. This is the greatest assistance the trust will have had.

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the \$170,000 provided for advertising the State be spent in Australia or will it be part of a world-wide advertising scheme?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It will be spent in Australia in magazines that reach the largest section of our tourist market. Our major overseas expenditure will be in New Zealand, where we have a considerable tourist market in the 40-year-old to 50-year-old age group. Most people who visit South Australia are in the 40-year-old to 60-year-old age group, and a high proportion of them come by motor car. We tend to advertise in journals that reach this group, such as the *Women's Weekly*. We would obtain European tourists only by advertising in newspapers and magazines using a mammoth campaign, and this would involve spending up to \$2,000,000. That is not the sort of expenditure we can afford, given other priorities. We are being selective about our advertising and looking to where we receive most benefit from a modest expenditure.

Mr. EVANS: The allocation to the Waikerie Gliding Club has been reduced to \$16,300, although the championship events are to be held at Waikerie next year. Does the club have to submit receipts of all expenditures before this grant is paid, or is it on a dollar-for-dollar basis or on some pro-rata rate? Is \$16,300 enough for the club to conduct the championships?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Australian gliding championships will be held first, followed by the world championships. The amount shown provides a subsidy of \$3,500 on the toilet block costs and \$12,800 granted to the Waikerie High School council towards the cost of an assembly hall. This is a special grant outside the normal education vote in order to provide an assembly hall earlier than it would normally be provided, because it will be used to house competitors at the world gliding championships. We have granted moneys to the gliding club for upgrading the toilet and ablution facilities and grassing some areas and, in addition, outside this line we have provided a watering service for the field and a special licence to enable the club to use the water. The expenditure by the State on basic provisions for the world gliding championship is more than is shown in this line, because it occurs under other lines.

Mr. EVANS: Will the Treasurer obtain details of the total cost of this project? I

understand that the gliding club has done well in oversea competitions.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Our gliding team may not be high in world competition, but I am interested in having something that will attract tourists and bring employment here.

Mr. Evans: The team did well in world championships.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It will also be a considerable facility for the town of Waikerie. To be able to win a world championship, even in a sport of this kind, is of benefit to the State. The sport has also obtained for us goodwill in other areas in which we have been negotiating with the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. MATHWIN: I would like to ask a question regarding subsidies towards the provision of swimming pools.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That question is repetitious, as an answer has already been given.

Mr. GUNN: Will the Treasurer say what instructions he or his department issues to the Tourist Bureau regarding the airline company to which Government business will be allocated? I asked a question on this matter last week. Does the Government accept the advice of people like the Minister of Roads and Transport, who has shown prejudice against certain companies?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member received an answer to this question when he asked it last week: no instructions have been issued by the Government.

Mr. Gunn: Are you willing to table all the correspondence from your department to the Tourist Bureau?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot table any correspondence between the Tourist Bureau and my department, because there has not been any.

Mr. Gunn: There has been verbal correspondence.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is lying. He says that there has been verbal correspondence, but there has been none. Why does the honourable member say something for which he has absolutely no basis whatever? How reckless can people get? Nothing has passed between my department and the Tourist Bureau regarding the company to which the honourable member has referred except his question and the letter I received from the company—nothing else. I have told the honourable member that it is the Govern-

ment's general policy to use one of the larger South Australian charter companies.

Mr. Gunn: How many aeroplanes have they got?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: South Australian and Territory Air Services owns 27 aeroplanes.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not allow debate along these lines to continue. There is nothing in this line about this matter.

Mr. WARDLE: As the Committee leaves these lines I want to commend the Treasurer for making an additional \$1,000 available to the Murray Valley Development League.

Line passed.

Agent-General in England, \$193,437—passed.

Public Service Board, \$1,263,150.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the vote for payments to consultants for services. Will the Treasurer say what type of consultants are used by the Public Service Board?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This vote is for payments for consultants in relation to work undertaken in connection with training courses and pay-roll procedures for the Police Department.

Mr. MATHWIN: I see that the allocation for this purpose has increased from \$12,000 last year to \$27,000. Will the Treasurer supply members with more information in this respect?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no more information than I have already given. Payments to all consultants are referred to the Public Service Board for examination. The board sets consultants' fees in accordance with what are considered to be conservative ruling rates. We engage consultants from time to time in various departments to examine the efficiency of certain aspects of departmental work. Since the board must cover administration worth an enormous sum, \$27,000 is quite modest.

Line passed.

Mines, \$2,679,060.

Mr. EVANS: Last year, \$130,000 was provided for boring, drilling and testing of mineral deposits, materials, special plant charges, travelling expenses, motor vehicle expenses and sundries for the Drilling and Mechanical Engineering Branch. However, actual payments were about \$28,000 less than that, and this year only \$100,000 is provided. Surely, drilling and testing must be the most important aspects of the Mines Department's functions. This State is not over-endowed with known mineral resources, and it is important for its

economic development that we continue our drilling and testing at the most rapid rate possible. Why, therefore, is there such a reduction in the vote, and why were payments last year less than the sum allocated?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is because of the difficulty of staffing the drilling teams with their full complement of technical people. We have set out a programme that we think we can meet with the staff available. Although this year's allocation is less than last year's, the sum for aerial and ground geological and geophysical surveys has considerably increased. It is certainly not possible for the Mines Department to undertake all the drilling and testing that is necessary in mineral exploration in South Australia, which is mainly undertaken by people under special licence who see some possibility of mineral development. To obtain further information, we do our own testing in areas that we think could prove of use to us. However, we expect that some additional work may be undertaken by the department in conjunction with one or two companies that have licences for exploration and drilling; that will be outside the provisions of this line.

Mr. ALLEN: Last year, \$1,000 was allocated for remedial action at Radium Hill, although nothing was spent, and \$1,000 has been allocated again this year. Can the Treasurer explain this?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is a provision for minor maintenance at Radium Hill. As we still have some installations there, we have kept the provision on the line against minor maintenance being undertaken.

Mr. GUNN: Does the extra sum allocated for the Chief Inspector of Mines, inspectors, and so on, include provision for extra inspectors to be stationed in the opal fields of the State, where many difficulties are being faced with regard to supervision?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot say whether this line covers something of that kind. The information I have is that the line covers the Chief Inspector of Mines, the State Mining Engineer (Mr. J. P. Minogue), salaries and wages of mining branch staff and employees and drafting officers performing work for mining branch purposes.

Dr. TONKIN: There is a reduction of \$40,000 in the contribution towards the operating expenses of the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories. Is this because Amdel has become more self-sufficient or is it in relation to fees payable by the Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is a provision for departmental contribution under the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories Act. Other departments are now contributing separately.

Mr. MATHWIN: The sum provided for overseas visits by officers of the Mines Department has been reduced from actual payments of \$791 last year to \$100 this year. Does this mean that officers will make overseas visits only to Kangaroo Island or Tasmania?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They can make overseas visits to Kangaroo Island without any charge being made on this line. This sum is to provide for the Mineral Development Engineer (Mr. Adam) to spend some time doing work for the Government while he is on leave in the United Kingdom.

Mr. EVANS: Regarding mining and drilling, I understood the Treasurer to say that it was difficult to find staff for, I take it, the drilling rigs.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The problem is to get senior staff.

Mr. EVANS: I was under the impression that there was a surplus of rig operators in Western Australia.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I am talking about necessary supervising staff.

Line passed.

Premier and Minister of Development and Mines, Miscellaneous, \$815,695.

Mr. COUMBE: The allocation for grants and provisions for the performing arts has been increased from about \$268,000 voted last year to about \$419,000 this year. Although I applaud the provision and expansion of sums for the performing arts (I am associated in this field myself), I think that we should have some information about the specific bodies to which sums are being allocated: in previous years the organization receiving the grant was referred to.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The list is as follows: Adelaide Eisteddfod, \$3,000; Adelaide Highland Games (which are apparently a performing art), \$2,000; Adelaide International Film Festival, \$5,000; Adelaide Repertory Theatre, \$2,000; Arts Council of Australia (South Australian Division), which is responsible for the touring activity in the country areas of South Australia, \$30,000; Australian Dance Theatre, \$27,500; Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust, \$70,000; Bunyip Children's Theatre, \$5,000; national training institutions (scholarships), \$5,000; Nuriootpa school band competition, \$900; South Australian Bands Association, \$6,200; South Australian Opera

Company, \$5,900; South Australian Performing Arts Centre, for young people (Carclew), \$7,500; South Australian Symphony Orchestra, \$50,000; Theatre 62, \$17,500; Adelaide Festival of Arts, \$100,000; Adelaide Festival of Arts, for illuminations, etc., \$7,195; South Australian Theatre Company, \$50,000; and contingencies and other groups involved in various applications during the year, \$10,000. A sum is also provided for the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust for a subsidy for theatre hire of \$15,000. This is against its general entrepreneurial activities.

Mr. MATHWIN: Why is the allocation for the Industrial Research Institute increased from about \$20,000 to \$100,000?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is for the general working expenses of the institute now established. The first grant was to cover the establishment of the office and the salary for that portion of the year in which the first director and executive officer of the institute was engaged. This year it is to provide not only for the office expenses but also for the initial work of providing research grants and engaging people in laboratories in relation to certain industrial research projects. A sum of \$100,000 is fairly modest as against a total research programme, and is rather less than the sum the institute sought from me. However, we have initially provided \$100,000 in this first year of the institute's undertaking full-scale operations.

Mr. WARDLE: I eagerly await information about how the Murray New Town Steering Committee will spend its allocation of \$40,000.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There will be a whole series of consultant and planning work in relation to Murray New Town during this financial year. A preliminary report on recommendations as to site has been made by the State Planning Authority but not as yet reported on to the Government by the steering committee. Therefore, no determination of the site has yet been made. However, in addition to this, a series of studies will need to be undertaken immediately on many aspects of the establishment of the new town. We hope we shall be able to attract a planning consultant and a team of international renown to make this as great a planning feature for the future and something of as much significance for South Australia as the planning of Adelaide originally was. This will require money during the coming year.

Mr. COUMBE: For the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust \$180,000 is provided. The Auditor-General reports that a grant of \$27,500 was made last year by the Treasurer to provide

the trust with funds to meet its administration expenses. Can the Treasurer say when the centre is likely to be available for use and how much money will be required to complete the complex?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The precise amount of extra money required to complete the complex I cannot tell the honourable member at the moment, but I will get him a report on it. We have agreed to a few extra payments in order to settle some industrial disputes on the site and to ensure that the building is completed on schedule for commissioning. My present information is that it is some days ahead of schedule. It is not for me to announce the opening date or the opening programme: that is for the Festival Centre Trust itself. It will be making that announcement shortly when it is certain of the date, to ensure that its programme goes on as planned.

Mr. Coumbe: Will it be ready for the next Adelaide Festival of Arts?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It will be ready in the early part of next year. There will be no problems of constant postponements of dates, as happened in Sydney. The sum of \$180,000 is for salary for the staff, running expenses and the commissioning of the centre. I expect it will require a continuing subsidy of that size. Originally it was expected that the festival hall alone would cost the Adelaide City Council about \$40,000 a year, a figure of which we have relieved it. That was an optimistic figure and a considerable under-estimate of what was required. I have been constantly in touch with the Festival Centre Trust and its General Manager on economic and rental policy for the centre, and the amount of money it will obtain towards staff salaries and running expenses. I expect it will be an effectively run and economic centre compared to other similar centres in the world.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the line "State Film Corporation—Operating expenses, \$25,000". The Treasurer had a letter from the Specific Learning Difficulties Organization expressing its desire to have a film made for teaching purposes to be shown to pupils and parents of children with learning difficulties, and the reply from the Premier's Department was to the effect that no help could be forthcoming from the Premier's Department for producing such a film. The Treasurer will understand the merits of having such a film produced in South Australia instead of using American films, because different techniques are involved and even the American accent makes those films difficult to follow. If this

line does not cover the production of such films, can the Treasurer make money available to have such a film produced outside of the corporation's activities?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Government departments will act as clients of the corporation and will, in their lines, have to cover the cost of films made by the corporation. For example, the Tourist Bureau will have to pay for its films, as will the Industrial Development Branch and the Chief Secretary's Department in the making of films of special educational value for organizations for the handicapped. In addition, the corporation will have some Loan money that it borrows, which will provide a revolving fund for its own experimental film work and for some loans to film producers who work in South Australia and thus provide employment here. So we shall get a share of the equity in these things where it is recommended that they be done. If people want a film made for a specific purpose, the money must be found within the normal system of budgeting or grants. Specific handicapped people would have to seek a grant from the Government under the "Chief Secretary—Miscellaneous" line if they could not find the money themselves, just as any other assistance that could be provided to a handicapped area should be sought. That would be looked at in the overall Budget situation of assistance to organizations for the handicapped. The State Film Corporation has to charge its costs to where they must lie. In itself, it is not an organization making films on a charitable basis; its costs must be charged up.

Line passed.

State Governor's Establishment, \$75,137;
Chief Secretary, \$102,788—passed.

Public Actuary, \$54,264.

Mr. CARNIE: I note that under "Actuarial Assistant and Clerical Staff" \$14,954 was provided last year, whereas \$30,628 (a little more than double) is provided this year. Although I realize that this involves increased salary payments, I should like to know whether an increase in staff has occurred.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): As I do not have that information, I will obtain it for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Auditor-General, \$484,542; Government Printing, \$1,404,734—passed.

Police, \$15,953,111.

Mr. COURCE: Under "Civil Defence", I refer to "Director of Civil Defence, Deputy Director of Civil Defence, Constables and Clerical Staff", involving salaries, "Office

expenses", etc., "Purchase of motor vehicles" and "Subsidies to local government bodies". In the main, these items have been static for some years, allowing for an increase in salaries, etc. Subsidies to local government bodies received the same allocation last year as is provided this year, and this applies also to office expenses, etc. Having been connected in some way with civil defence, I make the plea that the Government closely examine this area with a view to helping this rather infant wing (if I may use that term) of the Police Department. Many volunteers are engaged in this work and do extremely fine work for which they gain no reward. Does the Attorney-General consider that these allocations are sufficient? If he is not able to say so at this stage, I suggest that these items might be reviewed next year.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer those comments to the Chief Secretary.

Mr. McANANEY: In regard to the reduction in the number of police cadets over the last five years, I have been told, in reply to questions asked in the House, that suitable people are not available, and this amazes me. Can the Minister explain why suitable cadets are not available for training?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I can only say that savings were experienced in 1971 and 1972 owing to the inability to maintain the cadet establishment and to losses through resignations and a lack of suitable recruits. These savings were partly offset by the payment of salary determinations from December 9, 1971, and May 19, 1972. Provision is made to replace 105 cadets to be appointed to the force and for further recruitment to restore the number of cadets in training to the establishment of 450. The provision is there wherein cadets can be recruited. As I cannot say what might be the reason for the difficulty in attracting recruits to the Police Force, I will refer the matter to the Chief Secretary and see whether he can provide any further information.

Line passed.

Prisons, \$3,136,039—passed.

Hospitals, \$51,239,464.

Dr. TONKIN: I should like information concerning the item "Director-General of Medical Services (also Chairman, Royal Adelaide Hospital Board)", and I note that under "Royal Adelaide Hospital" board members' fees have increased sharply from \$2,700 allocated last year to \$3,200 this year. Is this in relation to the proposed change in constitution of the board? In other words, will the

Director-General of Medical Services no longer be Chairman of the board? Is this allowing for the additional payment to a Chairman?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I cannot tell the honourable member that; my note is simply that this is the normal expenditure, but I will obtain the information.

Dr. TONKIN: I note that under "Flinders Medical Centre—Administrator, Nursing Administration, Administrative and Clerical Staff", \$20,555 is proposed this year. I would be relieved to hear that the appointment of these people was so close at hand that we were budgeting for their salaries. Can the Minister say when it is intended to appoint these people, where they will be housed, and what they will administer until the hospital is finally built?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The line provides for the Administrator, office staff and additional positions for nursing administration. Whereas I think previously provision for the Administrator and the office staff was made under an item relating to planning and development, it is now included in this separate line relating to the Flinders Medical Centre and obviously does not involve a full year. As I cannot say precisely when appointments will be made, I will let the honourable member know.

Dr. TONKIN: Under "Nurses Registration Act Administration—Members of Nurses Board, Examiners, Registrar and Clerical Staff", I notice a steep increase from \$20,950 actually spent last year to \$31,339 proposed this year, and I imagine that this is a result of the changed structure involving registered and enrolled nurses and the additional work involved. However, I should be grateful to have this clarified.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Additional staff was appointed last year, and this provides for the full year's effect of the salaries of that additional staff.

Dr. TONKIN: Under the Royal Adelaide Hospital, "Trainee Nurses (training for Modbury Hospital)", \$548,598 was voted in 1971-72, but no sum is allocated for this year. Why is this so?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The amount provided in the 1971-72 Estimates was \$548,598, and the actual vote for this year is included in the item "Matron and Superintendent of Nurses, Matrons, Sisters and Nursing Staff". Provision for the coming year is also included under that line.

Mr. CARNIE: What is the reason for the increase in the salaries of the Medical Superintendent (part-time), Lecturers (part-time),

Pharmacist and Therapist at the Port Lincoln Hospital?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Normal expenditure.

Mr. CUMBE: Regarding domiciliary care staff at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, I am pleased to see that this work is to continue. Why has the allocation been increased by over 100 per cent, and what type of staff will be engaged?

The Hon. L. J. KING: We have provided for a full year's operation of the domiciliary care service which was progressively implemented in 1971-72 and, in addition, provided \$15,000 for the extension of the scheme to include the Port Adelaide area.

Dr. TONKIN: The Attorney-General said that the increases in salaries at the Port Lincoln Hospital were normal expenditure, but I take issue with that statement. The increase in such expenditure at the Mount Gambier Hospital is from \$6,866 to \$32,136, at the Port Augusta Hospital it is from \$5,393 to \$22,202, at Port Lincoln it is from \$4,324 to \$6,000, at Port Pirie it is from \$3,558 to \$16,201, at Wallaroo, from \$5,337 to \$6,400, and at Whyalla, from \$4,297 to \$10,932. Can the Attorney-General explain such increases as merely normal operating expenses? Surely there are other reasons.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The item under Mount Gambier Hospital, "Medical Superintendent (part-time), Lecturers (part-time), Pharmacist, Radiographer, Social Worker and Therapist", provides for paramedical staff previously paid under the line relating to the Medical Superintendent. This is merely a reshuffling of figures between the lines.

Mr. McANANEY: Attention has been drawn by the Auditor-General to deficiencies in the internal check of wages and salaries and mental patients' trust money. As that matter has not been resolved, will the Minister obtain a report on these discrepancies?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes.

Mr. CARNIE: Can I receive more details concerning expenditure at the Whyalla Hospital? The provision for the salary of the Administrator of the hospital has been increased from \$4,297 to \$10,932. Does this apply to only one specific position?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes. This is the full year's effect of the occupancy of the office of the administrator.

Mr. McANANEY: What staff is engaged in collecting outstanding accounts and when will the report of the Hospitals Department in regard to the collection of these fees be received?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not know, but I will inquire.

Line passed.

Public Health, \$2,457,000.

Dr. TONKIN: I note that the salaries of the occupational health staff have not increased to any great extent over last year's vote, although the actual payments were less. Was that because the necessary staff was not available or did not work full time? I also note the steep increase in the sum provided for the purchase of technical equipment, from \$8,656 last year to \$30,000 this year. What does the technical equipment represent?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The reduced expenditure on occupational health during 1971-72 was caused by delays in the creation of new positions and appointing additional approved staff. Provision has been made for existing staff and one additional engineer, two additional scientific officers and one additional technical assistant to be engaged on air-pollution work. Regarding the purchase of technical equipment, the reduced expenditure in 1971-72 was due to non-delivery of items before the end of the year. Provision was made for items ordered in 1971-72 but not delivered until the current year, and for noise dose meters, transceivers, sound level meter for hearing conservation programmes and noise investigations in industry; radiation survey meter; equipment for collection and analysis of samples to administer Clean Air Regulations and to provide data on air pollution, including monitoring of pollutants from motor vehicles.

Dr. TONKIN: Is it intended to transfer this technical equipment to the Minister of Environment and Conservation in the future?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Not as far as I am aware.

Line passed.

Chief Secretary and Minister of Health, Miscellaneous, \$10,725,471.

Dr. TONKIN: Among the many charities and organizations listed under this line, I am pleased to see that \$230,000 is being earmarked for the Royal Institution for the Blind, which does magnificent work. Does the Attorney-General consider that the provision for the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board is sufficient? Why, in view of the considerable difficulties under which the board's staff has been working during the last year and previously, was only \$95,000 spent when \$121,450 was voted?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to the Minister of Health.

Line passed.

Attorney-General, \$801,028; Crown Law, \$452,955—passed.

Public Trustee, \$582,625.

Dr. EASTICK: Is the considerable increase in the allocation for staff salaries taken up by salary increases or is it associated with an increase in staff?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The increase is due to variations in awards and the appointment of additional staff.

Line passed.

Supreme Court, \$450,999.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the considerable increase in the provision for salaries payable to Supreme Court officers. Has there been an increase in the number of courts? Have we sufficient staff for future needs, or will this allocation be increased annually? It has been suggested that, because of streamlining and because of the introduction of intermediate courts, the overall back-lag of court actions would be reduced. It was thought that such economies would provide for the foreseeable needs of the State. These continual increases in cost cause me concern.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The actual expenditure for 1971-72 was slightly less than the sum voted because the positions of Deputy Master and a clerk were vacant. However, savings were offset by reclassifications of the salaries of judges' attendants and associates, overtime, higher duty and temporary staff payments. The estimated increase for 1972-73 is caused by male clerical and court reporters' reclassifications, additional positions created, normal annual increments, commencement of the new Deputy Master, and the appointing of temporary staff for a murder trial, which has occupied a long time. The increase this year is not great. I have never said that the creation of the intermediate jurisdiction in the Local and District Criminal Courts would be likely to reduce the work of the Supreme Court, but it has provided the opportunity to eliminate the back-log of cases in that court and limited the court's expansion. Without the new jurisdiction the Supreme Court would have expanded dramatically and would have required a substantial increase in staff.

Government services generally expand with increased population and activities. However, the activities of the Supreme Court will not expand at anything like the rate that would have obtained had the intermediate jurisdiction not been created. Other unknown factors are possible changes in the law and the attitude of the Commonwealth Government in future to the exercise of Commonwealth jurisdiction. If

a Commonwealth court is established for this purpose and if it takes over the matrimonial work, the size of the Supreme Court will probably not increase for some time. However, if the Commonwealth Government does not establish such a court and decides to confer on the Supreme Court Commonwealth jurisdiction in matters where the present jurisdiction is exercised by the High Court, we can expect a drastic expansion in the Supreme Court. These are unknown factors as is the probable future political complexion of the Commonwealth Government and its attitude towards investing the State court with Commonwealth jurisdiction.

Line passed.

Local and District Criminal Courts, \$1,518,555; Registrar-General's Department, \$806,657—passed.

Attorney-General, Miscellaneous, \$201,249.

Dr. TONKIN: The Government is to be commended for increasing the grant to the Law Society of South Australia to \$150,000. For some time members of this society have provided legal advice at some expense to themselves in time and money.

Dr. EASTICK: Is the \$10,000 contribution towards the cost of the constitutional convention the probable total expenditure?

The Hon. L. J. KING: To be completely honest and candid, I do not have the slightest idea whether the final payment will be greater or less, nor does anyone else. Of the common expenses and operating expenses of the convention, the Commonwealth Government has agreed to pay 50 per cent, and the remainder will be shared between the States in proportion to their population. Each State will pay the cost of its own delegation.

Dr. EASTICK: As \$6,000 has been provided for the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General for an inquiry into present operations of schemes for group investment, does this allocation mean that a major investigation is being considered?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Standing Committee decided it was necessary to investigate the need for additional legislation concerning such schemes as mutual funds, unit trusts, and real estate syndication. As the Governments did not possess information on such schemes, difficulties would have been experienced in framing legislation. It was decided to set up an inquiry so that those interested in future legislation could put before it their submissions. The States have agreed to join in the costs of such an inquiry, which will be established soon. It will be a major inquiry,

occupying perhaps two years, and this sum represents South Australia's share of one year's costs on a population basis.

Mr. McANANEY: Apparently, the Judge in Insolvency must be the only unfortunate person in Australia whose salary has been decreased, as this provision has been reduced from \$3,302 to \$3,289. Why has this occurred?

The Hon. L. J. KING: This line relates to an arrangement with the Commonwealth Government. His Honour Judge Paine is the Judge in Insolvency, but the court has no jurisdiction or function of its own. It is the old Insolvency Court, long since obsolete. However, it is exercising federal jurisdiction in bankruptcy in South Australia, a jurisdiction conferred on it by the Commonwealth Government. This represents the salary paid to Judge Paine, who occupies only part of his time on this work. By agreement with the Commonwealth, the salary paid to him by the State is reimbursed to it.

Line passed.

Treasury, \$229,713—passed.

Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch, \$271,007.

Dr. EASTICK: A payment of \$7,176 was made last financial year for terminal leave. This is apparently a once-only payment, as no provision was made for it last year and none is made for it this year. Will the Treasurer explain this line?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The allocation relates to retirements or resignations from the branch, but this year there will be none.

Mr. CUMBE: Does the increased allocation for investigating, accounting and clerical staff mean that additional staff has been engaged as a result of legislation recently passed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. VENNING: Will the Treasurer say to which former Prices Commissioner the *ex gratia* payment is made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is a retiring allowance paid to Mr. Murphy for whom, because he did not have normal superannuation benefits, a special arrangement was made. This arrangement has been in operation since about 1966.

Line passed.

Superannuation, \$241,568; Valuation, \$873,360; State Taxes, \$654,522—passed.

Treasurer, Miscellaneous, \$38,334,080.

Mr. EVANS: An allocation of \$1,300,000 is made to the Municipal Tramways Trust

towards expected deficits. Much money is lost by the M.T.T. each year because of the design of its vehicles, 100 of which are sitting unsalable in a paddock at Gepps Cross because they do not conform to the normal laws regarding the width of vehicles. Despite this, the M.T.T. still continues to produce buses 3½ in. too wide. The Minister of Roads and Transport stated recently that the width of these buses could not be reduced because of their design. Having travelled on nine buses and examined them, I am convinced that that information is not accurate and, indeed, that the buses could be built to conform to the law, so that the trust would not in future have to sustain this loss.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will take up the matter with the M.T.T. The honourable member will appreciate, however, that the contract for building these buses was negotiated during the term of office of the previous Government.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the line "Insurance of Government buildings, etc., against fire and provision for premiums for special purposes—Transfer to Government Insurance Fund", actual payments for which in 1971-72 exceeded by \$150,000 the vote of \$120,000, which has also been provided this year. What was the reason for the additional expenditure of \$150,000?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was because of the fire at the Elizabeth Downs Primary School.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the line dealing with control of rents and housing improvement administration expenses. It would be satisfactory to increase the trust's allocation this year to enable an investigation to be conducted into the incomes of various people who rent its houses, because many deserving people are, I believe, being denied the right to have low-rental housing because of the present system. Despite the Deputy Premier's having said that the system cannot be changed, will the Treasurer examine this matter in an attempt to find a better method of deciding who should be permitted to rent low-rental houses?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although I appreciate the point that the honourable member is making, it is not covered by the housing improvement section of the Housing Trust, which deals only with houses which could be declared substandard under the Housing Improvement Act, and action to be taken in relation to them. It also concerns social work involved in the relocation of people from Hackney, and that sort of thing.

Mr. HALL: I notice that \$2,500 is allocated for the Dartmouth dam pursuant to the River Murray Waters Agreement. Why is this allocation, which is such a small amount when compared to the total cost of the dam, being made? Is this for investigatory work in relation to a dam that has been delayed a full two years by the actions of this Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is an interest payment on a special loan from the Commonwealth Government towards the construction of the dam, which is now being undertaken.

Mr. HALL: This small sum is indicative of the tremendous delay caused by the Government's hypocritical attitude in denying South Australians the opportunity to have this reservoir sooner. We now have this puny sum when we should have had a large sum. I know that the contribution to the Electricity Trust for subsidies in country areas is the result of a long-standing arrangement. In some instances, I think it is a subsidy on a continuing basis for local government distribution of electricity. Will this subsidy eventually be diminished or will it continue year after year? It would seem sensible over the years to pay this sum from the revenue of the trust, as is done in the case of other Government services. For instance, revenue received from city water charges is used to subsidize heavily the country water supplies. What are the future plans with regard to this country area subsidy of the Electricity Trust?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has obviously overlooked the fact that \$1,250,000 has already been voted towards the construction of Dartmouth dam works this year. The sum specified for this year relates to the current obligation to the Commonwealth for its contribution in relation to the same sort of payment.

Mr. Hall: It is very small so far.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The site works are being let and the first tenders have been called. The first storage will take place in 1976. The honourable member is carrying on with his usual caper.

Mr. Hall: That's different from 1974.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The provision for subsidy to country areas for electricity supply is likely to continue as a charge on revenue for a considerable period. The policy followed by this Government and instituted by the Playford Government is to provide a subsidy to those country electricity suppliers other than the Electricity Trust that are supplying the public, to ensure that they can keep

their tariffs within 10 per cent of the metropolitan tariff. I think it will be a long time before this can be taken off this line. I do not intend to charge it to the Electricity Trust.

Mr. HALL: When the cost of the distribution of electricity in the State is assessed, there is a complicated problem about where the final responsibility for payment lies. The Treasurer knows of the major cost involved in the large distribution networks that relay power from Port Augusta or Adelaide. When one comes to deal with the capital cost of supplying someone perhaps in the Eyre District, for instance, one can find some rather amazing amounts. I think that in the long term it would be advantageous to incorporate this figure in the trust's accounts, as is done in relation to other services.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suppose that, as a means of accounting, in addition to the amounts of subsidy already effectively paid to country areas through the operation of the trust, we could charge it with the duty of subsidizing some other undertaking, but I do not think it is very good accounting. The situation here is different from that which applies to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which certainly keeps its country water supply accounts separate from those of the metropolitan water district. However, it is the one service, whereas these are non-Governmental undertakings to which we are supplying a specific subsidy. It would require a marked departure from the principles of the Act constituting the trust that we should require it not only within its own area of supply to the country to subsidize its country services from its city returns but also to subsidize other organizations, and that is what the honourable member is suggesting. I do not think this is appropriate accounting or that Treasury officials would recommend it. I do not know whether this is part of the honourable member's campaign to get more interest in the metropolitan area for his section of his Party and to point out the degree to which his metropolitan supporters are subsidizing country supporters of other sections of his Party. If that is the case, I appreciate his deep motivation, but I think the present system of accounting is more satisfactory.

Line passed.

Lands, \$5,220,059—passed.

Botanic Garden, \$450,306.

Mr. EVANS: I notice that \$20,000 was spent as a special grant for the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden last year, and that \$5,000 is provided this year. Is this money for the

purchase of land or is it for the final development of this rather magnificent addition to the Botanic Garden? Last year, \$2,000 was allocated for the purchase of land and \$5,555 was spent. What land was purchased with that sum last year? In addition, is the sum of \$4,000 provided this year to purchase some specific land and, if it is, whereabouts is that land?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): Regarding the honourable member's first question, the money is to provide for further work for new car parks, for excavating an area for the re-erection of a glasshouse, for a new garage and potting shed, and for the development of new roadways. The sum spent in relation to the purchase of land was for about five acres of land adjoining the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden. I do not have any information about the \$4,000 allocated this year. I will find out about this for the honourable member. When I was Minister of Lands in 1967, I inspected this area. Although certain work was being done then, the area was not developed. I am as delighted as is the honourable member that this area has been taken over by the Botanic Garden Department. I know that another area was donated by the late Mr. Ashby, and this is a valuable addition to the Botanic Garden. I met the late Mr. Ashby, and inspected the area. It was a magnificent gesture by him and his family, who made the sacrifice.

Line passed.

Minister of Lands, Minister of Repatriation, and Minister of Irrigation, Miscellaneous, \$252,750.

Dr. EASTICK: For drought relief, \$100,000 is provided. Naturally, in continuing drought conditions further allocations would be needed. Some people are concerned that the information being given to prospective applicants for drought relief by various transport firms is at variance with departmental policy. Will the department make available to all transport firms some concise details of advice that they could give to people in necessitous circumstances, who would benefit from a direct knowledge of what concessions might be available to them? It is not the responsibility of any person other than the applicant for assistance to ascertain the relevant details, but it would be in the best interests of the people the Government is trying to help if transport organizations were given some information they could pass on.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to ask the Minister to examine the

Leader's suggestion. There is some doubt whether it is practical but, if it can be done, it should be done, although we never know where drought will strike and which transport operator will be involved in what place. The \$100,000 is to provide drought relief if it is required. If the line was not there, we would not have a line on which to operate in case of drought, and a special appropriation would be needed.

Line passed.

Minister of Works, \$69,301—passed.

Engineering and Water Supply, \$18,996,449.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the line dealing with portion of salaries, etc., under "Metropolitan waterworks". I have raised with the Minister a problem associated with the system of rating, which has been argued here for many years past.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Which line is this?

Mr. EVANS: "Metropolitan waterworks—Portion of salaries, etc., shown under General." This allocation comes from rates paid by the consumers.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member cannot pursue this line, because we are dealing with expenditure, not revenue. The only matter under discussion is the actual expenditure of revenue.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the problem in the water catchment area, where the Minister's department refuses to extend the mains to those blocks of land or those houses—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member cannot get at it in a roundabout way. We have dealt with the Loan Estimates; they have been approved by the Committee, and any discussion of an item approved by the Committee during the current session cannot be permitted. We are dealing with the Estimates of Expenditure, and that is the only matter that can be discussed by the Committee.

Mr. COUMBE: I refer to the line "Show Exhibit, \$43,500". Does that allocation cover the Royal Show exhibit or an exhibit at any other shows? I know that the filtration plant on display at the Show aroused great interest and that it has always been the practice of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to have a worthwhile exhibit at the Royal Show. The \$43,500 is a large sum; other costs may have been involved because a working model may have been used. The size of this allocation needs explaining.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): An amount of \$35,000 was involved in the construction of a permanent

building, not for the Engineering and Water Supply Department but for the Government. Future exhibits will be staged in that building. If the honourable member saw the filtration plant exhibit, he will appreciate that we have an attractive and functional building, which will remain on the site. This means that we shall not need to rent space from the show society. The Government will have its own building. The problem whether other departments will pay the Engineering and Water Supply Department rent is purely administrative. This money is to provide a building from Engineering and Water Supply Department funds that will remain there for some time, in which Government exhibitions can be housed, thus saving the cost of renting space from the show society. Therefore, the cost of the exhibit was relatively small. That exhibit will remain on the site in the show-grounds for about three months so that the schoolchildren can be conducted through it. It will then be taken from there and used further, so the exhibit itself could not be considered extravagant. In fact, I think it was a timely and worthwhile exhibit, because it shows just how effective are the methods that will be used to filter the Adelaide water supply.

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister explain the reason for the large increase provided this year in respect of the Mannum-Adelaide main and bores?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At the time the Estimates were drafted we were not certain of the seasonal conditions and, therefore, had to provide sufficient money to pump water to the metropolitan system. However, as since then we have had timely rains, all the money voted this year may not be required. Indeed, we were fortunate last year, bearing in mind the considerable reservoir holdings, that we did not have to spend much at all on pumping.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister assure me that when departmental surveyors enter people's properties they will inform the people concerned of their intention? A constituent of mine was recently injured when driving a tractor that ran into a survey peg on his property. That person, who fortunately was not sufficiently injured to fall from his tractor and end up in a mangled mess, did not know that officers of the department had been on his property.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I should like to give the assurance within reason. However, I do not want a situation in which, because a landowner is away, the surveyor cannot enter the property and must come back to Adelaide.

If it is possible and reasonable in the circumstances, I should expect officers to contact the people concerned and to let them know that surveyors will be entering their properties, but I cannot give an unqualified assurance on this.

Mr. CUMBE: Although I cannot find the relevant provision, I should like the Minister to say how the foundry at Ottoway, which came into operation recently, is functioning. Apart from the strike taking place there at present, is the foundry now working to capacity? Is it satisfactory and fulfilling the function for which it was intended?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am delighted to be able to tell the honourable member that the foundry has, in fact in about March, exceeded the work load originally stipulated. I shall be pleased to get a detailed report on this matter. Unfortunately, a strike is occurring there at present, and I think this involves a difference of opinion in respect of inspectorial services, but I think that matter can be resolved. Some teething troubles have been experienced, possibly because the men at the foundry were formerly almost isolated and ran their own affairs, and I point out that it takes a while to adjust in these circumstances.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister's department is carrying out considerable work in conducting pollution tests in the Hills area. If the results of the laboratory tests can be made available to the people concerned immediately the information is received by the department, growers may be able to change their methods accordingly and co-operate for the benefit of the department as well as themselves.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am happy about this suggestion, if it is at all possible to accede to it. I have found that, when new measures are being introduced, there is often a break-down in communications, and I cite as an example the controls that were to affect piggeries located along the Murray River. I think that insufficient information was given to the people who were vitally affected in the matter and, consequently, all sorts of misunderstanding arose. The Director and Engineer-in-Chief and I are currently investigating a method of informing people well in advance of any new policies that may be implemented, so that the people concerned will not be exposed to rumours. Indeed, I believe that, if we have any information that will help people who will be affected by a certain measure to be implemented, we should make that information readily available to them.

Mr. VENNING: Concerning payments in lieu of wages to employees stood down during the fuel emergency, how will this amount be paid out? Will employees have to apply for payment?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Many people were stood down during the petrol shortage, and the Government took the view, as a matter of policy (not only regarding this department but regarding other departments as well), that these people were not being stood down as a result of something for which they were responsible and, rather than having these people doing nothing, the Government considered it was better to stand them down and ensure that they suffered no monetary loss as a result of that stand-down, which I believe is a perfectly reasonable attitude. These employees were paid in the normal way. They were employees of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and, if the cost of their wages could not be debited against a specific job, they had to be paid under this line.

Line passed.

Public Buildings, \$16,223,223.

Mr. CUMBE: For some time there was a shortage of qualified architects. Has that shortage been overcome? Does some of the department's work still have to be let out to private architects? Is the Minister satisfied with the present position?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Generally speaking I am, although about 40 per cent of the design work carried out by the department is let out to consultants or contract architects. We have to try as a Government to establish the level at which we are to work in this area, because I do not believe that we should establish to the point where we may have people not performing as efficiently as they should be, because the work is not there, thus causing retrenchments. That is not desirable. I am sure that the Director of the department would agree that we have reached a stage where we can accurately assess our needs for a stable situation. I believe there is no shortage, because we can get work done outside whenever it is required. Although the department is often the subject of much criticism (and often unfair criticism), the sum spent on public buildings has trebled over the last 10 years.

The department has done a tremendous job, especially in view of the organization required. Had the Government sufficient money immediately available, it could easily spend, on the design and construction of school buildings, over \$30,000,000 this year. That could not

have been done before, and the honourable member knows this. However, that is only one aspect of the matter. Members generally do not appreciate the way this department has developed, because they are usually involved with minor works rather than major construction. I have referred to the reorganization that has gone on, but even that cannot change things overnight. I believe, however, that within two years all members will see a marked advance on the past performance of the department.

Mr. Becker: There would want to be.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member does not understand the complexity of the problems facing the department. If he did, he would be more tolerant.

Mr. Gunn: There are problems in my district.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Eyre represents an isolated area that has peculiar problems. I am impressed by the work this department does under great difficulties, and I think that what we are doing will work.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister yet been able to resolve the problem of the appointment of the Structural Engineer, Design Section, which has created some problems for the Public Service Board?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The position has been resolved to the extent that consultants were employed immediately I knew of the lack in this regard. We did not wait for the board to fill the position. I believe that insufficient remuneration is being offered by the board, but I am not critical of the board, because it has its classification problems. It is important for the department to have a structural engineer who can supervise operations in the section, but I do not believe that the salary offered is sufficient to attract the type of officer we need. The board has re-advertised the vacancy without results, as far as I know. I have every sympathy with the board in this matter, but I believe that until we offer a more attractive salary we shall have difficulty in making an appointment. At present, we are using a consultant and paying him much more than we would pay a permanent officer.

Mr. EVANS: Perhaps the Public Buildings Department does not liaise satisfactorily with departments such as the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I refer to the installation of new fire hydrants at the Blackwood High School. An unsuccessful attempt was made to set fire to the school. Five days later the hydrants had still not been connected to the

mains when a successful attempt was made to set fire to the school, and this resulted in part of it being destroyed. I must admit that the connecting of the hydrants would not have made much difference to the end result, but the Minister should direct that at no time when hydrants are being installed should the installation workers leave before the hydrants are connected to the mains.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will investigate the position.

Line passed.

State Supply, \$643,320—passed.

Minister of Works, Miscellaneous, \$549,000.

Mr. COUMBE: Regarding the Control of Waters Act, \$100,000 was allocated last year for administration, \$129,109 was spent, and \$200,000 is allocated this year. The Act deals with the few rivers we have in this State and the control thereof. Allied with this question is the line concerning control of water salinity in the Murray River, for which \$10,000 was voted last year, \$2,806 was spent, and no allocation is made this year. As the control of salinity in the Murray River is vitally important, will the Minister please explain this line?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Regarding the administration expenses, excess expenditure during 1971-72 resulted from slow progress on the metering programme, but the 1972-73 allocation provides for an acceleration of the programme. Regarding the control of salinity, large-scale investigations are proceeding under the control of the River Murray Salinity Committee, and future works will be a charge against these investigations.

Dr. EASTICK: The sum of \$49,915 was paid last year for constructing additional improvements to the sea outlet from Lake Bonney in the South-East, and this year \$42,000 is allocated. Is this the total expenditure (apart from maintenance) for this project, and how successful has it been in improving the pollution and environmental aspects of the lake?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This amount provides for the complete cost of the channel to the sea. In 1958, an uncontrolled opening was made to the sea to lower the level of the lake in order to obtain land for soldier settlement. A cutting was made at a position that the engineers thought would lower the lake sufficiently, but the level of the lake receded to a dangerous level. The opening sealed up and did not re-open. Last year landholders on the northern end of the lake complained, because the water rose to the highest level

since 1958. The land that was inundated by the excess water was not a large area, and most of it was Crown land let on annual licence.

I thought that the Government should not spend a large sum on correcting the situation, because it would be better to cancel the licences or purchase the land. However, I inspected the lake with the Regional Engineer (Mr. Ide) and to my horror I realized the danger of the lake breaking out into the sea again at the 1958 outlet, which had sealed over. We had to do something, and decided to install a controlled outlet, because, if this year was another wet year, we may have lost the lake. The lake was important in controlling pollution caused by the effluent from the two factories at Millicent, and the larger the lake and the higher the level of water the better chance we would have of breaking down the pollution and bringing the lake back to what it should be. A controlled outlet was placed south of the 1958 outlet, and it is effective. At present we are holding the lake level steady, or reducing it slightly: it is intended to hold the level at 113 R.L., as this will be satisfactory to landholders on the northern end of the lake and also from a pollution aspect. At present more water is going out to sea from the lake than is entering it. The money has been well spent, and this is the final payment for the project.

Mr. McANANEY: Last year \$180,000 was spent on preliminary surveys for water supplies and irrigation schemes, and this year the amount has been increased to \$240,000. Has the Minister an explanation for this?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The amount is provided for expected expenditure on investigations and preliminary surveys on water supplies that will not be developed and therefore charged to revenue. The 1972-73 expenditure provides for \$46,653 not transferred in 1971-72, and for increased expenditure on salinity investigations and water resources investigations.

Line passed.

Minister of Education, \$42,642—passed.

Education, \$105,820,319.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister name the council that received \$300 compensation for unrated departmental property? This is the first time that such an allocation has been made, and it may set a precedent.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): This payment occurred because of a misunderstanding when the Marion council did not rate a house that was occupied,

because it thought it was being used as a school building. In order to resolve the matter, this payment was agreed to.

Mr. VENNING: Last year, \$426,300 was voted for scholarships, whereas \$443,127 was actually spent. Despite that increased expenditure, only \$150,000 is allocated this year. Can the Minister say why?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The sum of \$396,914 has been provided under the salaries and wages line for full-time and release-time scholars, which previously came under the special contingencies line. This transfer has been made so that we will have more flexibility in administration. If we must change the number of scholarships, we can do so more readily than if it is under the contingencies line. There is no effective reduction.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the line dealing with running expenses for buses, and payments made under contracts for the transport of students. This year, the vote is slightly less than last year's actual payment, even though that slightly exceeded the sum voted. The reduction for this important undertaking has occurred at a time when costs are increasing. Will the Minister therefore explain this reduction? Also, although \$200,000 was voted last year as a contribution towards the cost of bringing lecturers and teachers from overseas and other States, only \$80,244 was actually spent. One therefore wonders whether the scheme was a failure or whether the need for additional staffing was not as great as it was believed to be. This year, the allocation has been reduced to \$100,000. Is this because a new approach to the matter is being taken or because more students are coming from our own training facilities, thus reducing the need for appointments from overseas and other States?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The apparent decrease in expenditure on buses of \$125,703 occurred because payments for teacher-drivers have been budgeted for under salaries and wages instead of under contingencies. In 1971-72, the actual payment of \$1,958,703 included \$336,183 for teacher-drivers. Therefore, the actual increase in expenditure on buses is more than \$200,000, or 12 per cent. This will take care of some increase in costs, and enable services to be improved.

Dr. Eastick: Is it a new accounting procedure to take out these wages?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the department is likely to over-spend on the contingency line, an excess warrant must be obtained; we

cannot juggle between lines under the contingencies allocation. However, under the salaries and wages line there is more flexibility if we are under the estimate in one area and over it in another. In such a case, we can offset one against the other. Also, there is a greater ease in administration generally and more flexibility in making appointments. This is necessary in a department as large as the Education Department. Similarly, payments for swimming instructors have also been transferred.

Regarding the second point, the under-spending of this line puzzled me. It occurred because of a significant over-estimate in costs of oversea recruitments. It may be that we estimated that many more of the teachers we recruited would be married and would, therefore, be bringing their families with them. Although many married couples came, in many instances they were both teachers. Therefore, although we were bringing over a married couple, we were getting two teachers. In each case we were paying the air fares. Therefore, if we brought a man, his wife and four children with him, we might have been getting only one teacher. In other cases, when we brought a single person we were paying only one fare and were obtaining the services of one teacher. This is one factor that caused us to over-estimate.

Certainly, last year our recruitment of teachers from overseas was up to the planned level. This year recruitments are likely to be slightly fewer, as increased numbers of students are coming from our colleges and more teachers are being re-employed. Some former teachers have returned to South Australia from overseas or other States and wish to teach again. Therefore, the need to obtain teachers from overseas is not as great this year.

Mr. CARNIE: Last year, the sum of \$32,196 was voted for the Deputy Director-General and the Assistant Director-General of Education, but only \$24,514 was actually spent last year. Will the Minister say what was the reason for the reduced expenditure?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: At the beginning of last financial year the Assistant Director-General had not been appointed and we had only one Deputy Director-General. For one reason or another, which I will not go into now, there was a slight delay in the appointment of the Assistant Director-General. Now, of course, both officers will be employed for the full year.

Mr. RODDA: This year, the meagre sum of \$300 is proposed for compensation for unrated departmental property.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is repeating a matter to which a reply has already been given.

Mr. CARNIE: I refer to the line "Administration and Finance—Director,

Administrative, Accounting, Supply, Clerical and General Staff", the allocation to which this year is a little more than double last year's actual payments. Although increased wages could have accounted for some of this increase, it would not have accounted for all of it. Has there also been an increase in staff in this department?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This is the compensating factor for the teacher bus drivers. A reduction in the expenditure on this line is compensated for by the increase under the contingencies expenditure.

Mr. MATHWIN: I see that last year \$1,277 was spent on office machines and equipment, whereas \$41,500 is allocated this year. Is it expected that there may be more demand for this equipment this year, and does this come under subsidy?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not part of the subsidy; that is provided for separately. This is for office equipment for the head office of the Education Department in relation to the activities of that office. The provision is for the purchase of items of office equipment necessary to modernize procedures for the expansion of the department. It includes a repeat provision for Lektrier equipment provided for in the previous two years but still not purchased. That was largely the reason for the gross underspending that occurred last year. We hope to get new equipment this year. If the honourable member wants a more detailed explanation about the Lektrier equipment, I will get it for him.

Dr. EASTICK: What benefit to the State did the visit of the United States consultant bring about?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That expense was incurred in relation to the visit of Professor Williamson, who is one of the authors of the *Web of Life* biology textbook used throughout our schools, a former President of the United States Science Teachers Association, and the head of the Education Department in the Oregon University. Part of our oversea recruiting campaign has been concentrated in the State of Oregon and at the Oregon University, where we have developed close relationships with the Faculty of Education. As a

consequence, last year we recruited about 40 teachers from that university. It was proposed that we should bring Professor Williamson to Adelaide for six to eight weeks so that he could see how these teachers were fitting into our system, so that we could improve our liaison with the university, and so that he could correctly advise us on any methods that we needed to adopt to get the effective integration of Oregon teachers into the Education Department. As this has been a great success, we have continued with the recruitment of teachers from that university this year. Our relationship with the university is so close that we are able to recruit on the basis of its own confidential reports.

Mr. McANANEY: The total allocation for education this year represents an increase of only 8 per cent, which would hardly cover the increase in salaries in the period. In addition, much money is being made available to the Government in the way of additional reimbursements from the Commonwealth, these sums representing an increase of at least 16 per cent. I cannot understand why there is not a greater allocation for education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Apparently the honourable member has not read the Treasurer's Budget speech. First, there are almost no direct Commonwealth grants in relation to recurrent expenses. The bulk of the funds are provided from State sources. It was pointed out in the Treasurer's speech that last year there were 27 pay days in the Education Department whereas this year there are only 26 pay days. The Leader of the Opposition also referred to this.

Mr. McAnaney: That doesn't cover the sum.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On account of the extra pay day in 1971-72 and on account of pay-roll tax paid in the first two months of the financial year 1971-72, the 1971-72 expenditure was about \$3,440,000 greater than it would otherwise have been. In addition, we had to adjust for the fact that only six months of costs of the teachers colleges are in the Education Department lines this year. The costs for the six months from January to June, 1973, are to be found under the "Miscellaneous" line. If we adjust for all those factors, the result is that the effective money rate of increase is 14½ per cent over the sum allocated last year, and the Leader of the Opposition and the Treasurer both agreed on this in their speeches. In addition, as the Treasurer's speech pointed out, the full year effect of awards this year is relatively small compared to the effect last financial year. I think

that the estimate is that \$2,480,000 will be incurred by the department because of the full year cost of the last national wage decision and the cost of several other smaller salary awards. Of the total effective increase, \$2,480,000 goes in meeting increased awards. The remainder is available for expansion. The real rate of expansion is nearly 12 per cent, a higher rate in real terms than has applied over the last two years when the rate of increase has been between 11 per cent and 11½ per cent.

Line passed.

Libraries, \$1,701,000.

Mr. COUNBE: Is the new system announced by the Minister the other day to be covered under this line or under the "Miscellaneous" line?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It would go under the Libraries (Subsidies) Act for capital cost of administration expenses for the purchase of books. There have been minor adjustments for upgrading subsidies, and those minor adjustments are allowed for in this year's Budget. The new arrangements will apply from January 1, 1973, although they have not yet been finally and firmly decided on. When I can give the honourable member the details, I will.

Mr. MATHWIN: Last year \$125,760 was voted for the purchase of books, and the proposed allocation for this year is only \$112,000, whereas one would have expected the allocation to be greater this year. Why is it not?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member will recall there were three councils, including his own, in difficulty in the last financial year in matching fully the subsidy from the Libraries Board for the purchase of books. He will doubtless also recall that he attended the meetings where special advance payments were arranged for the Brighton, Millicent and Mitcham councils to enable them to overcome their financial difficulties and to ensure that their libraries were adequately stocked. This is additional expenditure on the purchase of books to that shown in the accounts last year, and the reason for the slight reduction is that these payments do not appear this year. Indeed, some adjusting contribution is being made by the Brighton, Mitcham and Millicent councils as a consequence of the advance payments made last year, which is a further offsetting factor. The effective change in the whole system is in line with what was done last year.

Line passed.

Art Gallery, \$249,667.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the line "Over-sea visits of officers". Is that for some special purpose? Is it for sabbatical leave, or what does it involve?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is for an overseas visit by the Director of the Art Gallery. The Art Gallery Board believes it is necessary for the Director to go overseas every two or three years in order to look at the latest trends in galleries and to keep in touch with the art market. Since 1970-71, \$50,000 a year has been voted to the Art Gallery for the purchase of works of art. It is necessary that arrangements be made to permit of a suitable system for the purchase of works of art and, in order to get effective arrangements, it is necessary that the Director go overseas fairly regularly. Members may be interested to know that a person who occasionally purchases works of art for the South Australian Art Gallery is Barry Humphries.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister report on the travelling art exhibition? My predecessor instigated it and I had the pleasure of opening it; it has gone to many country towns. It is an excellent way of bringing art to country centres where many people otherwise would have no opportunity of seeing these works.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member and the member for Davenport may have instigated the exhibition, but we have paid for it. Last year the financial provision was \$5,000; this year the provision for the travelling art exhibition is increased by 20 per cent to \$6,000, so we are sustaining and developing that exhibition, which has been a successful venture. I congratulate the honourable member on his initiation of the project.

Line passed.

Minister of Education, Miscellaneous, \$29,999,715.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the line dealing with the Kindergarten Union of South Australia, in respect of which there is a substantial increase on last year's allocation. During recent months, the Minister has informed the House of a new scheme and has invited the attention of people interested in the building of kindergartens to apply. I am led to believe that the number of applications for assistance outstripped the funds available for the year. Can the Minister tell me (if not now, later) what are the individual allocation of funds to the various kindergarten projects? Would the number of applications

made indicate that greater allocations may be needed in the foreseeable future?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think we have accepted all applications where anyone is in an enclosed building. However, I would be out of order if I gave any details, because the subsidies for building kindergartens will be paid for under a line in the Loan Estimates.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I refer to the line dealing with grants for the fees concession scheme for students at university, where the allocation proposed this year is less than the money actually spent last year. As the Minister was expecting greater use to be made of this facility (in fact, some encouragement was given to students in certain circumstances to apply for assistance under this line) does he consider that the \$210,000 will be adequate or does he expect that the estimate will be exceeded by \$68,000, as it was last year?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The additional expenditure of the sum of \$68,000 was the result of a decision by the Government to expand fee concessions for tertiary students. Although \$218,000 was spent last year, I think the sum made available to students was greater, because each year now further money is available through repayments of money previously lent. Although I have not checked the details, I understand that the assistance given by way of fee concessions in 1973 will be slightly greater than the sum provided this year, although the actual Budget provision is slightly less.

Mr. COUMBE: In regard to "Hall of Residence and Residential Colleges", I ask whether the Minister can give details of the allocations made.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This relates to approved grants from the Commonwealth Government and, in the main, to the university colleges. As I cannot give the precise details, I will obtain the information.

Mr. EVANS: The sum of \$160 is provided this year for the Specific Learning Difficulties Association of South Australia, no provision having been made last year. As this organization carries out important remedial teaching work and does not receive much help except through voluntary work, I ask whether this sum is all that the organization asked for or whether it is all that can be provided.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I understand that this sum is all that was asked for, and it relates to help we provided regarding a conference held at Wayville. A joint committee comprising Education Department officers and members of this organization are investigating methods of providing a way in which the

organization can be of greater assistance to the department, and I expect that, as a result, greater support will be given to the organization in future.

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister say whether the increased allocation (from \$66,500 to \$95,000) in respect of the National Fitness Council of South Australia results from the Government's decision to make capital grants to youth clubs?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As grants to youth clubs come under the Community Welfare Department, I point out that this allocation relates to the activities of the National Fitness Council itself and to capital developments taking place at Mylor, as well as to the purchase of Graham Castle at Goolwa. The decision was taken last year to match fully any Commonwealth grants made to the National Fitness Council, which took over Graham Castle in the latter part of the year, and further developments will take place there.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister explain the reason for doubling the allocation to the Family Life Movement of Australia?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This is to expand the sex education work that that organization is undertaking in schools. In the main, father-and-son and mother-and-daughter lectures are organized with the co-operation of school committees and, although I do not know whether members have attended any of these lectures, I point out that they are extremely well presented. The organization wants to expand its activities, and we are delighted to help it do so.

Mr. Nankivell: Is it going to take over some of the department's responsibility in that respect?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the organization is operating mainly at primary school level, it is not taking over any such responsibility.

Mr. McANANEY: I congratulate the Minister on the increased allocation in respect of the Workers Educational Association. Can he say what project may have merited the increase?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This has been a complicated matter, because a capital payment was made to the association on account of the purchase of Graham Castle by the National Fitness Council, and that has altered the association's income-earning ability. In addition, the Government has agreed with the association that funds be provided for the appointment of a trade union education officer and, if applications for that appointment have not already been called, they will be called shortly. The honourable member will know that during his term as President of the association the trade union correspondence course was developed, although I do not know that he was actually responsible for that.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.31 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 21, at 2 p.m.