

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, March 1, 1978

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. G. R. Langley) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITIONS: PETROL RESELLERS

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO presented a petition signed by 67 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would reject any legislation that could cause petrol resellers to trade seven days a week until 9.30 p.m.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT presented a similar petition signed by 178 residents of South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN presented a similar petition signed by 57 residents of South Australia.

Mr. HARRISON presented a similar petition signed by 117 residents of South Australia.

Mr. BECKER presented a similar petition signed by 61 residents of South Australia.

Mr. SLATER presented a similar petition signed by 55 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITION: MINORS BILL

Mr. BECKER presented a petition signed by 294 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would reject any legislation that deprived parents of their rights and responsibilities in respect of the total health and welfare of their children.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. HARRISON presented a petition signed by 29 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that the position of blood relations sharing a family property enjoy at least the same benefits as those available to other recognised relationships.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

BEVERAGE CONTAINERS

In reply to Mr. SLATER (February 16).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Whilst the situation is being watched closely, it is considered that, consistent with the principles laid down for the establishment of collection depots in the metropolitan area, the inner north-eastern suburbs are adequately serviced by the depots which have been established at St. Peters, Holden Hill, Cavan and Wingfield.

PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In the temporary absence of the Premier, will the Deputy Premier now admit that the extravagant use of State taxes to expand the Public Service

is a major contributing factor to the record Budget deficit of about \$26 000 000 now expected for the current financial year? Despite the Premier's claims yesterday that the 3.5 per cent growth rate in the Public Service is not a great increase, 558 new Public Service positions have been created during the past eight months, and the number of State public servants per 1 000 head of population has grown from 8.9 in 1970 to 13 in 1977. The fact remains that the South Australian Public Service has continued to grow while the size of the Commonwealth Public Service has been reduced over the past two years. Indeed, the growth rate in South Australia has far outstripped that of the other States. In view of the record State deficit, there can be little doubt that the continuing growth of the State Public Service has resulted in an increasing drain on the resources of South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Premier has already outlined to this House in fairly great detail the real reasons for the deficit that may occur this financial year. It strikes me as rather odd to hear the Deputy Leader now trying to tie up any growth in the Public Service with this deficit. He knows as well as I do that each year the manpower budget is considered at the same time as all the other budgetary matters, and it was a deliberate decision of Government that the increase of, I think, about 3.5 per cent in the Public Service would occur this financial year. Because it suits his argument, the honourable member would of course say that we should not have done that now, but it is strange to hear, almost every day in this House, members opposite claiming that the Government is not providing sufficient services in some area or another. In relation to the Environment Department, I have heard nothing but cries of anguish on the part of the Opposition about increasing the staff. Look at the member for Murray shrink when he hears that. He has claimed that the Government has neglected this area and that we should be increasing staff by great numbers. He is saying that we are not providing adequate services. He cannot have his cake and eat it, too.

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! There are far too many interjections, and I cannot hear what the Deputy Premier is saying.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The increases that have occurred in the Public Service have been necessary in the interests of the people of South Australia. Many of those increases have been due directly to the Federal Government's inadequacies and to cuts made by that Government in providing services for the people of this State. Let members opposite deny that.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Of course they would deny it, because they do not know what they are talking about. The member for Kavel can apparently have it both ways, but he is not going to get away with this. The increase in the Public Service is decided each financial year. I do not have to defend the situation; it defends itself. The honourable member is doing nothing more than playing sheer politics in this matter.

ELIZABETH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. HEMMINGS: Can the Minister of Education say whether, as part of the second stage of construction of the Elizabeth Community College, an overway will be included? The second stage of construction of the building is separated from the main complex by Woodford Road, Elizabeth North. This road is one of the major sources of entry to the Elizabeth town centre. The fact that students

will be crossing the road at frequent intervals may result in a traffic and safety hazard on completion of the second stage.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I have seen the road in question, and I have inspected plans providing for a footpath overway for students. We do not intend to proceed immediately with the plans. However, we will monitor traffic movements very closely and, in the event of the results of the monitoring system showing up the necessity for an overpass, that could be incorporated. No definite decision has been made on the matter at present.

RURAL INDUSTRIES COMMITTEE

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Works inquire of the Minister of Agriculture the reasons for the dismissal of the Rural Industries Committee and ascertain whether, with the dismissal of that committee, the House will see immediately the introduction of legislation to lay down new guidelines for the operation of the new committee? The dismissed committee had its charter, I understand, on guidelines laid down by agreement with the Commonwealth Government. There has been some dissatisfaction from rural applicants for assistance from this committee, in that no-one has ever been able to get to the committee. However, from the Minister's statement it seems that members of the committee have had their services terminated. A new committee is to be appointed in place of the previous committee and, from the press report, we are to see new guidelines laid down without legislation to prop it up. I think the House is entitled to some Ministerial statement on what can be expected.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to refer the honourable member's question to my colleague. The people who are no longer on this committee were not dismissed.

Mr. Dean Brown: Oh yes they were, and you put the lid on it.

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Davenport knows everything! He is very well informed!

Mr. Dean Brown: I have seen—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not care what the honourable member has seen. I want to say not to the member for Davenport but to the honourable member who asked the question quite seriously, because he is concerned, that the term of office of those members had expired some time ago. They were not dismissed; their terms had expired.

Mr. Millhouse: Why couldn't they have been reappointed?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall forgive the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Millhouse: It comes to the same thing.

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He has been under a great deal of stress in the past few days, and I shall forgive him for his inadequacies at present.

Mr. Millhouse: You can't answer me.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The terms of office of those committee members had expired, not recently, but some time ago. They had been continuing to serve on the committee on an *ad hoc* basis. The things the committee has to do have changed.

I am not saying that the people who were previously on the committee were not adequately equipped in some

ways, but their professions are no longer necessary to be brought to bear on this question. We have to go in a different direction and we need expertise of a different kind on the committee; that is the main reason for the change of membership. I will obtain from my colleague the other information the honourable member has sought and bring it down as soon as possible.

CONCESSION CARDS

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether the Government will consider the position of persons holding State pensioner concession cards so that they are able to use the cards for travel, particularly on the railways? Can suitable arrangements be made with the Australian National Railways for the concession to apply to country and interstate travel?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes, the Government has considered this matter. From the time that the State concession card was introduced the South Australian Government intended that the travel concessions that apply to holders of the Commonwealth pensioner health benefit card would apply. Unfortunately (and to some extent what I am saying has a bearing on the earlier question asked today of the Deputy Premier about the State services that are being provided at present), the Commonwealth Government has decided that, where the travel concerned is on country or interstate railways, which are obviously now to be under the Australian National Railways, it will not honour the State concession card. I can inform the House that Cabinet believed this to be an unacceptable position for those people in the community who are to receive this help, and it has decided that a reimbursement basis will apply between A.N.R. (that is, the Commonwealth Government) and the State Government so that those persons who have received the State concession card will be able to receive the benefit to which we think they are entitled.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): I move:

That this House condemns the Federal Government for deploying large numbers of Social Security Department staff on "dole blitz" duties at a time when thousands of genuinely unemployed continue to suffer unnecessary delays in receiving unemployment benefit entitlements.

My motion relates to a report in the *Advertiser* of Monday, February 13, which prompted me to ask a question in this House of the Minister of Community Welfare about the placing of 15 investigating staff to assist in reducing the massive back-log in the Elizabeth office of the Social Security Department. I was sorry on that day that the question was received with some merriment by members opposite. I am glad to say that the Minister, in replying to my question, effectively took them to task.

He made them feel ashamed of the way that they had treated that question concerning the delays in the payment of cheques to the unemployed in Elizabeth.

A desperate situation is still currently being experienced in the Social Security Department, especially in the high unemployment area of the Bonython District. Figures released by the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations (although I could say the Minister for Unemployment) show a record level of unemployment in

Australia. Figures released at the end of January show that in Australia there was a record level of 445 300 unemployed, a total of 7.21 per cent of the work force. In South Australia, 41 205 people were unemployed, 7.15 per cent of the work force.

What is particularly tragic are the figures concerning unemployed school-leavers: in South Australia at the end of January, 6 899 school-leavers were unemployed, an increase of 1 079. To me that is a shocking state of affairs. In South Australia, unfilled vacancies registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service number 1 642. We have a situation in which 41 205 people who are unemployed have to go into 1 642 jobs. In the same press report the Minister for Social Security (Senator Guilfoyle) stated that as at January 27, 1978, the number of persons receiving unemployment benefits totalled 269 896 an increase of 13 673 from the end of December.

At present in the Bonython District, 4 387 people are receiving unemployment benefits, and discussions that the member for Elizabeth (the Attorney-General), the Federal member for Bonython and I have had with welfare workers and employment officers suggest that the figure could be as high as 5 000. Thus one out of 10 of the potential work force in Bonython is unemployed and, if this motion is carried, it may compel the Federal Government to become more humane and compassionate, and to show a more generous response to the unemployed, who are the chief victims of the Government's present economic policies.

Recently Mr. Fraser said, "Unemployment will fall from February and keep on falling and falling." Perhaps, because of seasonal patterns, that statement, with a bit of luck, may be true, but having regard to the economic sense, seasonal adjustments, and month-by-month comparisons with previous years, it would seem that unemployment will get tragically worse in the months ahead. The Federal Government can salvage little of its own numerical predictions by sending out teams of inspectors to hunt down so-called malingers. Such resources would be better placed in social security offices in regions of high unemployment such as Bonython, Whyalla, and Port Adelaide, in which the social security system is close to breaking down.

I assure members that this system is breaking down, because I have been told by my colleagues that, in areas they represent, the figures I have been quoting about the time people have to wait to be seen when making personal inquiries and the length of time they have to wait for cheques, is the same throughout the State. It is strange that no Opposition member has said anything about such a problem. The shadow Minister of Community Welfare has not once, since I have been a member here, voiced any protest about the way unemployed people in this State are being treated.

Mr. Whitten: Who is it?

Mr. HEMMINGS: It is either the member for Murray or the member for Glenelg, but all that the member for Glenelg wants us to do is increase punishment for juveniles. That is where there is a difference between the two Parties. We are more compassionate in treating people, whereas members opposite want to punish and vilify people.

Mr. Millhouse: Steady on!

Mr. HEMMINGS: I apologise to the member for Mitcham, but I am referring to the two major political Parties. As from the next election, I am sure there will not be a representative of the Australian Democrats Party in this House. At present in the Bonython District unemployment payments have been running three to six weeks behind, and not much imagination is required to

translate those delays into terms of individual hardship.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: And human suffering.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Yes. I am not reflecting on the officers of the Social Security Department, and I make that point as I did in my question. They work under extreme difficulties, the department is under-staffed, and they have to work within the oppressive guidelines submitted by the Fraser Government.

In the Bonython District, unemployment has increased by 300 per cent since 1974. As the staff of that local office has been increased by only 33 per cent during the same period, is it any wonder that cheques arrive up to six weeks late or, in some cases, not at all? The Federal Government will only increase the tensions in this society by the present punitive actions taken against the unemployed. It will cure only the conscience of its own supporters by creating a dole-bludger syndrome. A 1945 White Paper on full employment in Australia was ratified by the Commonwealth Government in 1969. One of the principles in the White Paper is as follows:

The maintenance of conditions which will make full employment possible is an obligation owed to the people of Australia by Commonwealth and State Governments.

Full employment is a fundamental aim of the Commonwealth Government. The Government believes that the people of Australia will demand and are entitled to expect full employment.

What a hollow statement that is in 1978! As far as I am concerned, if every unemployed person was to read that statement, it would make him or her feel sick.

Dealing now with the cost of unemployment, I will quote from an excellent report, which I recommend to the member for Glenelg, entitled "Whatever happened to full employment? Part II". The pertinent points are as follows:

Costs to the community are extremely widespread. First, there is the simple monetary cost of providing unemployment benefits themselves and the support staff and services to implement them.

The report deals with education at high school and tertiary levels, and states:

At tertiary education level, the education of the 5 500 1976 graduates who are likely to be unemployed in 1977 will have cost the Federal Government about \$100 000 000. This is in addition to the cost of educating the 5 848 professionals who are currently unemployed and the estimated 30 per cent of graduates who are employed in jobs which are not appropriate to their qualifications.

The report then goes on to deal with increased crime rates and decreased mental health, as follows:

Increased crime rates and decreased mental health have also been associated with prolonged periods of high unemployment. This is a long-term cost to the community, and would become more evident the higher the levels of unemployment and the longer their duration. These costs are closely related to the impact of unemployment on individuals who are jobless.

I also remind members of a recent survey that the Victorian Mental Health Department conducted in Ballarat. The survey found that, in 1976, as the rate of unemployment rose in that city, the rate of mental breakdowns increased in proportion. The rate of attempted suicides also increased in proportion. The survey concluded that, unless something drastic was done about unemployment, the Victorian Mental Health Department would become unworkable.

I now move on to the deep social and personal consequences of unemployment, and I ask Opposition members to listen carefully to what I have to say. I will quote from a report entitled "The Demoralising Experience of Prolonged Unemployment", written by

Richard Harrison. It describes the process of initial shock or disorientation on becoming unemployed, which is followed by an active search for a job. The report states:

The person is still optimistic and unresigned. As this situation continues, however, boredom, restlessness and pessimism are the keynotes, together with increased financial and social pressures. The person experiences the need to find something to occupy his time, but is limited by financial considerations—even odd jobs around the house cost money. The frustration associated with this boredom, coupled with such things as stigma, social embarrassment and irritability lead to anxiety and depression, and so, to further withdrawal from social contact.

The cycle is set: a lowering of self-esteem resulting from the social and personal consequence of unemployment, leading to a general social debility, aggravated, in periods of particularly high unemployment, by the added frustration of the futility of seeking employment. A further lowering of self-esteem results, and a decay of work habits and skills follow.

The Federal Government has done much to create this stigma. It has carried out rather successfully an operation to alienate the Australian people from the unemployed. Perhaps I sound ashamed of my fellow man when I say that the Federal Government has created the impression that the vast majority of unemployed have no intention of seeking a job and are content just to receive an unemployment benefit, pitiful though it is. The Federal Government coined the term "dole bludgers", which I find the most offensive description of an unemployed person possible. These people, especially Commonwealth Ministers of the Crown who actively promoted the idea that the unemployed were dole bludgers, should be condemned for peddling such a term when describing 7.2 per cent of the work force.

Let us consider these so-called dole bludgers. Again I will quote a few brief extracts from "Whatever happened to full employment?", as follows:

Mr. W. K. Allen, the first Assistant Secretary of the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations, has said that in regard to the young unemployed a small proportion are not keen to work for reasons related to their own value systems. They comprise a much publicised minority of the unemployed . . . Interviews with the young unemployed suggest that they are not as content as some might believe with their lot on the dole.

The Commonwealth Commission of Inquiry into Poverty also concluded "We found no evidence of work shyness." Instead the inquiry found that many unemployed people suffered from social and psychological disabilities and were wrongly labelled as "work shy".

A survey by the Department of Labour and Immigration for the Commonwealth Commission of Inquiry into Poverty found "little evidence among our sample of any anti-work motivation, or even what has been called 'work shyness'. Except for women with domestic careers ahead of them and people ready for age or invalid pensions, nearly everybody expected to have to work for a living and were prepared to do so."

A research report to the Commission of Inquiry into Poverty concluded that . . . unemployed persons felt humiliated, rejected, embarrassed, worthless.

A survey conducted by the Social Security Department in the four-week period ended August 22, 1975, concluded that 6.1 per cent of those surveyed failed the work test or were felt to be unwilling to work. However, the department has admitted that this could be an over-estimate because the survey was conducted in areas where there were most likely to be dole cheats.

That figure of 6.1 is immediately suspect. I now refer to

appeals where investigators have found so-called dole cheats. During the period October to December, 1975, 3 040 appeals were made by unemployed people in Australia against the suspension of unemployment benefits. Of these appeals, 69 per cent were upheld. In New South Wales, in the period January to March, 1976, 1 035 appeals were made, and 91 per cent of them were upheld. Thus, many people suspected of being work shy were proven not to be work shy.

Let us now consider prosecutions launched by the Social Security Department and compare them with the number of people unemployed at the time. From July, 1970, to June, 1971, there were 50 prosecutions out of a total of 76 277 unemployed. From July, 1971, to June, 1972, the number of prosecutions increased to 130, but unemployment increased to 115 149. The figures continue to the period from July, 1975, to March, 1976, when there were 91 prosecutions, while the unemployment figure had increased to a staggering 303 739. Thus, the number of successful prosecutions compared with the number of unemployed persons is extremely low.

The regulations covering field inspectors and their terms of reference provide that persons who have been receiving benefits for three months are required to be interviewed by the Social Security Department. This is often done by Social Security Department field staff, and a work test carried out by the field officers is restricted to locating claimants, probing work endeavour (work tests), and checking on the status of the unemployed, that is, whether there is a *de facto* relationship involved. Several situations can arise concerning the location of claimants. If field officers are unable to locate claimants, they have the authority to recommend termination of benefits. This is intended as a check against unemployed persons claiming under different names and addresses and against those supposedly working. However, locating a claimant is not always straightforward and it appears that this exercise sometimes leads to arbitrary decision-making. Does finding a house empty indicate that a person has changed his or her address or that they are holidaying when they should be looking for work?

From what people have told me I know that some of them are desperate for work and they go away from their homes looking for work. A constituent of mine went to Port Augusta to try to find a job. He had to borrow the money to get there. He had to go to Port Augusta in the afternoon to be interviewed the following day. He came back the day after that. While his house was thus vacant for three days a field officer tried to locate him there. He could not be found, so his benefit was cut off because the department said that he was using a false name and address. This is the kind of decision-making by field officers that subjects the unemployed to unnecessary delays in the receipt of benefits. After representation from the claimant, he received his benefit again together with back-dated cheques.

I think the work test situation is the worst aspect of the field officer's job. Research officers believe that, after searching for a job for six or seven months, going from place to place and getting no chance at all, an unemployed person starts to believe that there is no point in continuing to look for work. I can understand that and I am sure members opposite can understand it. That does not make him work shy but he is defeated; he has lost his self-respect and his dignity.

In normal cases the unemployed worker is completely unaware of his rights and he is confused about the way in which the work test operates. Since the work test was designed primarily for control purposes, it is not surprising that usually it operates to the detriment of claimants. As

well as being an attempt to reduce welfare expenditure, the work test acts as an intimidatory device in locking vulnerable workers into unsatisfying positions, and this contributes to the stifling of discussion over working conditions.

Finally, I say that, although members opposite may not view this motion with the same degree of importance as I do, my colleagues and I believe this House should make a protest on behalf of the people of South Australia. I suspect that Opposition speakers following will claim that I have distorted the facts and that the previous Labor Administration caused this higher rate of unemployment. If we are realistic, we will realise, without apportioning blame, that unemployment started to increase in the early 1960's, and it has been increasing steadily since then. Unemployment accelerated in 1973 and it has been accelerating ever since, regardless of which Government has been in power.

The problem—and this is something that I think most people do not realise—is that, although historically the base level of unemployment in Australia is generally accepted to be 1.5 per cent, if we had an economic miracle overnight, I think we would have reached a situation where the base level of unemployment has risen to 3.5 per cent. We have a horrifying situation that, even if we had an economic miracle, even if the present economic policies of the Federal Government worked, we would have 3.5 per cent of the people still unemployed. Having that 3.5 per cent in our society will create problems and wreck our already tottering social security system.

The Federal Government must recognise that the present unemployment benefits are insufficient and that they must be raised to a reasonable level. At the moment, unemployment benefits are below the Anderson poverty line. That is why I believe it is important that this House should support the motion. I think members in this place should show the people of South Australia and the Federal Government that they are concerned about social security and concerned that the department cannot function, simply because of lack of staff and lack of foresight by the Minister controlling the department; when the unemployment figures were rising so rapidly, no attempt was made to train officers to work within the department. The Senator, to give her her dues, was most likely tied by the figures for cutting down in public ceilings. I see that the Leader is treating this again with some amusement. Perhaps he should pay a visit to some —

Mr. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Leader was not treating this with some amusement. We attempted to come to an agreement that members would be brief in trying to get through their speeches, and that the honourable member would speak for about 15 minutes. The honourable member has gone for 25 minutes, and that is what we were laughing about.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I apologise for going on, but this is something that concerns me. I shall try to be as brief as possible. As the member for Ross Smith has said, this is an important subject. I have sat here and listened to members opposite speak at length, especially the member for Mount Gambier, who spoke for two hours on one subject. If I have repeated myself a couple of times, I apologise, but I object when members opposite pick me up when the member for Mount Gambier repeated himself so many times that it was not funny.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member will get back to the motion.

Mr. HEMMINGS: My final comment is that I ask that this House support the motion, as we are concerned about the use of field officers at this critical time when genuinely

unemployed people are suffering. Finally, I think the most important thing with which we should concern ourselves is the dignity of our fellow man.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): In this House in the past we had the Wallaroo warbler, and now it seems that we have Dame Nellie Melba; there were so many "finals" in the speech of the honourable member that that was not funny, either. What the member has been saying to this House in imputing attitudes to members on this side is quite ludicrous. He has suggested that members on this side would have no interest in these problems, and that they would not believe that a problem existed. We recognise, and we have publicly stated in this place and elsewhere, that there is a problem and that it will not be overcome simply by cheap politicking, the like of which we have had this afternoon.

I return to the motion, which was as follows:

That this House condemns the Federal Government for deploying large numbers of Social Security Department staff on "dole blitz" duties at a time when thousands of genuinely unemployed continue to suffer unnecessary delays in receiving unemployment benefit entitlements.

What has the honourable member been doing over the past three weeks? In the *News Review* of February 22 the following headline appeared:

M.P. hits out: unemployed "victimised".

On November 11, 1977, the following headline appeared:

Unions "restrict" jobs for youth.

What has his colleague, the Federal member for Bonython done? The following headline appeared in the same publication on February 22:

New scheme will help unemployed.

In that article he points out that the Federal Government has given the go-ahead for a new community youth support scheme in Elizabeth. The Federal Government gave the go-ahead for that scheme almost two years ago, and it has been under way, yet the honourable member's colleague goes out on a limb and tries to make cheap politics out of a situation involving the misery of large numbers of people who are, regrettably, unemployed. I now quote the following statement:

Department of Social Security field officers have started taking special steps to seek out and prosecute people abusing the unemployment benefit system. This follows the announcement last weekend by the Minister for Social Security of a campaign against people who may be making fraudulent claims for unemployment benefits. The Minister's announcement followed newspaper reports suggesting that a Bureau of Statistics survey had found that more than 25 per cent of people registered for employment had jobs. Subsequently there have been claims in the press that 65 000 people could be regularly cheating on unemployment benefits and costing the Australian Government untold millions a week.

That is not a statement made in 1978: it is a statement of May 19, 1975, and the Minister of the day was Mr. William Hayden, the Minister for Social Security. That was a statement defending his department's decision to check on the validity of claims being made by unemployed persons, yet the honourable member this afternoon decries the step which has been most recently taken by the Minister for Social Security, who merely follows the practice that has been common in the department for a long time.

I will come back to those statements in due course. Let it be known that, as a member interested in the problems of the people in his district, I have had constant contact with the Department of Social Security office which is near the centre of the honourable member's electorate. I was quite incensed when not two weeks ago I was informed by

an officer of that department that Mr. Blewett had indicated that henceforth inquiries relative to social security matters would be made through his office and that he had entered into an arrangement with the members for the district that they would channel all affairs relating to social security through Mr. Blewett and that he would handle them with the Department of Social Security.

Mr. Hemmings: He's achieving results.

Dr. EASTICK: Let me tell the honourable member that I have over a long period, before Mr. Blewett entered Parliament, achieved results on behalf of the people I represent. I will continue to make representations, as I know that all my colleagues make representations, to the regional Department of Social Security offices that affect their areas. It is a responsibility that a member takes on, and I find it quite hypocritical, and playing politics, when a Federal member new to the task comes in and tries to prevent or circumvent a member from having access to the Department of Social Security.

I point out to the honourable member that Mr. Blewett represents about 1 100 to 1 200 people in the District of Light, that that district has a much larger group of people than that, and that the area served by the Elizabeth office goes beyond the District of Light into the Districts of Goyder and Kavel, and I think it may touch on part of the District of Rocky River. There is a responsibility for members, and we will not accept cheap politicking associated with the misery of unemployed people. The honourable member referred to the period of delay. That situation is regrettable, but in many instances the reason for the delay is the failure of the applicant to be honest.

Mr. Slater: That's not true.

Dr. EASTICK: In many instances it is caused because the applicant has been less than honest. I give the honourable member a simple example. A young man came to my office 10 days ago, and I made representations on his behalf to the office in the honourable member's district. The young gentleman told me that he had failed to receive his cheque on time, although he had done all the things that he should have done, and that he could not understand it. I made representations, and there was some delay in getting the information back to me, because it was found that the same gentleman in his own name had gone to Mount Gambier, had been employed for a time, had come back to get his unemployment cheque, but had not told the department that he had been employed. The department picked up the matter by cross-checking.

We could also refer to the fact that people in need of sickness benefits or of special benefits, or those receiving invalid pensions, are all suffering from delays because of a series of problems associated with what I would call the muscle of some members of the Federal Public Service who are on a course of destruction of the activities of the Department of Social Security. It is far from being the Federal Government being responsible for many of these problems: that responsibility is sheeted home positively to members of the Federal Public Service, and their actions do them no credit. There is a grave problem, but it is not being assisted by actions taken by a number of public servants who are failing in their role of providing a service to the public purse that pays them.

I refer now to the statement recently made by the present Minister for Social Security. It is similar in terms to the statement which I have already read and which was made by Mr. Hayden in 1975, and it is contained in a document dated February 12, 1978, as follows:

Unemployment benefit visits by field officers:

Commenting on recent reports that departmental field officers have been stepping up the level of visits to homes of unemployment benefit claimants, the Director-General of

Social Security, Mr. P. J. Lanigan, said today that this was a routine administrative arrangement.

For the last quarter of a century, it has been a normal and routine part of the administration of the social security system that field officers regularly visit persons claiming pensions or benefits to ensure that the facts that they have asserted in support of their claims are correct. The number of field officers has not been increased significantly in recent times, but these officers are presently concentrating their efforts in the unemployment benefit area, because of evidence that significant numbers of people have been claiming benefits to which they were not entitled.

This problem was reported on last year by the Myers inquiry into the administration of the unemployment benefit system. There have also been cases reported in the press recently of offenders being sentenced to gaol terms for fraudulently claiming benefits under false names or when they are not unemployed and their level of income is such as to disqualify them from entitlement. The Director-General stressed that the inquiries are a routine method of checking the eligibility of claimants.

I also possess copies of letters sent by Senator Margaret Guilfoyle on much the same subject. One letter, dated February 20, is addressed to the Editor of the *Age* in relation to an article that appeared therein. Another letter, dated February 20, was sent to the Editor of the *Australian*, and in that letter it is interesting to note the following point:

Contrary to Mr. Brewer's inference, studies carried out in the area of unemployment benefit administration have indicated the value of home visits—for example, the Myers Report, mentioned by Mr. Brewer, says on page 45 that:

Operational experience has shown that the most productive way of detecting fraud is by field officer activity.

He goes on to say:

Worthwhile savings are achieved on a cost-benefit basis and there appears to be a strong case for intensifying field officer activity.

There is also other documentation, but I will not take up the time of the House by reading it. No doubt other members, given the opportunity later in the debate, will have something to say about the motion.

I return to the most important point associated with the motion. It ill behoves a member on either side to use a fact of life (in this case, the misery of many people who are unemployed, sick, or who are receiving illness or special benefits) to attempt to kick the Federal Government. The mover knows full well that, if there is no check (as evidenced by events of the past four or five years), there are those in our society who will bludge on the rest of society and who will not worry about increasing the ultimate cost to each and every one of us, as taxpayers.

Whilst those people are claiming something which is not their just desert, they are denying the increase to the people in necessitous circumstances who would positively benefit by an increase in their rightful pension or entitlement. I cannot support the motion, although I certainly support a genuine interest by members in the unemployment situation and in the problems in society that it causes.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT REGULATIONS

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I move:

That the regulations under the Electoral Act, 1929-1976, relating to fees for service, made on January 19, 1978, and

laid on the table of this House on February 8, 1978, be disallowed.

I move my motion for several reasons. The first reason I advance for members' attention is that the regulations which were promulgated in the *Government Gazette* on January 19, 1978, following a meeting of Executive Council held on the same day, state:

The Electoral Regulations, 1975, made on the 19th day of December, 1975, and published in the *Government Gazette* on the same day at page 1543 as varied from time to time, are hereinafter referred to as the "principal regulations".

I point out that no electoral regulations were made in December, 1975. At page 1543 of the *Government Gazette* of December 19, 1975, the regulations were promulgated. In the document that has been delivered to the House we are seeking to amend a series of regulations that legally do not exist. I have checked the *Government Gazette* and have ascertained that the date schedule on the promulgation is precisely the same and that it just did not exist, as no action was taken by the Government on December 19, 1975.

Section 35 of the Electoral Act provides:

(1) The Electoral Commissioner, on receipt of notice from a registrar of an enrolment of an elector on an Assembly roll, shall forthwith enrol the elector on the roll for the subdivision of the Council that corresponds to the subdivision of the Assembly roll on which the elector is enrolled.

(2) The Electoral Commissioner on receipt of notice from a registrar of a transfer of enrolment from one subdivision of an Assembly roll to another subdivision of an Assembly roll shall forthwith make such consequential alterations to the Council roll as may be necessary.

Consequent on changes to the Constitution Act and the Electoral Act it became fact that there is only one roll in South Australia and that a person who is enrolled for the House of Assembly is automatically enrolled for the Legislative Council. There is no longer a need for two rolls. In addition, Legislative Council districts no longer exist, yet the document which accompanied the regulations and which was forwarded to the Subordinate Legislation Committee continued to refer to Legislative Council districts and stated that the annual fee was to be doubled for any action taken by a returning officer in respect of the Legislative Council roll.

I am in full accord with just payment being made for services rendered, but I sincerely recommend to the Government that it should further consider the regulation that doubles the fee for activities associated with the Legislative Council roll. Such a roll does not exist, and there should be no yearly holding charge for a returning officer for action taken in respect of a roll that he does not have to consider or worry about.

The third matter contained in these regulations relates to the increase in the fees that would apply to returning officers, doorkeepers, poll clerks and the like. At page 1648 of *Hansard* of February 21 this year the Attorney-General stated that the fees paid to assistant returning officers, presiding officers and all other people for the State election on September 17, 1977, were the fees listed in this proposed regulation. That fee is double the fee that was referred to in the last alteration of regulation 31 of the Electoral Act regulations, which were brought down in June, 1975. Even though I have asked the Attorney who authorised the doubling of the fee for persons who provided services at the recent State election before the increases were authorised by the regulation under the Electoral Act, he has failed to bring down a reply.

People who provide this service to the State provide an essential service. The sum made available to them on the

1975 scale is deficient on present-day values; in fact, it was deficient at the time of the 1977 State election. However, that does not get away from the fact that the fees paid by the Government to persons who provided that service in 1977 were 100 per cent over the fee authorised in the regulation. That is, the fees paid were 100 per cent above the fees that could be legally paid at that time.

I do not for a minute question that the House would have passed or acceded to the passage of a regulation increasing the fees for service had the regulation been laid on the table of the House before the event in question. Although we on this side have constantly criticised retrospectivity in relation to Acts of Parliament and have clearly indicated to the Government that only in certain circumstances would we tolerate such retrospectivity, we now have a document before Parliament that seeks to legalise an administrative act taken by the Government about four months earlier. There is no suggestion of retrospectivity in the regulation.

I am not aware of any regulation that has contained a retrospectivity clause. I make the point clearly that the Opposition will not accept retrospectivity of a regulatory nature. We do not and could not condone this 100 per cent over-expenditure by the Government regarding the payment of fees relating to the 1977 election.

I seriously ask the House to disallow these regulations; they will be disallowed by Government action even if the Government does not accept the motion, because, as I have indicated, the regulations refer to a document that does not exist. The regulations try to tie back to a 1975 document that was never created. The regulations were introduced incorrectly, as they should have referred to a 1957 document.

At a time when it is essential to consider closely the financial affairs of the State it is extremely important that we ensure, in a regulation that seeks to provide for an annual fee to returning officers for actions in respect of the Legislative Council roll, that reference to such roll is deleted from the regulation, as the roll no longer exists. I ask the House to accept the motion.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

BUILDERS LICENSING REGULATIONS

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That the regulations under the Builders Licensing Act, 1967-1976, relating to the composition of the Builders Licensing Advisory Committee, made on December 1, 1977, and laid on the table of this House on December 6, 1977, be disallowed.

I move this motion, even though I know I could not win the vote. I wish to make the point that the advisory committee was set up with 10 members in 1974 and the term of the original committee expired in early 1977. At that time we as a Parliament agreed, by regulation, that the composition of the committee should be six members. No move has been made by the Government since the beginning of 1977 to have the new advisory committee of six members set up. The Government cannot think the committee is very important, or perhaps there is the belief by the trade union movement that there should be two additional union members on the committee. The trade union movement has a controlling interest in the Labor Party, and I believe there is a substantial left-wing union group within the building industry which has set out to convince the Government to increase to eight the number of members of the advisory committee.

The present regulation gives the Government the opportunity to have two trade union representatives on the committee, as well as a person representing the institute, a representative of architects, a representative of engineers, and a representative from another professional field. Most of those people belong to a trade or profession, so why do we need to give the unions equal say to the other mixed group? All the members do not have the same interest. The representative from the building institute could well be a builder. I do not see why we should increase at all the union representation. I do not believe it is justified, and I hope the Government will be forced in another place to have the regulation disallowed. The advisory committee can work with six members. The Government has failed to recognise the benefit of the work done by the committee because it has not appointed any members to the committee since the term of the previous committee expired at the beginning of last year.

The Attorney-General chose to appoint to the Builders Licensing Board a woman who was an assistant on a television station to Humphrey Bear or some other character. When that woman (Mrs. Phillips, who lives in the Attorney-General's district) was asked in an interview what experience she had had in the field of building and in particular in relation to builders' licensing, she told the media at that time that she had no expertise but she hoped she would soon learn something about it. That is not the sort of thing we want if we are to give proper consideration to the licensing of builders. The woman may become capable but there were people in the community at that time, of either sex, who were capable of doing the job and who had some expertise, and one wonders why someone from that area was chosen to sit on that committee.

I know I will not win the vote; it would be a waste of time taking the motion to a vote. I oppose the concept of increasing the advisory committee to eight members to allow four trade unionists to be on the committee. I believe two members is a fair representation for the trade union movement. The regulation existing before December is a suitable regulation, and I believe that the Government should put its faith in a committee of six. I ask members to consider these matters and I hope that the Government will accept the rejection of the present regulation, if such a move is made in another place.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE ACT

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, section 43 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act should be amended to allow the Minister to resolve the difficulties now caused by the restrictive nature of section 43 of the abovementioned Act.

I have two reasons for moving this motion. One concerns a matter brought to my attention some years ago, when the District Council of Kimba was in my electoral district; the second relates to an unfortunate happening that has occurred in a national park about 20 miles south of Streaky Bay. I am aware that great difficulties have occurred within the Environment Department. Yesterday, the Minister for the Environment completely destroyed the credibility of the former Minister, now Chief Secretary. I quote from the *Hansard* pulls, as follows:

I have tried several times to allay the fears of people in this department as to their future, and I have explained to them that this department will not only increase in influence but will also increase in size, and that I hope it will go in better directions than it has gone in the past.

That is a clear indication that the administration from the top of the department down was not only inefficient but incompetent, lacking the ability to administer such an important department properly.

The two matters to which I intend to refer were the subject of representations made to me by district councils, responsible organisations in the community, which have had lengthy negotiations with Ministers and departmental officers. I do not blame the local officers; they are bound by those in control of the department.

In relation to the original decision, when I made representations on behalf of the District Council of Kimba, I would be willing to say that the Minister was completely guided by his department and was not prepared to show any independence or any Ministerial responsibility; he was completely under the direction and influence of his officers. I think it was an abrogation of his duties. To explain the situation I draw the attention of the House to correspondence relating to the matter. On June 15, 1976, the District Council of Kimba wrote to me, as follows:

Dear Sir,

re National Parks and Wildlife Reserves

I enclose herewith the following documents:

1. Plan showing the location of the Pinkawillinie Reserve.
2. Letter from Lands Department *re* fire access roads.
3. Letter from National Parks and Wildlife Service *re* road-making material.
4. Letter to Eyre Peninsula Fire Fighting Association submitting an agenda item regarding access roads.

The importance of providing fire access roads into reserves is no doubt appreciated by you. Experiences on Eyre Peninsula accentuate the importance of the matter.

Before the Pinkawillinie Reserve was proclaimed this council opened up a rubble pit in the approximate position shown. The material from this pit was used in construction of the road which now passes through the reserve. My council claims that if pits are opened up in a proper manner and the overburden is replaced little damage occurs. The pit opened up by this council some years ago holds water most of the year and must be a welcome watering place for the wildlife in the reserve.

It is requested that you endeavour to have the provisions of section 43 of the Act modified to enable approval to be given to local government bodies to extract road-making material under the supervision of the departmental officers.

It is also requested that you use every endeavour to support our request for the provision of access roads.

Both those requests are reasonable; the council is merely asking for the department to adopt a commonsense approach. I have driven through the park many times and, having been aware of the location of the rubble pit, and having inspected it, I am amazed at the decision of the department. Certainly, it has not been made by people with any practical experience in these matters. The points made in the letter have been made to me by countless numbers of people on Eyre Peninsula who are concerned about the tight-fisted attitude and the uncompromising approach of the department. Those are strong words, but I make no apology for using them. I hope that the new Minister will take action. I believe he will be far more responsible; he is a practical man, and he will have some appreciation of the problems of practical people.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I am starting to worry about him.

Mr. GUNN: I am not surprised that the Minister of Education should make such a comment. He is an academic, and would not understand one aspect of the motion.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You don't even understand

what the motion is.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Henley Beach, formerly Minister in charge of the department, surprises me. He was responsible for introducing this legislation into Parliament, but he knows nothing about how it has operated or how it is going to operate. He has indicted himself by his own interjection. I suggest that he should read section 43.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You read it to me.

Mr. GUNN: I have read it many times. I suggest the honourable member should read it again. The Government of this State has failed to put before this House motions for the severing of that land. The request has been for the land to be severed.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What's this got to do with mining in national parks?

Mr. GUNN: Mining is taking rubble out of national parks. The answers received from the department indicate that it is concerned that a spate of these requests will be received. That is nonsense, because this is an isolated case, miles from any other suitable location. Rubble has been taken out of the pit in the past, and it has done nothing but good.

The second matter to which I shall refer in discussing the restrictive nature of the legislation relates to a national park south of Streaky Bay. For many years, a tennis club has conducted weekly matches at Calca. Some few years ago, the National Parks and Wildlife Service purchased land from a private landholder. At the time a mistake was made. Neither the private landholder nor the department realised that the area of the tennis courts and the adjacent facilities was on the title. The land was eventually dedicated as a national park, and a few years later the tennis club approached the district council to borrow funds to construct a new clubhouse on the area. When the necessary inquiries were made, it was found that the land on which the tennis courts were situated did not belong to the club but was part of a national park.

An approach was made to the Government to have the area set aside. Once again, this enlightened department declined the request, indicating that it would let the club have the land on an annual licence, but how can the club raise money on an annual licence? About 10 hectares of land needs to be subdivided off and made available to the organisation. It was an honest mistake, and it should be rectified promptly by the Minister. The previous Minister failed to do anything about it.

I have discussed the matter with the present Minister, and I hope that he will take action. However, if that does not occur in the next few months, I shall have no alternative but to put motions before this House requesting approval for the land to be severed from the national park. I do not think it is necessary to say more on this subject.

Much can be said about the department. The member for Murray has had much to say, and I endorse what he has said. There is a need to have a national parks and wildlife organisation in this State, but there is a need to have at the head of it people who are experienced in the management and operation of land and who have an appreciation of the problems of adjoining landholders. That administration should consist of people, in my opinion, who have been involved in agriculture or in the pastoral industry. The people who are at present involved may have had extensive academic training in that field, but unfortunately it has failed to lead them to an appreciation of the real problems of country people in South Australia, those people who have to live alongside these national parks.

I hope that the department and the Government will look very closely at the matters I have raised. I have

waited for some time before bringing them to the attention of the House, because I hoped the Government would change its mind and act responsibly. However, up to the present stage it has failed to take what I believe to be a responsible course on these matters. Two quite ridiculous decisions have been made, and I hope that the Government will rectify them by bringing in legislation to correct the anomalies. If it does not, I will have to take appropriate action at the first opportunity.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNLEY TRAFFIC

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That the regulations under the Road Traffic Act relating to Traffic Prohibition (Unley), made on October 27, 1977, and laid on the table of this House on November 1, 1977, be disallowed.

(Continued from February 22. Page 1726.)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I oppose the motion. I am sorry that the member who moved it is not prepared to grace this Chamber with his presence. Apparently he is out doing a bit more muck-raking.

Mr. Becker: He's on strike; he didn't get a big enough salary increase.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I wish he was on strike and learnt a little bit of decency.

Mr. Millhouse: I have.

Mr. Slater: The prodigal son.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: He is not the prodigal son; he is called "S. S. Millhouse". I do not think many people, and certainly not the member for Mitcham, really appreciate the effect of this motion. On looking at the *Hansard* record one can see that the honourable member would clearly not have been able to deliver a speech had Dr. McCarthy not provided much of the information, because 90 per cent of what appears in *Hansard* is a repetition of what Dr. McCarthy said.

I think the point ought to be made that the regulations that are presently before this House and subject to this disallowance motion have been determined after much proper consideration. What happened (without my going too far back into the history of the whole thing) was that a firm of consultants known as Loder and Bayly undertook a survey of the whole traffic problem in the area and brought down a comprehensive report. That report has the full support of the local government body of the area, so anyone who opposes the regulations, or supports the disallowance, is clearly acting contrary to the expressed desires of the City of Unley.

I think it ought to be taken into account by the House what City of Unley's view is on this matter. On February 24 the Town Clerk of the City of Unley wrote to the Chairman of the Road Traffic Board in the following vein:

It has come to the notice of the council that there is an attempt in Parliament for a disallowance of the Road Traffic Board Regulation: Traffic Prohibition (Unley). May I, Sir, express to you the council's concern at such a move? As you will recall, the council has gone to considerable expense in obtaining consultants, Loder and Bayly, and conducting surveys of resident feeling on street closures in the Malvern and Unley areas before asking for the implementation of the scheme. Your files will indicate that, since the original application for the closures, the council has, through consultation with and approval of the residents, modified the scheme.

The council believes that the present scheme is the most fair one and has proved itself in the safety aspect, as can be shown through the accident statistics. The council, in the strongest terms possible, wishes to make it known to you that, in fairness to all residents in the area mentioned, this scheme is the most practicable for safety and convenience, and accepted by the greatest majority of those affected, and that it will support any move you wish to make to ensure that the scheme is accepted by Parliament.

Let it be clearly understood that anyone who supports the motion for disallowance is acting contrary to the wishes of the City of Unley and contrary to the views and desires of the majority of the residents in the area.

I think the effect of the disallowance should also be clearly understood. The Road Traffic Board provided me with a report informing me of the effect if the motion before us were carried. It states:

- (1) Traffic signals are to be installed at the intersections of Fisher Street and Duthy Street and Wattle Street and Duthy Street. Both Fisher and Wattle Streets were closed at Duthy Street, and the regulations now being debated legally affected the opening of these roads. Disallowance would require these roads to be closed again.
- (2) Cremorne Street and Duthy Street intersection: the regulations legally effect the closure of the eastern arm of Cremorne Street and the removal of the closure on the western arm of Cremorne Street at this intersection. Disallowance would require the road closure to revert to the western arm.
- (3) Oxford Terrace and Duthy Street intersection: the regulations legally effect the closure of the western arm of Oxford Terrace and the removal of the closure of the eastern arm of Oxford Terrace at this intersection. Disallowance would require the road closure to revert to the eastern arm.
- (4) Eton Street and Sheffield Street near Unley Road: the regulations allow a minor relocation of closures on these two streets. When the initial regulations were prepared, an error was made in the description of these two closures. This error meant that the closures would create difficulties with access to several properties. Disallowance would require the closures to revert to their original positions.
- (5) Maud Street and Rugby Street intersection: the regulations effect the removal of the closure of the western arm of Maud Street at its junction with Rugby Street and the installation of a new closure further east along Maud Street between Rugby and Porter Streets. Disallowance would require the closure to revert to its original position in Maud Street.
- (6) Intersections of Cambridge Terrace and Maud Street, Fairford Street and Rugby Street and Rugby Street and Fisher Street: the amended regulation effects new closures on one arm (that is, Cambridge Terrace, Fairford Street and Rugby Street, respectively) of each of the above intersections. Disallowance would require removal of these three closures.

When we take into account the very serious effect that the disallowance motion, if carried, would have, when we take into account that the disallowance is contrary to the expressed wish of the local government body, and when we take into account that the disallowance would be in opposition to the majority view of the people of this area, I believe the case is clearly established. There is no reason why laymen should move for disallowance when experienced and technically qualified people have studied the whole area and have made a recommendation.

Mr. Millhouse: That's an absurd thing to say: anyone

has the right to move disallowance.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The only absurd thing in this House at present is the member for Mitcham, and in this debate I do not intend to canvass his level of intelligence. I make a clear observation that we have before us a recommendation from people who are professionally qualified, and I would never accept the view of laymen, especially that of the member for Mitcham, as opposed to the professional view of people who know what they are talking about.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from February 22. Page 1728.)

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): From time to time the Government and the Premier have expressed their opposition to the production and distribution of child pornography in this State. I believe that this Bill does not take the law any further than it now exists. The Criminal Law Consolidation Act as it stands and a section of the Police Offences Act can be used to deal with offenders in the production of child pornography. Recent offences by persons in relation to this matter have been dealt with severely by the courts.

I make my position clear. I do not believe that children should be exploited for these purposes, and I do not believe that any adult person should be exploited for this or any other purpose. The member for Murray in his speech last Wednesday stated that the present law and its penalties were useless in preventing children from being abused. I take issue with him on that remark. As I have said, recent cases that have come before the courts in South Australia have been severely dealt with, and justifiably so. I contend that the Opposition and, in particular, the Hon. Mr. Burdett, who introduced this Bill, were seeking mainly to gain some publicity in order to support their political philosophy.

The issue of the distribution of child pornography was subject to a decision of the Classification of Publications Board which made clear that the board would not sanction the sale in this State of publications which portrayed children in pornographic poses. It may be alleged that illegal sales will continue, but that is a matter of apprehension by the Police Force.

Mr. Mathwin: Why not outlaw the making of them?

Mr. SLATER: It is outlawed, but much material coming into South Australia is imported from overseas.

Mr. Mathwin: All of it, I would say.

Mr. SLATER: I would say all of it would be imported from overseas. If persons distribute this unclassified material, they are subject to the law.

Mr. Mathwin: I think you are wrong.

Mr. SLATER: There may be persons who will peddle such material, but we can be assured that if they are apprehended they face the risk of prosecution and the full force of the law. The appeal for much of this sort of material lies within a minute section of our community, consisting of people who I believe are sexually misorientated and who need not the weight of the law but guidance and psychiatric help. It is certain that community standards do not accept the use of children for sexual exploitation, and the Government supports those standards. The fact that Government members are not speaking in support of the Bill in no way condones the use of children for sexual purposes or exploitation, but we

believe that the present law is sufficient to deal with such offenders.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I fail to see why any Government member should feel embarrassed by supporting this Bill. It is a simple and direct Bill, introduced because existing legislation both in criminal law and under the Police Offences Act is considered not only by members of my Party but also by members of the public to be quite inadequate. It is inadequate.

The Classification of Publications Board has a basic right, which it states that it upholds, to refuse to classify material of the kind covered by this Bill. Surely we cannot lose sight of the fact that, to enable the board to consider classifying a book, that book has to be produced. There is no provision for prosecuting people who possess this material and who have it in their shop for sale and who are ready to make a profit irrespective of whether the book has been classified or not.

Many places in the world produce this material, including Australia. We were shown material when the debate was previously proceeding last year that was produced in Australia showing beer bottles, boxes, and cartons in the photographs, with Australian school uniforms and Australian children. There was no question that this had happened here. In the production of such material children can be physically and psychologically harmed, probably for life. Not only should we make it an offence to manufacture the material, but also we should carry on that theme and say that we really feel for our kids and that anyone associated with holding this material for a profit or for perversion should be subject to some aspect of the law by which he could be punished.

At present, under the Police Offences Act, the fine is \$200 for any person who prints, publishes, sells, offers for sale, or has in his possession for sale any indecent matter etc. This material costs little to produce. Such material has a base price of \$1.50, but this increases to \$6 because it is classed as child porn. These people, by selling five or 10 copies of material like that, can write off the fine now legislated for under the Police Offences Act.

The Government and its members would lose little face by supporting this Bill, but they could gain much public respect. The Bill transcends politics: it concerns children. Irrespective of where in the world children may be used for making child pornography, we should feel deep concern for them. We should not condone the making of child porn in any way. We should not condone it for the making of profit or to satisfy perversion and, in its inability to produce adequate legislation, the Government is giving tacit approval to people who possess this material and who have it, even if it is under cover, in shops for sale, and the Government states that although it will not classify the material, it will not take the necessary action to make it illegal and quite a costly affair by imposing substantial fines and punishment. I think that that is where the Government is in error: it does not see the absolute normality, rationality, humanity or sympathy for children that is behind the Bill. I strongly support the Bill, and I urge Government members to consider it on the grounds of sheer feeling for children.

Mr. WILSON (Torrens): In winding up the debate (and I must be brief), I am extremely disappointed that the Government has not seen fit to support the Bill. All that we had were two contributions from Government backbenchers which were no doubt sincere but which failed to answer the main questions posed in the debate. The member for Gilles said that recent cases had dealt with these offenders. For his benefit and for the benefit of other

members, I quote the statement of a learned judge in one of the most recent of these cases, as follows:

Oddly enough while the maximum sentence for a first offence of indecent assault is imprisonment with hard labour for five years, the maximum sentence for a first offence of procuring an act of gross indecency by a person under the age of 16 years even in front of a camera is imprisonment with hard labour for two years only. It is for Parliament and not for me to say whether that is enough.

I stress his final sentence. An alteration is what we are trying to achieve in this Bill. Why the Government does not allow a free vote on this matter is beyond me, particularly as we have shown that 87.8 per cent of the people want the Bill to be passed, and 88.5 per cent of Australian Labor Party voters were in favour of passing the Bill. In his speech, the member for Mawson said he had not been able to work out the actual effect of the crime. The effect of the crime is the exploitation of children, and that is what the Bill is all about. The Bill seeks to remedy that terrible state of affairs. The member for Mawson also quoted Gilbert and Sullivan in his speech, but the Bill deserves more than trite remarks of that type. Undoubtedly, certain Government members would like to support the legislation. On December 7, 1972, during a grievance debate in the House, the member for Playford said:

How . . . could we in this State permit the sale of books that included pictures of children being corrupted and degraded, very often in a way which, in this State and this country, would constitute a criminal offence but, in any event, treated in a way abhorrent to any reasonable citizen. That issue was largely resolved by the decision of the Classification Board not to classify such material, hence prohibiting its sale. I say it largely resolved the issue, because it is still alleged that illicit sales continue but, as I see it, that is a matter for police action.

He is right, because that is all the Bill is trying to do—to help the police. He continued:

So, in that sense, I support my constituents' ideas that it is only a vast community pressure that will ensure changes and, at the same time, make them sure and safe changes that will remove the right of people to reap benefits and also maintain the dignity of all men and women.

I heartily agree with those words, and I am sure that my colleagues would also agree with them. That is what the Bill is trying to do. The Government has failed to show that we should not have a specific objective definition of indecency; it has failed to show that the taking of a photograph of a person under 14 years of age appearing to be engaged in an indecent act should not be a specific offence; and it has failed to show why the printing, publishing, distributing or selling of such photographs should not be a specific offence.

The member for Mawson also said that the penalties contained in the Bill were too severe. However, the people of this State do not agree with him. In answer to a specific question in the poll to which I have already referred, the vast majority wanted the penalties increased to \$2 000 and three years gaol. I have in my possession a publication (I know that I cannot display it in the Chamber) purchased during the past fortnight. It is called *Just Boys*. It is a homosexual magazine, and shows young children in appalling poses. It is classified as child pornography by New South Wales and also, I believe, by the Commonwealth. The publication is available here, and is unclassified. Although the price shown on the cover is \$1.50, it sells in sex shops for \$5. The Bill has been introduced as a sincere method of righting a situation that the Opposition and the people want righted. I ask the Government to re-examine its attitude on the Bill and to

support it.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (18)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson (teller), and Wotton.

Noes (26)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne (teller), Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

Second reading thus negatived.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 22. Page 1732.)

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): When I last spoke about this Bill I indicated that, because of some communication that had occurred with the Mallen committee, I intended to prepare an amendment or amendments, and I sought leave to continue my remarks later. I can now indicate that an amendment has been prepared, and for that reason I intend to limit my remarks to supporting the Bill to the second reading stage. It will be apparent from those remarks that I have further to say on that topic at the appropriate time.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I thank the Minister for his courtesy in the negotiations on this Bill. I am pleased that the Government has seen fit to support the Bill to the second reading stage. I do not intend to repeat what I said in the second reading debate, because that would be pointless. However, I will have more to say when the Minister's foreshadowed amendment is considered in Committee. I am pleased that the Bill will receive the unanimous support of the House to the second reading stage.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Medical termination of pregnancy."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): I oppose the clause. The honourable member who introduced the Bill quoted the Mallen committee in support of this amendment's being made. He said, in effect, that there was really no need for the continuation of reporting by doctors. The communication I have had with the Mallen committee would suggest that otherwise is what should occur in this matter, and for that reason I have prepared a new clause, which allows for the continuation of the existing practice of doctors reporting the termination of pregnancy. In addition, my clause will further add to that requirement a requirement for the superintendent or manager of the hospital in which the termination is carried out also to report on that matter. On examination of the proposed new clause, some members may believe that a degree of semantics is involved, but that is really not the case. This clause will set out to amend the subsection that deals with regulatory power and relates to the present practice in this matter. The amendment will add the additional requirement that is already set out in this amending Bill.

I hope that the new clause will be acceptable to the mover of the amending Bill. Although he may not entirely agree with my new clause, he will see that it is a regulatory power. In future it may require some fine tuning, but that will be easier to do under my provision. If the new clause is accepted, it will mean that members will have the chance to consider regulations under this Act as they are altered and laid on the table of the Chamber. It is for that reason that I am putting the provision in that way. In indicating my opposition to this clause, I hope that I have conveyed to members that I am not opposed to the concept that is behind the original amending Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I thank the Minister for explaining his intended new clause. However, I believe that the clause that I drafted initially gives greater clarity to the way in which this procedure will be carried out. I admit openly that the Mallen committee recommended that the change be made by regulation and it was clear, although the Mallen committee was circumspect enough not to say so in so many words, that the present method of reporting led to errors. Whether the difficulty of policing this procedure was too great I do not know. Under the previous regulations, the onus was on the doctor to report abortions. That system has obviously broken down. The present clause 3 makes perfectly clear what is required. One of the problems with the new clause relates to cases of complications. One of the salient points of the Mallen committee report was that complications were not being reported. One of the difficulties is that the treatment of the complications may take place at a hospital other than at the hospital where the original abortion was performed.

It is perfectly clear that what is required in the present clause is a notification of the complication which occurred either in the original hospital while the woman was having the abortion or when she was admitted later to another hospital. I will not take issue with the Minister because I believe the Bill will provide for far greater accuracy. I have consulted the Mallen committee on this matter in the past few weeks, and I believe the matter will be resolved to the satisfaction of all, but I persist in the view that clause 3 as drafted is certainly clearer than the proposed new clause. We have no control over the drafting of regulations. For these reasons, I will continue to support clause 3.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The new clause will leave in the present subsection (4) (b) the words:

... such other information relating to the termination as may be prescribed to the Director-General of Medical Services.

Complications obviously would relate to the termination and I see no reason why that should not be covered.

Mrs. ADAMSON: My concern is to see that terminations and complications arising from terminations are reported accurately and also that the confidentiality of the patient is preserved. Does the Deputy Leader believe that the Minister's new clause satisfies both accuracy of reporting and preservation of the confidentiality of the patient?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The question of confidentiality is not spelt out. On the form which is prescribed in the regulation there is a line where the woman's name is to appear and it is marked "in confidence". This form will go to the South Australian Health Commission and there the matter will rest. I do not believe there is any argument about confidentiality. I am interested in the accuracy of statistics and the reporting of them to Parliament. I think we can all be satisfied that confidentiality will be respected. I believe that the clause or the new clause will go a long way towards righting the present inaccuracies. My only query is in relation to complication rates. We really cannot make a judgment on that matter until we see

the form of the regulations that will be prescribed.

Clause 3 negatived.

New clause 3—"Medical termination of pregnancy."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move to insert the following new clause:

Section 82a of the principal Act is amended by inserting in paragraph (b) of the subsection (4) after the passage "who terminates a pregnancy" the passage ", and the superintendent or manager of the hospital in which the termination is carried out,"

In the 1976 report, the committee acknowledged that the reporting of complications was not capable of an entirely satisfactory solution. I think the honourable member would understand this because it depends on the patient herself coming forward and saying that she has had a complication. A woman may not wish to do that, depending on the type of complication it is. The Mallen committee has rightly recognised this. I believe that an amendment to the regulatory powers is the best way to handle this matter. I have already spoken to the honourable member who moved the Bill and undertaken on behalf of the Minister of Health that we would draw up the necessary regulation. What we are doing here is simply adding to the power to make the requirement and the additional requirement itself for the reporting by the superintendent or manager of a hospital is not actually being passed or rejected today.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I support the new clause. If it is carried the relevant provision will state that the Governor may make regulations—

(b) for requiring any legally qualified medical practitioner who terminates a pregnancy, and the superintendent or manager of the hospital in which the termination is carried out, to give notice of the termination and such other information relating to the termination as may be prescribed . . .

I do not think that this entirely satisfies us in relation to complications, and I hope the matter will be sorted out in another place.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EDUCATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Abbott:

That this House notes that the Commonwealth Education Commissions have a charter to examine the needs of education in Australia and make appropriate recommendations to the Federal Government for the funding of Government and non-government schools and other educational institutions in the State and Territories. Accordingly, the House deplores the recent decision of the Commonwealth Government whereby specific and very restrictive guidelines have been given to the commissions. A clear undertaking that payments for recurrent costs to schools and universities would in this financial year be escalated by 2 per cent in real terms has been repudiated and there is to be no indexation of capital costs for any of the education sectors. This House therefore calls upon the Commonwealth Government to restore growth to education funding and to withdraw the guidelines recently given to the commissions.

(Continued from February 8. Page 1439.)

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I shall be brief in my remarks, because many matters need to be covered on this, the last private members' day in this session. I have read the motion closely, and I believe the member for Spence is to be congratulated for introducing a motion of

such importance and for the excellent way in which it is worded. I also read with a great deal of interest what the member for Mount Gambier was saying in his reply to the motion, trying to find the thread of his remarks. The only conclusion I could reach was that it was a lengthy apology for lower spending on education in South Australia.

One would have thought that the member for Mount Gambier would have had some compassion—a word he often uses in this House—for children or school-goers in this State. He showed a total lack of concern. Any reduction in funding for education in Australia falls most heavily on that section of the community least able to afford the cost of education. Consequently it benefits, in an irrelative way, that section of the community best able to afford the cost of education. To me, this is one basic difference between the philosophies of the Parties represented in this House. The policy of the Government and of Government members is a more egalitarian or equalitarian attitude towards education and I believe, after listening to the member for Mount Gambier, that a more elitist attitude is adopted by members opposite. I find it quite difficult to know where, in that lengthy speech of 1¾ hours, the member for Mount Gambier came to terms with the real issues raised in the motion.

Mr. Groom: Do you think he understood it?

Mr. KENEALLY: I am sure he understood the issues at stake, but he cleverly negotiated around them. He did not want to be forced to speak directly to the motion. That is typical of the attitude of members opposite to education. They mouth support, going into the community and saying that they support funding in education, in continuation of the programme started by the Whitlam Government, and yet in practical terms they do their best to reduce it.

For the first time in our history, the Whitlam Government took education out of the political field. No longer would we have occasions like this one, debating whether or not money should be spent on education. The School Commission had been set up and had been given the authority to make recommendations as to what should be the sums of money spent on the needs existing within the Education Department. The Fraser Government, quite callously, has taken this power away from the Schools Commission. It has brought political interference once again into education, and we are back to the position of five years, six years, or 10 years ago, arguing about education once again as a political issue. That is not what it should be about. The member for Mount Gambier shakes his head, as if to say that is not what is happening, but it is what is happening in Australia at the moment: education once again is a political issue.

I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House that this is what the Whitlam Government intended to stop by its massive increase in funding; it wanted to stop education from deteriorating into a political issue. The member for Spence is to be congratulated for introducing the motion to the House, and he should be given an opportunity to close the debate so that the House will support overwhelmingly the sentiments of the motion.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): Although I do not intend to speak at length in closing the debate, several points require some comment. The claim of the member for Mount Gambier that he believed the Government's pre-election raising of this issue was a Party political motion brought up as a pre-election ploy could not be further from the truth. For his information, I first gave notice of this motion on Thursday, July 21, 1977, at which time there was not even the slightest indication of a State election, let alone the Federal election that was held on December 10 last, almost five months after I gave notice of the motion.

I, and all members on this side of the House, together with the South Australian Institute of Teachers, school principals, university vice-chancellors, parents, students, education administrators, and even the Governor-General (Sir Zelman Cowen), criticised the Federal Government over education spending cutbacks. To say that the raising of this issue was a pre-election ploy is wrong, and it was quite unfair for the honourable member to say that. He also admitted that he was more confident in debating the issue now than he would have been before the Federal election. I quote from the *Hansard* report of his speech on Wednesday, February 8, as follows:

In hindsight, now that the Federal Government has been returned to office, I find it much easier to debate this matter coolly and rationally than I would have been able to do two or three months ago, when I last spoke.

We can only assume from that that, had the Federal Government not been returned to office, the member for Mount Gambier would have supported the motion. It is quite understandable that the Institute of Teachers seems to have softened its approach over the past three months, following the Federal election. The institute knows that it would be like bashing its head against a brick wall to try to obtain more finance from this Federal Government for education purposes.

The honourable member raised various matters in his lengthy contribution to the debate. He referred to the spending of \$21 000 000 on Regency Park Community College and the effect of that on the Kilkenny College of Further Education. He referred several times to that college, its cost, whether it fulfils a need, and why the Kilkenny College of Further Education was absorbed into it. Unfortunately, I do not have time today to reply to all the comments in relation to the Regency Park Community College.

The member for Mount Gambier also raised several issues concerning migrant education. His claim that Federal funding for migrant education had not been reduced was incorrect. The adult migrant education programme required funds of \$520 000 during 1977-78 just to maintain the same level of operation as in 1976-77. The actual allocation by the Federal Government was \$423 000, which was \$97 000 short of what was required for the continuing commitment. The Commonwealth eventually recognised this shortfall and allocated a further \$159 000, composed of \$97 000 needed to maintain the 1976-77 level and \$62 000 for expansion of the programme. The suggestion by the member for Mount Gambier that some of the substantial expenditure on State unemployment relief might have been lobbied for by the Minister of Education for unemployed teachers is utterly absurd. This Government has done more than any other Government for the unemployed and can hold its head high in this regard.

The member for Mount Gambier had the audacity to criticise the member for Newland, and myself as the mover of this motion, for omitting some salient points that are very much in favour of the way in which the Commonwealth Government has administered the country over the past two or three years.

Does the honourable member expect us to commend the Federal Government for the current economic stagnation? Should we congratulate the Federal Government for achieving a post-depression unemployment record of 7.2 per cent? The Federal Government stands absolutely condemned by the number of 445 300 registered unemployed. Does the honourable member expect us to be dancing with joy over the Federal Government's action in creating jobs for the boys, especially as regards the former Governor-General,

who—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not speaking to the motion. There is nothing about unemployment in the motion; it concerns education. The honourable member for Spence.

Mr. ABBOTT: In conclusion, nobody has shown that the Government shall have a blind acceptance of any of the recommendations made to it by any commission or committee that it may appoint. I do not know of any Government anywhere that accepts every recommendation made to it. The remark made to that effect was quite stupid. All of the facts are quite clear in this motion. Everybody, including the Federal Opposition at the time, acknowledged the Karmel report as being an outstanding report. It was a document of major significance for Australian education, and that is why all of its recommendations were adopted in full. I wholeheartedly agree with the member for Newland that there should never have been the need for this motion in the first place. There was only one Opposition speaker against the motion; perhaps the remainder intend to support it, and I urge them to do so.

Motion carried.

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Gunn:

That in the opinion of the House the provisions of paragraph (c) of section 83 of the Constitution Act unduly inhibit the Electoral Commission in making an electoral distribution and accordingly these provisions should be repealed.

(Continued from February 15. Page 1566.)

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): In the past, whenever the Electoral Boundaries Commission has been commissioned to undertake a redistribution, one of the criteria has been to consider existing boundaries. The motion seeks to remove such a criteria, so that, in reality, existing boundaries may be totally ignored. I cannot accept that proposition.

If we completely disregard existing boundaries, we are snubbing previous Electoral Boundaries Commissions and ignoring all the research they undertook and the work they did previously. Apart from the need to consider the expense involved, there is also the community of interest or the relationship between constituents and their electorates to be considered. Many of my constituents know that they are members of a district that for generations has been the Flinders District. If the relevant provision in section 83 of the Constitution Act was deleted, no longer would the history of an electorate remain, and that is a matter of some concern.

The member for Eyre seems to be confusing the criteria involving the commission's consideration of existing boundaries with community of interest. Before the last redistribution, both the Liberal Party and the Labor Party submitted to the commission that the District of Flinders should be divided north and south: in other words, that the peninsula should be divided down the middle. This, of course, interfered with the criterion of community of interest, and the commission recommended an east-west division based not on existing boundaries but on community of interest. Therefore, the member for Eyre, in his criticism of the criteria to be considered by the commission, was not as accurate as he could have been.

I doubt very much the need for this motion. It casts a reflection on previous commissions, and it takes away from constituents the relationship they have with a district

in which they may have lived for a long time. I see no useful purpose being served by removing the present criteria to which I have referred. In the event of a vote being taken on this matter, I will vote against the motion.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Groom:

That this House commends the State Government for continually refusing to permit extensions of the Adelaide Airport beyond its present boundaries and for its insistence that the present flying time curfew be retained and obeyed. (Continued from February 22. Page 1726.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I do not oppose this motion, but I do not totally support it. Taking the first part of the motion, I support the State Government's present refusal for any extension of the Adelaide Airport. I am not sure that we, as a State, will always be able to support that proposition. I think that, with modern technology improving aircraft all the time and reducing the noise made, particularly by the wide-bodied aircraft, together with the prospect of taking Tapley Hill Road underground and running the airstrip over the top, there may be a need in the future to revise our attitudes.

Maybe some houses would need to be bought. We have bought towns like Chain of Ponds in order to protect the quality of water in Adelaide, and we have told the people concerned to pack up and move somewhere else. The Government bought 50 or 60 houses around the Mount Bold reservoir and told the people to move on, so that we would have a better water quality. Indeed, when building or protecting reservoirs, and when constructing freeways and railways, we have taken action to remove people from their homes, for the benefit of the community generally.

I do not object to that so long as the minority are compensated fairly and are paid more than the properties are worth because of the inconvenience caused. I support the Government's present approach that the airport should not be extended, but in future one may have to support another action, although it may cause a public outcry in that area. In my district there has been that sort of outcry, and I have had to take action similar to that taken by the members for Hanson and Morphett and other members showing their concern for airport use and the noise and inconvenience to their constituents.

The second part of the motion asks that we commend the State Government for insisting that the present flying time curfew be retained and obeyed. Perhaps the Federal Government should be included, if we are to commend Governments, Parliaments, or political Parties. It is necessary that we support the present flying time curfew, although I do not believe that, even if we allowed wide-bodied aircraft on international flights to land once or twice a week, there would be any need to change the curfew, because flight time schedules could be altered to enable the aircraft to land within the approved hours. In the long term, with fuel costs increasing and fuel becoming more difficult to obtain, any form of travel will have to be considered in the context of what fuel is available.

If an international airport is constructed in a place that is up to one hour's travel from the centre of the city, a burden will be created that we may not be able to carry in future. The present Adelaide Airport is ideal for the traveller coming to South Australia and wishing to get to the city. It may not be ideal for people living in that area but, wherever an airport is situated, it would not be ideal for those living close to it except those who accept the noise and other inconvenience. I do not support the

motion as it is worded, as the word "supports" would be better than "commends", and I do not think it would be a good thing to state that we continue to refuse anything in future, as the honourable member's own Party may support an extension to the airport if it found it desirable.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I do not support the motion. I read in it the attitude of the member for Morphett of trying to cash in on the hard work that has been done in the airport area by many members of Parliament. In 1970-71, I called the first public meeting after it had been rumoured that the airport boundaries were to be extended, and about 450 people attended the meeting and voiced strong disapproval of any proposal to extend the boundaries. The Anti-Airport Noise Association conducted two further meetings at which concerned Federal and State members of Parliament were present, and we unanimously refused to support any extensions to the airport and to curfew times.

Earlier in my Parliamentary career I suggested to the Government that it could refuse any airport extensions because it had control over the land, which was the West Beach Trust recreation area. That is the point that has always been used: that State Government has control and can prevent any extension of the airport established in that part of the area. Although the member for Morphett is trying to grab headlines in the area, he should realise that motions have been moved previously in this House by me that have been amended by the Government to suit the Government's own purposes. When introducing the motion the honourable member said:

I consider this to be an important issue, not only locally but also for the State. I am concerned that the member for Hanson has had a motion before the House that touches on international flights and that it has never been put to a vote. Such innuendoes are dishonest, and to try and mislead the people by making such a statement typifies the action some people will take to try to create these innuendoes. We have had an example in this past week of rumours, statements, innuendoes, etc., illustrating the problems that have been caused to the Government and a certain member of this House. My motion was to stop the Adelaide Airport from being upgraded to an international airport, but there is no way that I can afford to let it go to the Government side, because it will be amended and taken away from the action I wish to take. That is the tactics used by this Government. As I do not wish the credit for the hard work that has been done to be taken away, I move to amend the motion as follows:

After "State" leave out "Government" and insert "members of Parliament concerned", and leave out "its" second occurring and insert "their".

I challenge the mover of the motion and the Government to reject this amendment. If the Government opposes my amendment, it is condemning the efforts of the member for Henley Beach, who has worked very hard for many years since he was member for West Torrens.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Why didn't you put the member for Henley Beach in there?

Mr. BECKER: I should like to include the name of the honourable member, my name, and the name of the member for Peake, who is now Chief Secretary, because he, too, has supported what we want to do in this amendment. Also, the Federal member for Hindmarsh, Mr. Clyde Cameron, a man for whom I have much respect, the Federal member for Hawker, Mr. Jacobi, and also the member for Adelaide, the Minister of Labour and Industry, have been involved in public meetings and in representations on behalf of their constituents, and it behoves the House to give recognition that is due to all

members who have continuously fought to preserve curfew hours at the Adelaide Airport and who have fought to prevent its boundaries being extended.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

CADET CORPS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Mathwin:

That this House congratulates the Federal Fraser Government for re-establishing the Army Cadet Corps and in particular for the formation of the first open unit in Australia, viz., the Warradale 27th Cadet Unit, giving great benefits to those young people who feel inclined to take this advantage.

(Continued from February 22. Page 1734.)

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I am getting the impression in this debate that Opposition members are realising that the subject is one that has had a number of chapters, and they also want my speech to have a number of chapters. This is the second time I have tried to bring my words of wisdom into the debate and to put the member for Glenelg on the right track.

Dr. Eastick: Pearls of wisdom, perhaps, but not words.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That may be so. This is not the first time the member for Glenelg has moved a motion of this kind. I am convinced that he wants to continue this pleasant Wednesday afternoon study of playing boy scouts.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you support my motion?

Mr. MAX BROWN: No, and I have no intention of supporting it. If it comes up again in private members' business in the coming session, I will oppose it again.

Mr. Mathwin: Will you speak against the R.S.L. members, as the member for Stuart did?

Mr. MAX BROWN: No, nor will I say that 13 or 14-year-old cadets do not look impressive and that they are not a credit to themselves. That is not my main opposition to the motion. My main opposition is to the training of 13 and 14-year-old lads in the art of war.

Mr. Mathwin: That's ridiculous.

Mr. MAX BROWN: It is not ridiculous; it is a fact.

Mr. Mathwin: You don't know what the programme is.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg has had his opportunity, and he will have a chance to reply.

Mr. MAX BROWN: And most of us have had him. Members on this side are not opposed, in certain instances, to boys between 18 years and 21 years of age being trained as cadets. What we are opposed to is the brain washing of 13 and 14-year-old boys. The Opposition believes that service as a cadet is a self-disciplining exercise; in other words, a 13 or 14-year-old boy is taken away and subjected to self-discipline in marching down the street. He does not have a gun over his shoulder, because the Budget does not allow for it, but the situation is similar.

I am the father of three boys who have been adequately raised by their mother without their marching down the street on a Saturday afternoon in khaki uniforms.

It was only recently that I had the privilege of being on a balcony with Madam Mayor of the City of Whyalla on Australia Day. We were honoured by Navy, Air Force and Army cadets, giving us a demonstration. I agree with the member for Glenelg, because they did look smart, but I still believe that the principle behind the whole idea of the cadet corps leaves much to be desired. As I have much more to say on the matter, I seek leave to continue my

remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Chief Secretary) moved:
That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Henley Beach): First, I refer briefly to the recent conduct of the member for Mitcham and take this opportunity of congratulating the Leader of the Australian Democrats (Mr. Chipp) for dissociating himself from the actions of that member. I understand this was done on several television stations last evening. I think that the *Financial Review* best summarised the position of the member for Mitcham in a cartoon I noticed only yesterday. The cartoon depicted the Premier ducking from what appeared to be dirt that was sticking to an election poster behind him. The poster featured Mr. Chipp and said, "Vote Democrats and put decency back in politics." I think that that is a real joke in the light of what the member for Mitcham has been saying recently. I think that he has, with some pleasure, referred to himself for some time as a Liberal with a small "l". I think that no longer can he be referred to as a Liberal with a small "l", but rather as a pain with a big "p".

I also refer to some of the matters which have been brought home to me and which concern the recent Federal election. During the past day or two, I, together with other members, received notification of the new advantages we will receive as a result of the tax cuts that have been bestowed on us by the Fraser Government. I suppose that we should consider them selfishly with a great sense of joy. However, I recall the election material that was effectively used during the most recent Federal election that showed people with their hands out and receiving great handfuls of notes, supposedly from the Federal Government. That material stated, "Vote for us, and you'll receive all this additional taxation in your wage envelope."

However, I think that the truth of the matter, now that the scheme has been operating for some weeks, has now been brought home to people. In recent advertisements that the Commonwealth Treasurer placed in our newspapers we saw the actual scale of the tax cuts that would be provided to the community. I noticed that an employee receiving \$135 a week was to receive an extra \$1.15 in his wage packet. However, an employee receiving \$400 a week (and I suppose that that would apply to most members) was to receive \$16.55 extra in his wage packet.

Mr. Becker: What?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I note the surprise of the member for Hanson, but he will find that that is the sum he should have received. I am sorry if I have drawn this matter to his wife's attention. It could well be that he is underpaid. Perhaps if he were paid on performance he would receive less than would the rest of us.

What a dreadful situation that the employee on the average wage of \$135 a week receives a tax saving of \$1.15 a week, and a person on \$400 a week receives a tax saving of \$16.55 a week! I do not believe that anyone could possibly justify that that situation is appropriate in the present financial climate in which we find ourselves. The Labor Party suffered badly at the recent Federal election because it said that these tax cuts should not occur. The average member of the community, believing that he was going to receive a large handful of money, was impressed by the promise and, in many cases, voted for the present Federal Government, but to his present dismay. These tax cuts need not have been given to the community,

especially those sections of the community that least need them. Instead, the money could have gone towards providing a new means of employment for the 500 000 people now out of work.

I was amused by the following reference in the advertisement put out by the Federal Government that joyfully told people that they would be provided with this additional money each week:

Now—the Government has taken the next step by introducing a new standard rate system which both reduces total tax and also, for most people, the tax on every extra dollar earned. Now, it again makes sense to do overtime or get a pay rise!

People would have little hope of getting a pay rise out of the Commonwealth Government, if we take that Government's action before the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission in opposing any increase in the wage indexation system as a guideline. It does not make sense to work more overtime or receive a pay rise because the person receiving \$135 a week, if he earned \$20 overtime, would save only an additional 60 cents over what he would have paid under the old tax rate. The statement about doing overtime or getting a pay rise in the advertisement can hardly be described as fair advertising.

The implementation of these new tax scales (although they sounded great during the election campaign) has brought home to most people just how they were tricked into believing that the Federal Government was going to put more money in their pay packets. It follows that, with higher paid members of the community receiving substantial tax savings under this scheme, additional inflation must be created. Therefore, the \$1.15 saving to which I refer will soon be eaten up by the resultant inflation.

The Commonwealth Government should reconsider this sort of programme: it should realise that the money could be better spent in providing employment for the many hundreds of thousands of people now out of work, and the many hundreds of thousands of other people who will follow them into the unemployment situation.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I wish to grieve about Golden Breed Proprietary Limited. Nine months ago the South Australian Government established a new garment manufacturing company, Golden Breed Proprietary Limited, which took over the stock and business of O'Neill Wet Suits (Australia) Proprietary Limited. This company (Golden Breed) was half-owned by the State Government with an investment of \$250 000 in share capital and \$500 000 as trading credit. At that time the Premier claimed that 500 to 800 jobs could be saved.

Since the new company was established it has been plagued with serious management problems. The seriousness of these management problems is highlighted by the following happenings: first, in the past two weeks the Managing Director, Mr. Casey-Joosee, has ceased to be employed by the company. Apparently he resigned, although I believe that that occurred under pressure. Secondly, the plant at Lonsdale has been working only a 30-hour week for the past few weeks. Thirdly, there have been serious shortages of new materials to manufacture the garments. Fourthly, the total work force of the company is now down to 129 people, with six employees being dismissed in the past few weeks. This employment needs to be compared with the 500 to 800 jobs that the Premier claimed could be saved.

Fifthly, several senior management personnel have been sacked during the last nine months, including the Production Manager and the Distribution Manager. Sixthly, the former Managing Director, Mr. Casey-Joosee,

managed the operation from the small office in Sydney, even though it is a South Australian company with all of its manufacturing and distribution based in Adelaide. Why has a South Australian Government venture been managed from Sydney? I understand the new manager is now based in Adelaide. Seventhly, an American executive will be, or has been, appointed the new Managing Director of the company, which is a disgraceful reflection by the State Government on the management expertise available in Australia and in Adelaide. Such an appointment is surprising in the light of our local unemployment.

Eighthly, the company has lost its No. 1 market position as the leader of the specialised life-style merchandise. Leading retail outlets have confirmed this. Ninthly, there have been serious problems with quality control, with almost 9 per cent of the garments below the accepted standard at certain periods. Since Christmas about 11 000 units have been set aside as seconds because of quality problems, even though these garments were manufactured as firsts. Tenthly, the distribution centre was moved from Edwardstown, where there was 44 000 square feet of floor space at a rental of \$88 000 a year, with a fire sprinkler system and a burglar alarm, to Waddikee Road, Lonsdale, where there is only 27 000 square feet of floor space at about \$82 000 a year, with no fire sprinkler system or burglar alarm. Eleventhly, there was a major break-in and theft of goods from the Waddikee Road distribution centre but, because of inadequate records, the exact quantity stolen cannot be determined.

From this evidence it is clear that there have been serious management deficiencies in the company. When the Premier was trying to justify to Parliament on August 16, 1977, his Government's involvement in this new company, he admitted that only 164 of the O'Neill work force had been employed by the new company. He also said:

The Government is confident that the new company will be profitable and the work force will increase above the initial level.

My purpose, in bringing these facts to the attention of the House, is to ensure that the Government takes appropriate action to improve the management of the company.

I emphasise that I have not commented upon the financial position of the company. I do not know that position, and certainly do not wish to give the impression that it may be unsound. I am just as interested as the Premier to see successful industry in South Australia. However, industry will not be successful without the highest standards of management. It is important that the Government adopts these standards for its own enterprises.

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): I wish this afternoon to speak about hypocrisy and hypocrites. Looking at the dictionary, I find that a hypocrite is a person who is a pretender. I fully endorse the remarks made by the member for Henley Beach when he spoke about the member for Mitcham. However, I do not wish to speak about the member for Mitcham, although I think a few things should be said. It would seem that that honourable member is willing to rake up muck and then wallow in it, and every member of this House should realise what sort of a person he is.

When referring to hypocrites, I do not confine my remarks to the member for Mitcham. We should examine what members of the Liberal Party, particularly its Leader, have been saying recently. On February 18, the Leader said: "The A.L.P. is trying to discredit us." Why would the Labor Party want to discredit the Leader?

Mr. Allison: Give us a guess.

Mr. WHITTEN: This is the point I am trying to make: a hypocrite is a pretender. He does it all himself then tries to blame someone else. The report on February 18 states:

Mr. Tonkin said Labor was promoting the ridiculous and obviously unfounded rumour that he would retire from Parliament within two months.

Why would the Labor Party ever want to get rid of him? We had the exhibition of the campaign he ran, aided and abetted by Mr. Taylor, in 1977. Let me remind you—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should have said, "Let me remind honourable members."

Mr. WHITTEN: I will remind members opposite and our members as well that I warned the Leader about just what was happening with Mr. Taylor and what sort of man Mr. Taylor was. I am pleased to be vindicated by some of the statements of Mr. Taylor, but he might also be a hypocrite.

Mr. Allison: Are you going to say this outside the House?

Mr. WHITTEN: All I want to do is just quote some of the things out of the mouths of Mr. Taylor and the Leader. Under the heading "Liberal censure move in Taylor row", the *Advertiser* on February 11 reports:

Mr. Taylor said there was friction between the Leader of the Opposition and the President of the Party (Mr. J. W. Olsen).

I can recall several members on this side of the House telling the people and the Liberal Party that there was friction there.

Mr. Allison: Friction can be—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mount Gambier is out of order.

Mr. Groom: Do you think the member for Davenport—

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

Mr. WHITTEN: I heard what the member for Morphett said; he mentioned the member for Davenport. Perhaps I should mention him as well. The report of February 11 also states:

He [Mr. Taylor] had tried to get the two men together for informal lunchtime meetings, but after a couple of meetings these had been discontinued. "They just didn't hit it off," he said. Mr. Taylor also said there was a move within the Party to depose Mr. Tonkin as Leader. The move was gathering momentum.

Perhaps this is where I can mention the member for Davenport. The report continues:

Mr. Dean Brown, the Liberal member for Davenport, was making more and more of a run for the leadership.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WHITTEN: The report continues:

There was great concern in the party at Mr. Tonkin's performance as leader. "I don't think Mr. Tonkin is strong enough for the position," Mr. Taylor said. "There is a frantic search going on in the whole area of leadership. There is no question about the fact that I don't think he will be leading the party at the next State election."

Mr. Taylor said he had originally been reluctant to speak out. But more and more people were telling him he had to speak up "for the good of the organisation."

Since the Liberals got rid of Mr. Taylor they have another fellow who says he was not a member of the Party.

Mr. Klunder: Is he a member of the cadets?

Mr. WHITTEN: I was going to say that perhaps he could have a uniform on. He had some sort of office in the Army, but whether he retains it and gets a pension like Kerr I am not sure. Let us not worry about that.

Mr. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mount Gambier is out of order.

Mr. WHITTEN: He has never been in order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Price must continue with his remarks.

Mr. WHITTEN: A report in the *News* of February 15, 1978, headed, "Bunglers! An ex-Liberal attacks", states:

There was too much talk and not enough action by the Liberals, former South Australian Liberal Party State Council member, Mr. Harold Steele, said today.

Mr. Dean Brown: Do you want him?

Mr. WHITTEN: The honourable member could not give him to us. He might want to sell this gentleman, but he is worth nothing. The report continues:

Mr. Steele said he thought Mr. Tonkin was an effective Opposition Leader, "but uncommitted people I've talked with have said the Liberal Party has no hope of winning an election under him. And that's a fact. If there was a need for an alternative leader it would be a problem because there is none."

I do not know where that puts the member for Davenport. I mentioned Mr. Willett. I refer now to a letter from a gentleman who opposed me a couple of times in Price. He was the Liberal endorsed candidate against Mick Young. I refer, of course, to Chickens Hanson. Before he was a member of the Liberal Party, he wanted to become a member of the Labor Party to run for the seat of Hanson. He had a great slogan: what could be better than Hanson for Hanson? It seemed that the Liberals had a bit of sense about that. Mr. Hanson's letter in the *News* of February 16 reads as follows:

One can expect at some stage or other a series of frustrating, confused and sometimes nonsensical decisions to get passed on to the professional by the amateurs.

He appears to be saying that the honourable doctor is an amateur and it is necessary to take notice of a professional, perhaps a professional soldier.

Let us come back finally to Mr. Taylor. On the Philip Satchell show on February 10, Mr. Taylor made the following comment:

I believe that my track record has been far more successful in both this country and overseas than selling newspapers in Kadina.

He does not say, of course, whether he is talking about the President of the Liberal Party or about the member for Gouger.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, there is a Standing Order which states that debates must not be repetitive. Parts of this transcript have been read to the House on two or three occasions by members opposite and I wonder whether the honourable member is out of order.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I think the honourable member has mentioned the member for Gouger.

Mr. WHITTEN: I do not know whether he was referring to the member for Gouger; I leave that open to conjecture. Talking of the leadership, he said:

I guess that rather depends on whether Dr. Tonkin remains the Leader of the Opposition at the moment, because there is a gathering groundswell in Parliament that is taking place against him.

He was asked who was behind it and he said it was a group in the shadow Cabinet. I can simply say to the Leader that he has some people sitting close to him and he should wear a shield on his back.

The SPEAKER: The question is—

Mr. BECKER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, as a period of eight minutes remains in the time for the grievance debate, I wish to speak in the time remaining.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member may speak if he wishes.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I think it is a great pity that we have had a very poor debate on this adjournment motion by Government members. They resorted to tactics, obviously to abuse and insult members of the Opposition. Particularly, they have carried out what they have been dying to do for the past few days; that is, attack the Liberal Party, the Liberal Party leadership and the policies of the Liberal Party, whether Federal or State. It is obvious that the Government is worried. It is under attack, and quite sustained attack, from various members of the Liberal Party. The members of the Liberal Party are doing a good job in that respect. Also, Government members are under instruction to attack the leadership of the Liberal Party in this State.

I can dispel any theories that members of the Government have that the Leader does not have the full and total support of all members of the Liberal Party in this House and the full backing of the members of the Liberal Party in South Australia. There are no problems. There are no splits, no arguments and no problems whatever within the Liberal Party in this State, and more particularly in this House. I will say again, as I have said on many other occasions publicly, that the Parliamentary Liberal Party has worked extremely hard in the past few years to bring its policies up to date. It went into an election and found difficulties presented by the gerrymandering system of electoral boundaries, but it has come out of that election and continued to work hard with its committees to update the policies of the Liberal Party.

More importantly, the members of the Liberal Party in this House have worked successfully to highlight issues of public concern, issues that obviously have the Government worried. When Government members rise in this House in adjournment debates and other debates and continually attack the Liberal Party, we know that there are problems within the Government. We know that some head counting and number counting has been going on within the Government of this State. We were pleased that the member for Price this evening gave us some light relief in his attempt to belittle the Liberal Party and certain persons who were either formerly employed or were members of the Party.

That happens in any other organisation and, of course, it is always easy for those sorts of people to obtain publicity when they are attacking the organisation they have left. This is always regrettable, but the Government itself states that it does not believe the press in this State. Therefore, the members of the Liberal Party in this House are not concerned with the attacks that Government members are making upon us this evening and have made in the past. The Parliamentary Liberal Party will continue with all its vigour and all its might, no doubt with the full support of all my Parliamentary colleagues, to ensure that we attack and highlight in the public arena the faults and failings of this Government.

The Government is getting tired and running out of ideas, and finances will make it extremely difficult for it to finance all the programmes that it has commenced in past years, programmes which it hoped would be of benefit to the people of South Australia but which in most instances were nothing but electioneering at taxpayers' expense.

Mr. Chapman: What about the—

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

Mr. BECKER: As the member for Alexandra reminded me—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra was out of order.

Mr. BECKER: The suggestion has been put to me that the Government has found it necessary for statutory authorities to be given wider powers to increase their borrowing ability from within the money market to help finance Government programmes because of the serious financial position of the State. There is no doubt that the State Government is worried, because next financial year it will probably have to chase tax increases of about \$50 000 000 to \$70 000 000. This will be spread right across the board, and the poor taxpayers in South Australia, instead of getting some relief, will find that we in this State will again be hard hit to finance some of the airy-fairy promises made during the recent State election. For that reason, the Government of this State must be severely condemned.

Motion carried.

At 5.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, March 2, at 2 p.m.