

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 19 July 1978

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

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 140 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would take all necessary steps as a matter of extreme urgency to prohibit the sale of pornographic material in South Australia, in the interests and protection of the children of this State.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: MINORS BILL

Mr. GUNN presented a petition signed by 34 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would reject any legislation which deprived parents of their rights and responsibilities in respect of the total health and welfare of their children.

Mr. RUSSACK presented a similar petition signed by 886 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITION: PORT AUGUSTA ROAD

Mr. KENEALLY presented a petition signed by 758 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to have Shacks Road, Port Augusta, reconstructed as an all-weather, solidly-based road, preferably sealed.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: NORTHFIELD HOSPITAL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Following information provided to me in 1976, I requested an Auditor-General's investigation of food use at Northfield Hospital. It was apparent from the Auditor-General's investigation that the accounting systems of that institution were not satisfactory for the proper control of food. The Auditor-General subsequently reported that the accounting systems should be tightened in all Government hospital institutions.

The Director-General of Hospitals and Medical Services subsequently informed the Government that a series of joint operations had been set up to improve the accounting systems and make for tighter control of food. At the beginning of this year information reached me which led me to believe that food controls remained ineffective and I therefore set up a Public Service Board committee to review and report on the control of consumables at Government institutions. That committee has met, conducted its investigations, and reported, and I table a copy of the report.

The committee has made a number of findings showing that the existing systems of control of consumables are unsatisfactory and has recommended specific changes to improve these systems. The Government has accepted the report and has given directions for its implementation promptly. In addition, the committee has recommended that it be authorised to conduct a further investigation into pharmaceuticals, and this it is proceeding to do. A copy of this report has been forwarded to the Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee on Public Accounts. It should be noted that in the course of investigation some matters arose which led to police inquiries. The committee has been careful to avoid interfering with police work. The police work is continuing and I expect a report from the Police Commissioner shortly. The police investigation related to a possibility of pilfering or other dishonest practice. The committee reported that pilfering or dishonest practice was possible but it certainly was not taking place to the extent necessary to explain the discrepancy between the amount of meat actually used and the amount allowed for in the prescribed standards approved by the department.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PROSTITUTION

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In any inquiry into prostitution in this State, it is necessary to ensure that the inquiry is enabled to obtain evidence relating to the matter in the inquiry, and that is inevitably difficult where the matter inquired into is currently prohibited by the criminal law.

It is not possible under Select Committee procedure alone to provide the necessary immunities to witnesses which would ensure that a Select Committee would get the evidence necessary for it to draw conclusions and report to the House, but those immunities and assistance could be provided by the Government. It would be necessary to provide similar immunities to those provided to witnesses before the current Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs. The Government will consent to a Select Committee of Inquiry and will provide the necessary immunities but it will consent to a Select Committee of Inquiry of the House of Assembly alone, not a Joint Select Committee of both Houses. In respect of a Select Committee of the House of Assembly, it will provide the necessary immunities in the same way as it has done in respect of the Royal Commission mentioned.

The Government is concerned to see that all matters pertaining to the question of prostitution be dealt with by the Select Committee and therefore the terms of reference of the Select Committee of the House of Assembly must be broader than those provided in the resolution which has been moved so far in both Houses. The terms of reference which will be supported by the Government are as follows:

1. the extent of prostitution in this State and including the ownership and operation thereof and receipt of profit therefrom;
2. whether the law relating to prostitution should be altered in any way; and
3. whether it is advisable to introduce a licensing or registration system for massage services for reward by other than registered physiotherapists, legally qualified medical practitioners, or chiropractors, where the massage is not connected with prostitution.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you propose to move—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In due season, when the matter comes on.

QUESTIONS

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S ABSENCE

The SPEAKER: I point out to honourable members that, as the Attorney-General is absent, the honourable Premier will take questions directed to him.

CORBETT REPORT

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say how he can now justify the statements he made, before the recent State election, on hospital meat consumption, in the light of the Corbett Report? On 6 September 1977 the Premier stated publicly:

The Auditor-General's investigations showed that food costs per patient at Northfield were not excessive and indeed were around the average for institutions of a similar nature within South Australia.

He also stated at that time:

An investigation was then taken up by the Public Accounts Committee, which has discovered no impropriety.

In fact, the Epps Report on food costs at Northfield indicated that they were excessive and not around the average. The Public Accounts Committee is still considering the matter and has not made any such finding of no impropriety. Now that the Corbett Committee findings have confirmed massive wastage, how can the Premier now justify his previous pre-election statements?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader, prior to those statements of mine, had alleged improprieties which were specific, and it was to those I was referring. The improprieties he alleged were that food had been going out, pilfered, from the department and was being supplied to other institutions. What is more, he proceeded to tie that to a particular institution in South Australia. He had to apologise about that particular implication to the person concerned. It was to improprieties of that kind that I was referring.

The position is that at the moment there is no indication that, apart from the prosecutions which we brought prior to any investigation by the Public Accounts Committee, there has been any impropriety of a criminal nature in this matter. It has yet to be established that there has ever been. What I pointed out before the election last year was that an Auditor-General's investigation had been ordered by the Government, and that investigation showed that there was inadequacy in the accounting system and that action had been taken by the departments in relation to that accounting system.

All that the Corbett Committee has shown is that the Government, not being satisfied that the action in relation to that accounting system was adequate, ordered an inquiry, found that it was right in doing that, and has taken the further action recommended to tighten up the accounting system.

SAFETY MEASURES

Mr. HEMMINGS: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry use his influence to urge employer organisations to encourage their members to take positive action by

installing in plants additional safety measures, and lifting equipment, that will provide safer working conditions for employees and a real reduction in workers' compensation claims? In today's *Advertiser* an article on workmen's compensation quoted Mr. L. G. Lean, Assistant State Secretary of the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union. The report states:

For the first six months of this year, the union had made 198 claims for a total payment of \$872 321. This comprised \$128 324 from civil court claims where negligence had been proved and \$743 997 in workmen's compensation payments. Most claims—138—were for industrial deafness which resulted in payments of \$363 442 in compensation—an average of \$2 633 a claim.

The next most frequent claim was for back injuries where 16 claims had brought payments of \$206 229. The biggest settlement was for \$82 000 in the civil court where employer negligence had been proved for the loss of four fingers. Mr. Lean said the A.M.W.S.U. was highly critical of frequent statements by the State Opposition and employer organisations that high workmen's compensation payments had contributed to a decline of South Australian industry and a shift of business to other States.

They raise compensation costs as a major contributing factor to the crisis and suggest the solution is to reduce the payments to injured workers. The problems we face in industry in South Australia are common throughout Australia and the rest of the capitalist world. It is not something unique to South Australia. Employers generally are not taking an interest in spending money on safety measures, such as lifting equipment. Certainly, for the 16 claims for back injuries, the companies involved would have saved money if they had bothered to spend a bit on lifting equipment.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member has given a long explanation to his question, and I will not answer all the matters he has raised. First, it is not true to say (although I know that it has been said from time to time by the Opposition) that the Workmen's Compensation Act is responsible for shifting industry to other States. The collapse in the South Australian manufacturing industry is due to policies enunciated by the Federal Government, and not by the State Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is always easy to strike oil, and I have evidently struck oil with that statement, because each Opposition member knows that it is true. They will not admit it, but there are other Liberals in Australia who would admit it. Opposition members should talk to Mr. Hamer and other Liberals who have more know-how and sense of the political sphere in Australia about the Federal Government's policies. The crux of the question is what can be done to save further injuries and, as a consequence, further claims under the Act.

I believe that our Safety, Health and Welfare Act is the best in Australia, and has been commended by many people on both sides of the political fence as being the model throughout the world. The only system I know that can compare to it is in Canada; in some aspects that has advantages that ours does not have, and *vice versa*. The minimum requirements as introduced by this Government for the protection of workers are as good as any available. I also make the point that they are the minimum standard only. By that, I mean that employers can and should take a further interest in seeing that every safety opportunity is given to their employees and staff.

In that way, if they were sincere about reducing the premiums paid under workmen's compensation (I do not

deny they are high and, in many areas, they are too high), I believe that the insurance companies could reduce the premiums if they desired. There could and should be positive action taken by employers to introduce every piece of safety equipment it is possible to purchase, and for more planning of factories and process lines in such a way that the first consideration is given not to profit but to the safety of the working class. As a result, I believe that production would go up, workmen's compensation claims would be reduced, and South Australia would be a better place in which to live.

FOOD THEFTS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say whether there is any evidence that rackets have existed in relation to massive thefts of meat from South Australian hospitals? The Corbett Report seems to be in conflict with the Premier's earlier claims that nothing was happening in hospitals in relation to massive food losses that the police could investigate. The Premier made that statement in reply to questions in the House. The Premier made this claim after Mr. J. Epps, a senior auditor, had said in one of his reports that indications were that a large proportion of estimated losses was due to theft.

The Premier also said that there was nothing the police could investigate, but in a Ministerial statement to the House this afternoon, the Premier said that the police were actively investigating this matter. Is there any evidence now that was not apparent to him then in relation to thefts from hospitals?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At this stage, the Government has no clear evidence upon which any charges could be laid. Whether there will be evidence provided in that police report remains to be seen. My statements, at the time I made them, to which the honourable member has referred, were absolutely correct. There was absolutely no evidence upon which any charge whatever could be laid, and no evidence which could lead to further police investigation. I made that statement at the time upon the basis of material supplied to Government from the Auditor-General's investigation, which I had ordered. I point out to the honourable member that the member for Alexandra then took the information which was in the hands of the Public Accounts Committee, as well as in the hands of the Government, to the Commissioner of Police, and was told exactly the same thing publicly. The police said at the time that there was nothing in the material which was given to them which could lead either to a further police investigation or to the laying of charges. That was perfectly correct. The material upon which the police have now been led to investigation has been material discovered originally in the investigation of the Corbett Committee. The police were informed of that. It relates to a period long after Mr. Epps made his report. It does not relate even to the same institution.

EDUCATION FINANCE

Mr. KLUNDER: Will the Minister of Education check to see whether the tertiary education sector has been short-changed in the amount of money promised to it by the Fraser Government for 1978? The Tertiary Education Commission guidelines for 1978-1980, dated 3 June 1977, indicated on page 3 that the total amount to be made available to the tertiary sector (universities, colleges of advanced education, and TAFE) in 1978 would be \$1 169 700 000 at December 1976 cost levels. The

guidelines for the 1979-81 period, dated 9 June 1978, indicate on page 3 that the amount provided to the total tertiary sector in 1978 is to be \$1 269 600 000 in estimated December 1977 prices. This is an increase of 8.5 per cent. The c.p.i. indices for 1977 showed an increase of 12.7 per cent over 1976. If the increase in funding was to have compensated for this c.p.i. increase, an extra \$43 900 000 should have been provided, and universities, colleges of advanced education, and TAFE have been short-changed to that extent. Even if one does the usual trick of finding more favourable figures to play with, the g.d.p. for 1977 showed an increase of 8.8 per cent, and even the most favourable figures one could possibly find, that of the non-farm g.d.p.—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Because of the involved nature of this matter, the honourable member was kind enough to give me notice yesterday that he would be asking this question. This has enabled me to get some figures which might assist honourable members in what, after all, is a fairly complicated matter. The short answer to the question is that the tertiary sector has been short-changed, but not necessarily in the way in which the honourable member suggests. The Tertiary Education Commission, in calculating supplementation, uses a rather more sophisticated index than simply the c.p.i. For example, from December 1976 to December 1977 the Tertiary Education Commission used the following indices: recurrent academic salary costs were inflated by 6.6 per cent, recurrent non-academic salary costs by 8.5 per cent, recurrent non-salary costs by 13.2 per cent, and building costs by 9.24 per cent.

They are the nation-wide figures but they must be weighted for the various impacts of these costs as between the States. For example, in South Australia the weightings as to the three recurrent costs are 55 per cent academic salaries, 27 per cent non-academic salaries, and 18 per cent non-salary costs. The final overall recurrent index worked out to be 8.33 per cent. They are the figures that really must be applied, and I have not had the opportunity yet to apply those figures to the base figure with which the honourable member has provided me.

The point I want to make is that Senator Carrick, in his statement to the Senate on the guidelines on tertiary education, indicated that supplementation for the 1978 programme of cost increases would be limited to increases in respect to the wages and salary components of the recurrent grants. From the figures I have just given, the percentage increase that is the highest does not fall within those two categories: it is the recurrent non-salary costs which, for the 12 months I have indicated, were 13.2 per cent. They are the lightest weighting, but they are still the highest percentage costs, and we will get no supplementation for that aspect of cost increases.

Mr. Tonkin: Does that apply to other States?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes, it is a national system, but it is weighted from State to State.

Mr. Tonkin: We're not getting a bad deal compared to other States.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Every State is getting a rotten deal for tertiary education. Not all the costs that inflate are being met by supplementation on whatever sort of figures one uses. I thank the honourable member for drawing the attention of the House to this anomaly. As I say, the system is a little more sophisticated than simply using c.p.i. figures, but there is no doubt that supplementation is not occurring in all those areas where it should be occurring.

EDUCATION POLICY

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Minister of Education say why his policy statement ED 809/3/80, dated 12 January 1977, which gives parents the final rights to enrol their children in any course they want to even if their decision runs contrary to school policy and professional teacher advice, was recently invoked by Mr. Jim Giles, the Acting Director of Education, when the South Australian Institute of Teachers claims that neither the institute nor anyone else had even been informed of any such policy change and that the policy had not been promulgated? I refer to today's edition of the *South Australian Teachers Journal* and to an open letter signed by 65 teachers and ancillary staff at a metropolitan high school and also endorsed by an additional 12 non-teacher members of the school council. Among certain allegations in the letter is that Mr. Giles invoked the Education Department circular to which I have referred, which gives parents final rights, to which I also referred, and the letter continues:

The school was informed by letter dated 22 May 1978 that Mr. Giles instructed the school "to allow the student to continue in matriculation . . . from the beginning of second term. In so saying, I am acting within an established policy of this department . . ."

I will not read the whole letter, but will refer to some relevant comments. I am sure the Minister is familiar with them, anyway. The letter continues:

It was cold comfort to know from this letter that the Acting Director-General of Education felt that "the school had advised . . . to the best of its ability and has acted with real concern for the student's future . . . The immediate attitude of the school staff was one of incredulity at the existence of such a policy whose only known implementation was to reverse, without notice, the responsible and professional opinion of fellow teachers.

They say that they considered the situation several times, and believed that their decision was correct. The letter continues:

We have been made to change it without any investigation because our decision did not comply with an unpublished Education Department policy.

They expressed their distrust of secret policies and their dismay at the implications of the use of Education Department policy on their professional competence and on the autonomy of the school. Mr. A. W. Jones, a former Director-General of Education, in his address "Freedom and Authority in Schools, A Postscript, August 1977" said:

Freedom and Authority memorandum: You have my sincere thanks for what you have done during my term as Director-General of Education, and for the way you have used your authority and freedom. I am sure you will have the full support of the Education Department for your efforts in the same cause in the future.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is interesting to note that long explanations do not always come from the Government side of the Chamber. The honourable member gave most of the relevant information except the name of the school involved. I think I had better find out which school is involved, so that I will be in a better position to enlighten the honourable member.

HAIR DYES

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health to obtain a report on whether or

not an inquiry is proposed, or has already commenced, by health authorities at State or Federal level into the allegation made in England that some hair dyes may lead to cancer, in order to ascertain whether appropriate action should be taken here to protect and warn the users? An article which appeared in yesterday's *News* headed " 'Cancer' hair dye warning" stated:

London: A shock warning that hair dye may lead to cancer was made by medical scientists today. They want warning posters displayed in hair salons and health warnings printed on hair dye bottles. At the heart of the problem are components used in "permanent" and "semi-permanent" hair dyes—those used by hairdressers and by millions of women in their own homes.

I do not know whether the use of these hair dyes is restricted solely to the female sex. It could be that hair dyes containing similar components are in use here.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member was kind enough to advise me earlier today about this matter and I was able to obtain advance information, which will be of interest to honourable members. The permanent hair dyes are generally paraphenylene diamine substances, commonly known as the "para" dyes. Since the first American report of several years ago that these substances were suspected carcinogens, the National Health and Medical Research Council has kept the matter under review. Overseas reports have been closely examined, including those relating to exposure in the manufacture of the dyes and occupational exposure by, for example, hairdressers. Some reports have not shown any increase in the incidence of cancer in hairdressers who use the dyes regularly. It is understood that in the United States of America pending further review of the matter, as a precautionary measure, exposure in the manufacturing processes will be minimised.

The withdrawal of the products from the market does not at this stage appear to be justified. In Australia, a report is being prepared on the dyes that are available and used in Australia. It is anticipated that this report will be considered by the Poisons Schedules Standing Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council at its meeting next month. Information will then be sought on the latest report from the United Kingdom.

LABOUR FORCE STATISTICS

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier table the full document he quoted in this House yesterday concerning labour force statistics and, in particular, will he table attachment 1 Table 2 of that document? Does he agree that attachment 1 clearly indicates that South Australia had, between June 1972 and March 1978, the highest percentage increase of any State in Government and local government employees? Finally, why did the Premier not quote these figures yesterday?

Yesterday, the Premier questioned statistics that I had used, and he tabled his own statistics. I have prepared from Bureau of Statistics figures a table of State by State comparisons of labour force figures from June 1971 to April 1978. Will the Premier accept these figures as official figures? Will he examine them and report back to this House so that he may correct the false impression that he created yesterday? I seek leave to have these figures inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

The SPEAKER: Are they of a statistical nature?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes.

Leave granted.

Employment Comparisons Plus Percentage Changes
June 1971-April 1978*
(Source: A.B.S.)

State	Date	(000) State Government Employees	(000) Private Employees	Per cent State Government to Private Employees	(000) Total Employees	Per cent State Government to Total Employees
South Australia	June 1971	77.7	285.1	27.3	397.0	19.6
	April 1978	114.9	286.8	40.0	438.9	26.2
Per cent rise		47.8		46.5		33.7
Western Australia	June 1971	73.7	244.9	30.0	345.2	21.3
	April 1978	103.8	269.0	38.6	404.7	25.6
Per cent rise		40.8		28.7		20.2
Victoria	June 1971	194.5	937.7	20.7	1 244.7	15.6
	April 1978	255.6	928.0	27.5	1 311.4	19.5
Per cent rise		31.4		32.8		25.0
Queensland	June 1971	111.3	386.1	28.8	551.1	20.2
	April 1978	143.4	415.0	34.5	620.6	23.1
Per cent rise		28.8		19.8		14.4
Tasmania	June 1971	28.8	86.9	33.1	125.5	22.9
	April 1978	36.9	89.5	41.2	137.6	26.8
Per cent rise		28.1		24.4		16.9
New South Wales	June 1971	270.5	1 232.6	21.9	1 666.0	16.2
	April 1978	325.0	1 181.1	27.5	1 685.9	19.3
Per cent rise		20.2		25.5		19.1

* Corrected for Railway Employee Transfer on 1 March 1978 in South Australia and Tasmania

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The figures I gave to the House yesterday were correct, and I am prepared to table them. The conclusions I read out from those tables are correct, and they clearly show that the statements made by the honourable member previously in South Australia were wrong.

SALT CONTENT

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Will the Minister of Works provide me with a report on the salt content of Adelaide's water supply and indicate whether or not that content is causing any concern? My question arises from a report appearing in the *Australian* today and quoting Professor Rose, a Brisbane scientist, as saying that the Murray River was acting as a drain carrying the salt into the Adelaide water supply.

In that same report are comments made by the professor indicating that a high salt content in water is likely to cause health difficulties. As a number of people may read that article and conclude that there is perhaps some problem here, I would appreciate the Minister's replying to my question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This gentleman is not the first man to make such a comment. I heard, I think about two weeks ago, on *AM*, the A.B.C. public affairs programme, a similar statement by a professor at Perth University regarding the Perth water supply. He claimed that the salt content of Perth water was so high that it

could be (or was) detrimental to the health of people living in Perth.

That report concerned me and on my arrival at the office that day I immediately checked with the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which in turn checked with the Public Health Department (and I am talking about the health aspects). I was informed that the Public Health Department was not concerned about the salt content of water supplied to the people of Adelaide. However, I will obtain a report from that department to put it on an official basis for the honourable member, but I say here and now that my information is that residents should not be concerned about the salt content of the water supplied to their household.

The observations made by Professor Rose about the Murray River and its salt content are, to a large extent, true. People are astounded when they hear that 1 000 000 tonnes of salt flows annually into the sea from the Murray River.

Mr. Millhouse: No wonder the sea is salty.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I suppose it adds a bit! As members are probably aware, I recently initiated what was part of an inspection tour, together with the Victorian and New South Wales Conservation Ministers and officers of the New South Wales Environment Department. I was absolutely astounded at the extent of irrigation that takes place in New South Wales and Victoria from the Murray River. Indeed, I was envious because, when we look at the irrigation practices in those States, particularly in New

South Wales, we find that they are irrigating wheat with beautiful water with a salt content of only 20 parts a million. One of the mistakes made in the past in the management of the river is that there has been uncontrolled irrigation in those States, and only recently has it been controlled. As members will be aware, it has been controlled in this State for a considerable time.

This Government and I are concerned about the salinity content of the Murray, hence the initiative we took in 1973, when this State's Premier asked the then Prime Minister (Gough Whitlam) to convene and attend a meeting of the Premiers of Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia to discuss an extension of powers to the River Murray Commission or some like body in order to control the quality as well as the quantity of water in the river. It was from that meeting that a steering committee of Ministers representing the various States and the Commonwealth was established which, in turn, established a working party of technical people who reported back to it in 1975. Then in 1976 permission was given to the commission to extend its function to the extent that it could examine the quality of water in the Murray River. Indeed, it is in that position now by agreement among all the Governments involved, and hence its ability to comment on the establishment of the paper pulp mill at Albury.

As the honourable member would know, I have recently written to the Minister for National Development (Mr. Newman) in Canberra, asking him to convene a further meeting of Ministers of the various States represented on the commission. I have done that, because the commission has within the past fortnight reported to all the respective Governments with its recommendations on what alterations should be made to the River Murray Waters Act. South Australia strongly favours those amendments and is prepared to go ahead forthwith and have its Parliamentary Counsel draft the necessary amendments to the Act, so that Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia and the Commonwealth can put legislation before the various Parliaments and so that we can give statutory backing to what is now the commission's practice.

I am anxiously awaiting a reply from Mr. Newman, because I believe that there has been a slight change of attitude on the part of New South Wales and Victoria to the commission's recommendations. I hope that the meeting I have asked to be convened will resolve those differences and that we can during this session legislate for the necessary extension of function in order to confirm by Statute what the commission is now able to do.

Since it has been in office, the South Australian Government has consistently demonstrated the need for this quality control, and has taken every possible initiative and every action necessary to improve the situation. We would rather have power than extension of function, but we have achieved what we have been able to achieve in the circumstances, and we hope that shortly we will get the final agreement necessary so that legislation can be introduced during this session.

STATE TAXES

Mr. EVANS: Will the Leader of the Opposition say whether he has examined a copy of the document on State Government employment from which the Premier quoted in this House yesterday, and, if so, what conclusion he has reached on the Premier's statements made at that time?

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a matter in which Government policy is involved, and I cannot allow the

question.

Mr. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I bring to your notice a question asked yesterday in this House. It was asked by the member for Newland of the same person of whom I am asking my question. The question asked yesterday reads as follows:

Does the Leader of the Opposition agree with the oft-repeated statement by the Liberal Leader in New South Wales, one of which that gentleman made a feature of in the Earlwood Primary School on 4 July 1978 when opening the Liberal campaign, that New South Wales residents pay the highest State taxes in Australia?

That question was admitted. My question relates to a statement made in the House yesterday, and it is in relation to employment in this State. The Premier today agreed to table the document from which he read, making it a document that will be available to the House. As the question I am asking has as much relevance to a State or Government matter as the question asked yesterday by the member for Newland, I ask that it be admitted.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold that point of order.

Mr. TONKIN: On a further point of order, Sir, I protest about this. It seems to me that the matter of State Government employment, on which the Premier saw fit to attack my colleague the member for Davenport so viciously yesterday, is something which is very much the business of this House. The figures and the document from which he quoted have been tabled in this House. I believe it is a matter of public importance, a matter touching this Parliament, and one which is now before this Parliament because the document has been tabled. I believe that I must be able to answer such a question which is, of necessity, most pertinent, particularly as I believe the answer given by the Premier yesterday was quite deliberately misleading.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, why was my question to the Premier permitted? It was on exactly the same subject, about exactly the same document as this question which has been ruled out of order. I should like clarification as to the difference between my question and that now asked by the member for Fisher. It is on exactly the same material and the same document.

The SPEAKER: Order! I refer the honourable member to Standing Orders 123 and 124. I do not uphold the point of order.

Mr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Sir, may I ask for your clarification of how Standing Orders 123 and 124 apply in this case?

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Leader to look at those Standing Orders.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have looked at Standing Order 123, which states:

At the time of giving notices of motion, questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs;— we are not dealing with that; we are dealing with the Leader of the Opposition—

and to other members, relating to any Bill, motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the House . . .

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: "In which such members may be concerned."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes. The point is that this was raised in the House yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition was quoted, and the answer was given to the House yesterday, also. The Leader was also accused of misrepresenting the facts. I can certainly see his concern. It is a matter before the House and, therefore, he should be given the right to answer the question asked of him by

the member for Fisher.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): In that case I move:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER: Bring it up in writing. The Leader of the Opposition has moved to disagree to my ruling and states the following:

I disagree with the Speaker's ruling because it is directly contradictory to the ruling given regarding a similar question yesterday.

The honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. TONKIN: I take this action with some considerable concern because it seems to me that the ruling that has been given today is directly contrary and contradictory to the ruling that was given in this House yesterday on a similar question. Just to recall members' minds to the situation: yesterday, the Premier organised a question relating to State Government employment to be asked by the member for Newland of me as the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He wrote it out.

Mr. TONKIN: I do not know whether or not he did, but the point is that the member for Newland asked the following question:

Does the Leader of the Opposition agree with the oft-repeated statement by the Liberal Leader in New South Wales . . .

He went on about State taxation, and that is an important question, which applies to all of us. One of the features of State taxation is that the size of the public sector very much governs the amount of money that the taxpayer pays for the administration of this State. The question that was asked today was in relation to a statement made yesterday by the Premier about State Government employment. I repeat it as follows:

Has the Leader examined a copy of a document on State Government employment from which the Premier quoted in this House yesterday?

That is just as pertinent a matter as State taxation. It seems that there is only one difference: yesterday, the question was asked in order, it was hoped, to put me under some pressure or to embarrass me. It did not do so. It backfired on the Government and, indeed, it gave me an opportunity that I have been looking forward to for some time to put right the position on State taxation. You, Sir, admitted that question; you did not even query it, and no point of order came from the Government benches. You asked me, which I took to be a matter of courtesy, whether I wished to answer the question, and I said I did. You have extended me no such courtesy on this occasion, Sir. The ruling has simply been "No, the question cannot be admitted," without even a question to me as to whether I am prepared to answer it. I cannot for the life of me understand how those two attitudes can be reconciled. On the one hand, because it comes from the Government side (and I would not in any way accuse you, Mr. Speaker, of being biased or partial)—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable Leader does not.

Mr. TONKIN: The unfortunate interpretation that may be placed on this matter by other people is that because the question came from the Government benches it might have been an attempt to embarrass me. Since this question today has come from my own side of the House, it might embarrass the Government and therefore should not be admitted.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It would, too, because he told a pack

of lies yesterday.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition is out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has audibly made a statement from his side of the House that yesterday I told a pack of lies. I require a retraction and a withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Deputy Leader to withdraw the remark.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will withdraw because I do not want to waste the Leader's time, for one reason.

The SPEAKER: Order! I want a full retraction.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I withdraw.

Mr. TONKIN: If we consider the subject matter on which the question has been asked of me today (which was the answer that the Premier gave yesterday) we notice that the Premier has on more than one occasion (at least twice here that I can see on a brief examination) quoted me as having made certain statements and has used the Parliamentary forum to stand in this House and criticise and quote statements that he attributes to me in the explanation he has given. They are as follows:

If we turn to the statements made by the Leader that private employment . . . The Leader then said that 34 per cent of employees worked in the public sector in South Australia.

I was not far out either, in round figures. The Premier has raised this subject; he has quoted me, and now that a member of this Parliament wishes to hear from me on this subject about what the Premier has had to say you, Sir, have ruled that out or order. I think that it is totally contrary to the ruling yesterday. If it is not appropriate for me to answer a question today, it was not appropriate yesterday. If it was appropriate to admit that question yesterday, it is appropriate to admit it today. I totally and absolutely disagree to that ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that you will see the good sense of reversing your decision.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): It generally happens that the Leader's decibels tend to rise the less adequate is the argument he has to put. He has worked himself into a considerable lather in the past few minutes, saying the same thing over and over again.

Mr. Tonkin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable Leader of the Opposition to order; he has had his opportunity to speak.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What the Leader is suggesting is that the practice of this House should be so changed that, in fact, questions from his own members to him may give him the right to comment on anything at all. That is not and never has been the practice of this House. If the honourable member has any basis for objecting to what I had to say yesterday (and I cannot imagine what it is) he has a simple means of dealing with that in this House, and that is to seek leave of the House to make a personal explanation. He could do that at any time.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He could have done it yesterday.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He cannot introduce a new procedure into this House by the device he is endeavouring to introduce today.

Mr. Tonkin: So it's all right for your side but not for ours.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Leader continues I will definitely warn him.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick,

Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Rodda, Rus-sack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, and Wotton.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Dunstan (teller), Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Mill-house, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Nankivell and Wilson. Noes—Messrs. Duncan and Virgo.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

SPORTS INJURIES

Mr. BANNON: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what response there has been to the report of the committee to inquire into workmen's compensation and accident cover for persons participating in sporting activities, and what action does he intend to take on its recommendations? Last year legislation was passed entitled the Workmen's Compensation (Special Provisions) Act, 1977, which provided that a person participating in any sporting activity and receiving payments for such participation was not deemed to be a workman as defined by the Workmen's Compensation Act. Following the passing of that Act, which was essentially a special holding Act to ensure that no legal complications arose during the time of consideration, the Minister appointed a committee to inquire into and report on the desirability, feasibility and scope of workmen's compensation accident cover for persons participating in sporting activities. The committee took much evidence and submissions from sporting organisations, and the Minister released its report for comment in March 1978. Since then no statements have been made concerning this report.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am extremely disappointed at the lack of response from all those sporting groups and organisations which received copies of the committee's report about four months ago. To the best of my knowledge not one organisation has commented favourably or unfavourably on the recommendations made in the report. That could mean perhaps that no real need exists for special compensation cover for non-professional sportsmen, or that sporting clubs are happy with present arrangements.

The Government took prompt action to legislate to protect sporting clubs in South Australia from the necessity of providing workmen's compensation cover. That Act is to remain in operation until 31 December 1978 but it may be repealed earlier if necessary. As I see it, two alternatives are open to the Government at this stage. The first is to give the Workmen's Compensation (Special Provisions) Act, 1977, indefinite life or to repeal that Act and make any necessary consequential amendment to the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1971-1974, to ensure that sportsmen (other than professional players) are not covered by the definition of "workman" in that Act.

The second alternative, which I favour, is that it would be appropriate for the committee which we recently appointed in order to report on rehabilitation and compensation of persons injured at work to consider the position of sportsmen, as the recommendations of the committee inquiring into accident cover for sportsmen highlighted the need for a comprehensive compensation scheme for injured persons, irrespective of the cause of their injury.

TRADE UNIONISTS

Mr. VENNING: What are the Minister of Labour and Industry and his Government doing about the actions and activities of militant trade unionists in this State? The Minister will recall that towards the end of the past session of Parliament a situation developed in South Australia concerning the export of live sheep and the associated picketing carried out by trade unionists. At that time the Minister was asked by my colleagues, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Victoria, what he would do about the situation. With a smirk on his face the Minister replied to the question. By way of interjection I said, "You couldn't care less."

The Minister objected to my interjection in the House, and I said to him at that time, "Prove me incorrect when I say this by taking some action." The Minister took action—he went on holidays. We all know what happened about the sheep—the farmers came down and demonstrated.

The people of Adelaide were appalled to think that farmers from Eyre Peninsula, who had had three years of drought, had to come down to the city to demonstrate to the Government the need for some action about the matter. What is the Minister and the elected Government of this State doing in this area?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: First, the member for Rocky River must have an extremely short memory. He must be confusing that incident with some other incident when I might have had a smirk on my face (and one could not be blamed for having a smirk on one's face because of the stupidity of some of the interjections made by the member for Rocky River). Almost every member of this House smirks from time to time at the absolute stupidity of the member for Rocky River. On this occasion there was no smirk on my face, I took that dispute—as I take all serious disputes—seriously.

I said in the House that there was a good case for both sides of the argument: on one hand the farmers had a sound reason for wanting to export their sheep, and on the other hand the unions had a sound reason for not wanting sheep exported in such numbers, and that has since been proved correct, because meat workers have been laid off all over Australia. I reiterate what I said on that occasion; namely that there was an argument for both sides of the dispute, and I had no smirk on my face about that or any other serious matter.

My holiday in Surfers Paradise was arranged some six months in advance, but I did everything I could do about that dispute before I went away. I said on that occasion that it was a Federal matter. The matter was finally determined and settled by Mr. Hawke and Mr. Street, who got together to settle it. It is strange, and quite interesting, that I acted much more quickly than anybody else in Australia about that matter. The dispute was affecting everybody in Australia, but I was the first Minister to bother to call a conference between the Parties, and we had a two-hour conference about that dispute. Everything possible was being done at the South Australian level to try to stop the dispute spreading further.

Turning to the second part of the question; namely, what the South Australian Government is doing about militant union action in South Australia, I refer the honourable member to the figures and statistics I have been supplying in this State ever since I have been Minister. This State has the best industrial record in Australia, if not the world. The figures are on record, and

I suggest that the honourable member takes the time to study them. I only hope that he has enough sense to be able to understand them.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 18 July. Page 69.)

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): State control and ownership of all means of production, distribution and exchange, and the "democratisation" of every aspect of our way of life, or the private enterprise system with freedom of the individual, and the Government protecting that freedom and providing equal opportunities for all are the choices which presently face all South Australians. They are the choices between two clearly defined ways of life, and this is the most important and significant issue ever to have confronted the people of this State.

In 1975, and again last December, the nation decisively rejected the Whitlam Government's attempted take-over of our Australian way of life and chose individual freedom and private enterprise instead. South Australians have been subjected to a similar but far more insidious and gradual take-over bid by the State, and because the South Australian Government has adopted a soft-sell approach people are only now coming to realise how far the State has already intruded into their lives. Too many believed that State ownership and control, as seen in some other countries, just could not happen in South Australia. They have not been prepared to face reality.

The first six months of 1978 has brought a dramatic change to the political scene in South Australia, and there has been a significant change in the level of general political awareness. For the first time in nearly a decade, more and more people are looking critically at South Australia's Labor Government and questioning its direction and ultimate destination. The Australian Labor Party has never made any secret of its plans to socialise the means of production, distribution and exchange in South Australia and to create a society in which the State collectively owns and controls every aspect of our lives. That fundamental plank of socialism, and interestingly enough of communism, too, is clearly spelt out in the A.L.P. platform.

The Premier has restated his belief in this philosophy many times, including the 1976 Chifley Memorial Lecture, in the article commemorating his 25 years in Parliament, when he talked of the "democratisation" of every aspect of our way of life, and most recently in his book launched a week or so ago. He adopts the classic approach of all social democrats, wherever they may be, that there should be a bringing together of the best aspects of both communism and of capitalism to create a whole new way of life, and many people have been attracted by that idea.

It is becoming increasingly clear that private enterprise and capitalism have very little part to play in this Government's ultimate plans for the future of South Australia, as the events of the past few months have shown. In fact, the A.L.P. is committed to a growing expansion of Government enterprise, regardless of the disastrous effect its policies may have on the private sector and the community, and, even more cynically, it is committed to increase State taxes to support these activities.

South Australia's prosperity was built up by the vital and pre-eminent role private enterprise played in a mixed economy, and the systematic destruction by the

Government of this system can only destroy the whole basis of our former prosperity. It is now absolutely clear, for those who wish to see, that what the Federal Labor Party tried unsuccessfully to do to Australia in three years the State Labor Party has been far more successful in achieving here by spreading its moves over eight years.

It was the initial shock of the Salisbury affair in January which jolted people into thinking for themselves again. The summary sacking of Harold Salisbury from the position of Police Commissioner must be considered one of the most significant events in the political history of South Australia, and will mark the beginning of the end of the Dunstan era and of the A.L.P. Government. The Salisbury issue shocked the significant number of people who had come to support the Labor Party in State politics, and caused them to question their original reasons for giving that support. Idealistic expectations have been replaced by a growing disillusionment and the knowledge that the reality has been very different from the promises.

Desperate public relations and publicity activities are now being indulged in by the Government to try to repair the Government's loss of credibility, but disillusionment continues to grow and, indeed, is being reinforced by these activities.

A mounting level of attack is being made on members of the Liberal Opposition, but this will serve only to strengthen our resolve. Despite the strenuous efforts of our opponents, the Liberal Opposition intends to demonstrate to the people that it is well worthy of their support as South Australia's alternative Government.

One of the major failings of the present Government has been its total unwillingness to face reality. People do not want continued Government propaganda telling them everything is all right when they know from their own experience that things are not all right. What they know is that there is nothing any Government can do about solving a problem if it will not recognise or accept that the problem exists. Winston Churchill once said, "Don't argue about difficulties, the difficulties will argue for themselves." But in South Australia the difficulties have not been allowed to argue for themselves. If the Government had put as much effort into solving our difficulties as it has done in trying to cover them up with its propaganda, we would not be in our present critical situation.

The Liberal Party is not afraid to face reality. We recognise the enormous difficulties facing the State, and we will offer practical solutions and a long-term plan for the future. All Liberal Opposition members will be involved in this programme of ventilating South Australia's difficulties and promoting solutions to them during this Parliamentary session. Several basic questions are to be asked and answered, namely, "What is the present state of the State?" and, "Is South Australia really worse off than other States?"

The list of headings to be considered in this respect is a considerable and comprehensive one, including State finances; State taxation, Government expenditure and accountability; Government services and the cost-benefit value to the taxpayer (including education, health and community welfare); industrial development, mineral development, and the State's prosperity; building costs; the rural economy; and cost of living, personal security, and quality of life.

In assessing South Australia's performance, comparisons will be made with other States and with Australia. Unfortunately, the final answer to the question, "Is South Australia worse off than other States?" is, as we will show, "Yes! we are worse off". Inevitably then we move to the next major question namely, "To what extent are the

Labor Government's policies and administration responsible for South Australia's current difficulties?"

This question must be considered to some extent in conjunction with the headings I have enumerated under the first question. Our consideration will encompass the same headings, and some others; for example, the effects of socialist policies on the private-enterprise system, and the effects of expansion in the Government sector; and the style of Government adopted by the South Australian Labor Party, its dependence on publicity to replace action, and its attitude to the Parliamentary process.

The final answer will be, "Yes! the Labor Government's policies and administration are basically responsible for our current difficulties." Then we must consider the question, namely, "Is the Government likely to change or modify its present commitment to left-wing socialism if the effect on the ultimate prosperity and security of South Australians is seen to be adverse?" Here, the consideration is a simple one, and there is no lack of evidence indicating that the Government's ultimate aim for South Australia is total socialism, and that it is committed to this policy regardless of the adverse effects on South Australians.

The Government may delay its time table to meet occasional set-backs and adverse public reaction threatening it electorally, but it will not change its ultimate goal. The basic answer is, "No, it will not change its direction."

And, finally, we must ask the question, namely, "What plans to restore the State's prosperity has the Liberal Opposition to offer, as South Australia's alternative Government?" These will include the following: plans to reverse legislation which over-regulates, is unduly restrictive, or which intrudes unnecessarily into individual freedoms; a positive programme to revive and support private enterprise, including industrial and mineral development and the building and construction industries; a return to the provision of Government services on an efficient and maximum cost-benefit basis to the taxpayer; relief of excessive State tax burdens which currently apply to all South Australians and which discourage investment in South Australia; reforms to Parliamentary procedures to ensure maximum community awareness of proposed legislation; and many other detailed policies involving the full range of State Government responsibilities.

The headings I have listed will be dealt with in detail at the appropriate time during this session of Parliament. But even the briefest consideration of some of the various subjects I have listed reveals a disturbing and depressing picture of South Australia at present, and provides enormous scope and challenge for urgent remedial action. This the Liberal Party is prepared to provide.

What then is the present state of the State? The present financial situation of South Australia is critical: it is the result of several years of irresponsible and uncontrolled Government spending, and unparalleled expansion of the public sector. While the Premier has deliberately used the obscurity and complexity of Federal-State financial arrangements to conceal his Government's ineptitude in managing the State's economy, our prosperity has steadily deteriorated.

Now, with threats of higher State taxes and charges ringing in their ears, the people of South Australia are demanding that the Government return to a basic commonsense approach to the State's economic management. People know that they cannot afford to spend more than their income, and that borrowed money must be paid back. People are accustomed to setting their priorities, and to governing their spending according to their income. No-one can afford to waste money, and what is good enough for people should apply also to Governments.

After all, the money used by Governments, whether State or Federal, ultimately comes from the taxpayers' pockets, and both people and Governments must be strong enough to say "No" to tempting proposals for extravagant spending.

The evidence to demonstrate the State Government's economic irresponsibility is not hard to find, and while a more detailed analysis will be made during the debates on the Loan and Budget Estimates, we need only look at the State Budget deficit for the financial year just ended. True to form, the Premier has used all his undoubted talents as an actor to underplay the issue. He must, because he knows that the size of the State's deficit gives a true measure of his Government's ability to manage the economy.

His present standing and credibility is on the line as he tests the present level of gullibility of the South Australian electorate. The likely deficit was forecast as \$26 000 000 several months ago, to give people every chance to get used to the idea. When the final working deficit of \$25 000 000 was announced, the attitude expressed was almost one of relief. Even the *Advertiser*, true to form, obliged the Premier with the unreal headline, "State Deficit Reduced".

This whole situation would be Gilbertian, if it were not so serious: \$25 000 000 is a record deficit for this State, even allowing for inflation. The previous highest levels were \$3 900 000 in 1972-73 and \$9 150 000 in 1976-77. In fact, this year's deficit is far greater than the sum of all the South Australian deficits of the past 10 years put together, that is, \$20 390 000.

The Premier deliberately avoided giving straight answers to questions on this topic on the opening day of the session. Members will recall that what he said last week was that the State Budget deficit was only tiny compared to the Federal deficit, that it was all the Federal Government's fault anyway, and that with the injection of reserve funds the deficit was really much smaller than it looked.

Just how much longer does the Government expect South Australians to remain fooled by this double talk and deceit? It is time we got a few facts clear about State finances, fundamental facts which will stand up despite all the double dealing and deceptive statements of the Government.

As well as their own taxes from State taxation the States receive funds from the Commonwealth, basically in proportion to their populations. Any cut-back in Federal funds is thus felt by all States to an equal degree. That was the point the Minister of Education was trying to avoid acknowledging during his reply this afternoon. In other words, South Australia is not the only State to have received less than it would have liked in this past financial year. The real measure of a State's management lies in what each has been able to achieve with the funds that are available. In fact, all other States, with the exception of Tasmania, which budgeted for a small deficit, have concluded this financial year with Budgets that are virtually balanced. Most States had been budgeting to cope with expected financial cut-backs anyway. But South Australia had a record working deficit of \$25 000 000.

The Premier tried to imply that somehow South Australia had received a worse deal from the Commonwealth in 1977-78 compared to the other States. I have no doubt that that campaign will be continued on into this financial year. He was brought back to the present with a vengeance when Treasurer Howard reminded him on *T.D.T.* that the Premier had known for several months, and in fact had agreed to the proposal at two successive Premiers' Conferences, that the States were to be

guaranteed a fixed amount for 1977-78. The Premier still lays heavy blame on the Commonwealth Government for financial cut-backs, but what is clear is that South Australia has not been treated any more harshly by the Commonwealth in this last year compared to other States. But it was South Australia that had a record working deficit of \$25 000 000.

For 1977-78 the States got a net 12 per cent increase in actual dollars over the previous year. Because inflation was further controlled in that time, actual costs went up only by about 8 per cent. In other words, together with the other States, which prudently used it to help balance their Budgets, South Australia had a significantly greater increase in terms of real purchasing power than it originally had expected. But South Australia had a record working deficit of \$25 000 000.

In 1975, the Premier told us South Australia would be better off by about \$800 000 000 over 10 years as a result of the transfer of the country rail services to the Commonwealth, and that we would be in a better financial position than any other State as a result. This year, allowing for the \$60 000 000 saving to the State because Canberra now pays the country rail deficit, South Australia should have had an extra \$100 000 000 in round terms from the railways transfer, a sum which other States do not have. But South Australia still had a record working deficit of \$25 000 000.

The Premier cannot credibly explain these inconsistencies. Blaming someone else is something he has become adept at doing, but when we consider the position of other States, and remember that South Australia should be better off than they are, the fact that we are worse off is a damning indictment of the Labor Party's policies. Results are the best measure of performance, and this result can mean only one thing—grossly irresponsible economic management by the present Government of this State.

South Australia is still one of the mostly highly taxed States in Australia. Only yesterday, we saw yet another attempt to fudge the issue by the Premier, just as he fudged the issue during the election campaign, and as he did last week on the opening day of this session, by adding mining royalties to comparative total tax receipts, thus showing Queensland and Western Australia with per capita tax levels higher than South Australia. I think we have dealt with that question, much to the embarrassment of the Government. The Premier omitted to say that South Australia's very low return from mining royalties (about \$2 000 000 compared to about \$48 000 000 in Queensland and \$34 000 000 in New South Wales, with other States having figures of that magnitude) meant that more tax had to come out of our taxpayers' pockets in South Australia, compared to Queensland and Western Australia, whose taxpayers are helped by returns from a thriving and lucrative industry. We are not. Who does he think he is fooling?

Simple examples are best, and we will continue to give simple examples during the life of this Parliament. Why is the stamp duty payable on the purchase of an average family car the highest of any payable in any State, particularly when South Australia should be stimulating the car industry on which we rely so heavily? The Premier cannot explain. We still have not heard any explanation for it. It is inexcusable that it should be four times as high in South Australia as it is in Western Australia. Obviously, such taxes have a depressing effect on new car sales in South Australia, and thus on the industry on which we depend so much.

We are a high tax State, and taxpayers are beginning to question further rises when there is clear evidence to show that the Government has not concerned itself with getting

the best possible value for their tax dollars. The Liberal Party has put forward proposals to improve efficiency in Government departments to the extent of 3 per cent, both in spending and in staffing. The resultant savings would obviate any present need to increase State taxes and charges, while still maintaining present services.

The calls of the Auditor-General for adequate accounting methods and satisfactory budgetary control in Government departments have been repeated many times since 1971, and the Government has done no more than pay lip service to them. This House is still waiting for the Public Accounts Committee to bring down a report on expenditure and accounting in hospitals, but the Government today has demonstrated that it is more concerned to extricate itself from a potentially embarrassing situation than it is to get at the truth, and control wasteful expenditure. The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works lacks the respect of Government departments and the means to ensure that respect, according to the Chairman who retired last year, and examples have been given where the committee has been ignored.

These matters have been canvassed before and will be ventilated further, and positive steps to overcome the deficiencies will be proposed by the Liberal Party in later debates on the Budget. What is clear is that this Government has no idea of the proper controls necessary to make sure that taxpayers are getting the best possible value for their dollars—and more important still, it has not cared. It has used publicity and propaganda techniques to promote a picture of "good housekeeping" which is just not true.

Industrial development is now in a negative balance with more businesses closing or moving out than are coming to South Australia. This disastrous situation will be discussed by my colleagues in some detail but, in brief, the State Government, with its avowed socialist policies, is entirely to blame for this situation.

Mr. Wotton: How long do you think it will continue to fool the people of South Australia?

Mr. TONKIN: It will continue to fool the people of South Australia for as long as the people of this State want to remain fooled, and that will not be very much longer. The Government boasts it has achieved the best working conditions in the world for employees in South Australia, with generous worker's compensation, long service leave, and holiday loading provisions as the major benefits. But it is becoming more and more obvious that these same working conditions are forcing up the cost of labour, and driving private enterprise out of business, or out of South Australia, and are destroying jobs in the process. Various forms of licensing and control also add to our costs, our frustrations, and to the size of the public sector.

Finally, if any manufacturing industry still considers coming to South Australia under these conditions, then the threat of the Labor Party's industrial democracy programme is likely to discourage it once and for all. Whatever the Premier now says is the Government's policy, the damage has been done. He has advertised his commitment to the left-wing interpretation of industrial democracy, with an international convention, having just returned from an abortive overseas trip allegedly designed to attract private enterprise to South Australia.

Mr. Dean Brown: Was he successful?

Mr. TONKIN: I may say, as was to be expected, he was singularly unsuccessful. This situation would have vastly attracted W. S. Gilbert also, I suspect.

Most people now recognise the Government's complete dependence on the support of the militant left-wing

unions, whose avowed policy is complete and total "industrial democracy". Union control of industry will inevitably lead to State ownership of industry, and the destruction of private enterprise. How the Premier could imagine for an instant that private enterprise would be attracted to a State with a Government so totally committed to left-wing socialism is beyond all reason.

Existing industries in difficulties need not despair, for the State Government will make funds available to prop them up, or to buy their shares, or ultimately to take them over, for that is the ultimate aim. Fortunately, for private enterprise, the rest of Australia is available for its operations, but that is little comfort for those of us who love, and live in, South Australia.

The critical position of the building industry in South Australia is only too well recognised, and will be examined in some detail by my colleagues. But there is little value in the State Government's continuing to blame the Federal Government while, at the same time, it maintains its present State legislation and policies for long service leave, workers' compensation, holiday loading, compulsory unionism, industrial democracy, and all the other things which have effectively forced building costs up in South Australia.

The last straw has been the growing intrusion of the Public Buildings Department, that is, Government enterprise, into the building industry, undercutting and forcing smaller private enterprise firms out of business. The Premier confirmed last week his Government's commitment to that important part of the socialist philosophy, at both Federal and State levels—continued growth in public spending and public enterprise at the expense of private enterprise, and the need to raise still more tax to support this principle. That this is exactly our Government's attitude, we have learnt only too well.

The massive growth of Government spending and the rapid expansion of the Commonwealth Public Service were two factors which characterised the disastrous Whitlam era, and are still the basic philosophy of the Australian Labor Party. Precisely the same principle is being applied in South Australia with similarly disastrous results.

The March issue of the *Australian Bulletin of Labour* shows that, since the end of 1971, employment in public administration has increased by 50 per cent in South Australia, compared to the next highest, 35 per cent in Tasmania and Western Australia, and 31 per cent in the Commonwealth. During that time, yearly growth rates in the Public Service in South Australia have ranged from a low of 3.75 per cent to a high of 12.6 per cent. I want to refer later to the most recent developments on the matter of Government employment in South Australia.

Total State Government employment has increased by 56 per cent. Western Australia has had a greater increase of 62 per cent but it also has had a positive private sector growth compared to South Australia's decrease of 1 per cent. Western Australia has also had a population increase of 14.8 per cent, a private sector growth of 4 per cent, and an increase in manufacturing employment of 4 per cent. South Australia has had a fall of 16 per cent in manufacturing employment since 1973.

In other words, Western Australia, with its population growth and its vigorous programme assisting mineral development, has had every reason to increase State Government employment. South Australia obviously cannot afford this increase, but has still extended the public sector, regardless of the cost to the community. For example, the Australian Bureau of Statistics shows that from June 1973 to March 1978 there was an increase of 28 000 in the public sector in South Australia, and most of

that rise was in State Government employment. In the same period there was a decline of 4 600 in the private sector, but this obviously has not worried the Government. After the events of yesterday and today, if ever a Premier needed a credibility fund it is the present incumbent after his performance in this House. In what was one of the worst examples of misleading this Parliament by the use of selective figures, the Premier used a weird collection to try to direct attention from the growth rate of the Public Service in this State. He claimed that the most recent estimates from the Bureau of Statistics were for June 1977, and he proceeded to use them on that basis.

I have examined in some detail the document that he was quoting. It is a significant document; it is one that varies on the basis of the figures from page to page. If we consider the first page, we find that the most recent estimates available are up to June 1977.

Mr. Dean Brown: They are his words.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Damn lies!

Mr. TONKIN: Figures for March and April 1978 are available.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I believe I heard an audible interjection from the Deputy Leader that I would ask him to withdraw.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I withdraw it for the second time.

Mr. TONKIN: I have never heard the Premier present the exact opposite of the truth with greater exactitude. On page 2 of the document that was handed to the media yesterday he used figures based to April 1978. Then, on page 3, he jumped to a brand new base and used figures based from 1961 to 1977.

Mr. Allison: He wasn't even Premier during a lot of that time.

Mr. TONKIN: That is the whole point. How can he justify using that length of time? He is trying again to escape from the realities of his period of office. He cannot use the good management of the Playford era, which covers a large part of that period, to hide his own mismanagement.

During the 1971-78 period of office of the Premier and his Government, the South Australian Public Service has risen at the fastest rate in Australia, and the Premier knows it. The worst thing about all this is that yesterday, when the Premier read out figures that he claimed showed our rate of growth to be in the middle, he had in his hand a document that showed the opposite, and he knew it.

The member for Davenport has, this afternoon, incorporated in *Hansard* a table that shows between June 1971 and April 1978 the employment comparisons plus percentage changes between the States. For South Australia it was 33.7 per cent. If we go down the list we see that Victoria was 25 per cent; New South Wales, 19 per cent; Western Australia, 20 per cent; Tasmania, 16.9 per cent; and Queensland, 14.4 per cent. That will make interesting reading.

What makes the Premier's conduct yesterday so reprehensible (and I suppose we have become used to Ministers misleading this House in the past) is that the Premier had a document in his hand that showed quite clearly that, over the past five years to June 1977, South Australia had the most rapid growth in the Public Service. I seek leave to incorporate a statistical table in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the same document that the member for Davenport had incorporated?

Mr. TONKIN: No, it is a new document.

Leave granted.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES—PERCENTAGE MOVEMENT OVER YEAR EARLIER
(PER CENT)

Year ended	State and Local Government (a)							C'With Total Govt. (a) Govt.		Private			
	N.S.W.	VIC.	QLD.	S.A.	W.A.	TAS.	TOTAL (b)	(c)	(c)				
June 1973 ...	1.7	3.2	3.2	6.6	3.7	0.6	2.9	(1.9)	4.1	3.2	(2.5)	2.9	3.0
June 1974 ...	1.2	4.0	4.0	5.3	6.3	1.8	3.3	(5.8)	5.1	3.8	(5.6)	4.7	4.4
June 1975 ...	7.4	8.3	8.9	10.8	7.4	13.0	8.4	(4.5)	5.3	7.5	(4.7)	-4.4	-1.1
June 1976 ...	-1.8	2.3	-0.1	3.7	1.0	-0.5	0.4	(4.2)	-2.0	-0.3	(2.4)	-0.3	-0.3
June 1977 ...	-2.8	3.3	2.3	3.7	4.9	2.9	3.1	(3.1)	-0.6	2.1	(2.1)	-1.3	-0.3
March 1978	2.8	3.5	0.3	-4.9	3.2	-1.8	1.6	(2.5)	3.2	2.0	(2.0)	-1.0	-0.0
(d)					(1.6) (e)		(2.8) (e)			(0.8) (e)			
Average over 5 years to June 1977 ...	2.2	4.2	3.6	6.0	4.6	3.5	3.6	(3.9)	2.4	3.3	(3.5)	0.3	1.1

(a) Includes semi-government bodies (e.g. business undertakings) but excludes defence forces.

(b) Includes Northern Territory.

(c) Figures in brackets adjusted to exclude estimated employment under various unemployment relief schemes. March 1978 figure adjusted to exclude effect of the transfer of the employees of the South Australian country and Tasmanian railways to the Commonwealth on 1 March 1978.

(d) Preliminary figures.

(e) March 1978 figure adjusted to exclude effect of the transfer of the employees of the South Australian country and Tasmanian railways to the Commonwealth on 1 March 1978.

Mr. TONKIN: This is the missing sheet from which the Premier did not quote yesterday. It is summed up by the figures. It deals with the rate of growth and percentage movements over the years earlier, and shows, over the five years to June 1977, the following: New South Wales, 2.2 per cent; Victoria, 4.2 per cent; Queensland, 3.6 per cent; Western Australia, 4.6 per cent; Tasmania, 3.5 per cent; and South Australia, 6 per cent; which is the highest of them all. The average is 3.6 per cent, so that South Australia has had nearly twice the rate of growth during a large part of this Government's term in office.

This is one of the most disgraceful episodes of the selective use of figures, figures which are there in the hands of the Premier of any State, and it should be condemned by this House. Returning to the growth of the public sector at the expense of the private enterprise sector, textile, clothing, and footwear industries are among the few who have fared better in South Australia than in other States during recent years. However, the Government still insists on setting up its own clothing factory, although existing private firms may well be put out of business as a result.

What is clear, unfortunately, is that the only effort the South Australian Government is likely to make to contain and reduce the size of the public sector will be either a public relations exercise or attempts forced upon them by public opinion. It would be against its ultimate policy for it to do anything other than to assist private enterprise to wither quietly away and disappear from the scene. We are well along the road to socialism in South Australia and much further than people imagine. With the steady increase of Government enterprise comes a corresponding decline in individual community concern. For some reason, the socialist philosophy does not allow for voluntary workers in any sphere at all where paid employment could be substituted.

As a result of the intrusion of militant officials demanding compulsory union membership into the affairs of social clubs and voluntary groups, and in particular of volunteer St. John ambulance drivers, many people who now derive much satisfaction from serving the community

in various voluntary and charitable organisations suddenly find themselves threatened by union activity. Only last week a meeting of such organisations expressed grave concern at current trends and at the attitude of the Government, and many wonder if Red Cross and Meals on Wheels drivers will be next. Surprisingly, such moves seem to have the tacit support of the Government.

It is important to realise that despite all protestations, the Government's ultimate aim is for voluntary work to be taken over by paid staff working for the State. Ministers have left no doubt in the minds of many voluntary organisations that the Government's ultimate intention is to take over the entire responsibility for all community services. The Liberal Party believes strongly in the role of voluntary organisations in the community. They provide the best and most effective way of demonstrating individual concern, and of utilising a special dedication and commitment for the provision of the most efficient possible services, and we will do everything possible to support them.

Much has been said about the insidious development of the welfare State syndrome, which results from increasing regulation and control, and the take-over of all major personal responsibilities by the State. Where the State takes over, individuality disappears, and so does that element so vital to a real community, common concern and individual initiative.

A building company from interstate recently conducted a survey designed to help it develop effective plans to meet the future housing needs of South Australians. The survey was conducted here, as well as in other States, but the results for South Australia were significantly different and disturbing. High building costs and a lack of any sign of an early recovery for the building industry were findings that were not unexpected. What did stand out, however, was a marked difference in basic attitudes between people living here and those in other States.

Aims and aspirations for home ownership, and the upgrading of existing accommodation, together with plans for an eventual move to higher standard housing, were commonly expressed ambitions for the future, as well they

might be, but these were significantly lower in South Australia. Here there is a lack of concern about the future amounting almost to apathy concerning housing ambitions, and it is likely we would find a similarly depressed attitude to many other aspects of our lives in South Australia if the appropriate surveys were conducted.

The destruction of individual ambition and initiative is an inevitable product of the welfare State, but what the socialists do not recognise is that in destroying any incentive for individual initiative and personal advancement they are destroying one of South Australia's most valuable resources. Individual initiative, private enterprise, and honest hard work founded this State of South Australia, and caused it to prosper. The piecemeal destruction of private enterprise, and the ever-growing intrusion of the Government into our lives, is converting our once prosperous State into a stagnant backwater. Apathy and conformity are replacing initiative and individuality, and every value which once made South Australia a challenging and rewarding place in which to live has been either torn down, or is under threat.

The social democrat line is now being canvassed more and more openly in South Australia by its proponents, and by those still blind to the realities of life. "Socialism can provide a compromise between communism and capitalism," they say. "It can bring together the best features of each system, and here in South Australia we have an opportunity to have the best of both and to create a new sort of society." This is the classic approach of the social democrat, wherever it may be made. On the surface it sounds reasonable and even attractive, but it fails entirely to explain how this compromise can be reached, and what checks and balances can be used to stop the move to the left half-way.

Paradoxically, it supports the benefits of free competition, with the opportunity for individuals to excel and to make up their own minds about what to do with their lives (that is the Liberal philosophy), while at the same time advocating a system which forces people to go out and do something for the State. "Of course," they always add, "we abhor the oppressiveness and totalitarianism of the Russians" (the Chinese do not seem to come in for the same degree of criticism) "and we would never allow this abuse of power to occur in South Australia." I have news for these perhaps well-meaning but mixed-up people who promote the so-called compromise between communism and capitalism. For anyone prepared to face reality, there is already evidence enough to demonstrate a growing and blatant misuse of power in South Australia and building up of a whole new structure of society, very similar in many respects to that of any totalitarian regime.

To put it quite clearly, in South Australia today people are either "in" with the Government's "new establishment", or they are not. For those people who are "in", who knows what favours may come their way, what appointments may be made, what tenders accepted, what contracts offered, and what other patronage and benefits may result? Even people who are dependent on the private enterprise system now find themselves caught up in and supporting a regime which seeks to tear that system down.

It may be sheer survival which motivates that support, although self-interest and a need to feel part of the scene are also factors. Fear of offending is always a very real motivation when Executive power is flagrantly abused, and when people are desperately concerned for the future of their businesses, disadvantaged by the policies of that same State Government. Disagree with Government policy and you are knocking South Australia. Disagree with the Premier and you are not only a knocker but a

traitor to South Australia. The connotations are frightening, but quite in keeping with a totalitarian State. Disagree with anything the Government does and you will be viciously attacked, and told you do not know anything about the subject. If you are a journalist, be careful not to offend the Premier or you might find yourself eventually on trial for slander against the State as has just happened in Soviet Russia. Disagree with anything about the Government and you will be attacked personally and in the most vicious way.

People and concerns who are not supporters of the "new establishment" do not rate much attention from the Government, unless they are powerful enough in their own right to compel attention, or are thought to be useful in the general scheme of things. The style of government the Labor Party has made its own depends on public relations exercises, continuing propaganda and power. The taxpayers' money is not spared in any way to present everything the Government does in the best possible light, indeed, to paint the perfect picture. If things are good, it is entirely the State Government we have to thank. If things are bad, some-one else is always to blame, and judging from what we have heard so far this session it is usually the Federal Government.

Recently, it has been revealed that money is being raised by friends and supporters to form a personal fund for the Premier, to be used to help restore his credibility and standing in the community. People who are desperately concerned for the future of their businesses have felt compelled to contribute to the "credibility fund" to help rebuild the image of the Chief Executive of our State. They are hardly in a position to protest at what they may reasonably interpret as corruption, because they know they cannot afford to put themselves off-side.

Anything which smacks of bribery, blackmail, or the offering of inducements is a most serious matter at any time. When it touches a member of this Parliament, it is particularly serious, and when it touches the Premier, as the Chief Officer of the Executive Government of this State, its importance cannot be over-stated.

As I understand it, requests for contributions have been made to people, in some instances, who have been in the course of negotiations of one sort or another with a branch of government, and one can easily understand the construction that has indeed been placed on the request for money by some of these people.

Many companies and individuals depend on Ministerial approval for specific activities in their fields. Certain companies or individuals could be waiting on a building permit, a planning appeal, or even on a decision from the Attorney-General as to whether or not a prosecution should proceed. What are they to think when confronted with a demand for money for the Premier's use?

To say that the multi-national company with vitally valuable contracts dependent on Government approval is in a difficult situation is the under-statement of the year. Smaller, local companies may feel themselves in an even tighter squeeze because of their greater vulnerability to any change in the Government's attitude.

The existence of a slush fund for the personal use of the Premier serves simply to whitewash and give a dubious standing to what in its absence would be seen as nothing less than blatant blackmail or bribery, and provides an enormous potential for corruption, either real or perceived. The whole concept is abhorrent in that it deliberately exploits the concept of Executive power. It directly contravenes every principle of our system of Parliamentary democracy, and I cannot condemn it too strongly.

Members of Parliament, whether in Government or

Opposition, should not at any time know who has given donations to the Party, and certainly not be associated with direct approaches for personal funds. Since 1973 the Liberal Party has insisted that all funds be collected and accounted for through the Party organisation.

For whatever reason, there are many people in the community who have been afraid of offending the Government for fear they might suffer some disadvantage, but the time is fast approaching when they will have to stand up and be counted, if private enterprise is to survive.

This Government has never been afraid to exploit and use power, and it is amazing that its social democrat supporters have been unaware that the same potential for abuse and corruption which they strongly condemn in communist regimes already exists in South Australia.

What then are the chances of the Government revising its commitment to socialism? Well, pigs might fly, too. All the evidence points to the fact that total socialism is the Government's ultimate aim for South Australia even though it may defer and side-step particular issues if they seem to be disturbing the community. The current gyrations on industrial democracy, and the contrived newspaper article suggesting that the "conservative right wing" and, therefore, presumably the respectable section of the Labor Party, is coming to the fore again, cannot be taken seriously, bearing in mind the continuing attitudes and activities of people like the Chief Secretary and the Attorney-General, and their supporters.

There is a determined effort at present to persuade the activists to slow down or to delay their efforts, but while the whole principle of Fabian socialism is to progress only so far at any one time as it is possible to go without alarming or disturbing the people, ultimately, the long-term goal of total control remains unchanged. The present-day Labor Party, whatever its past attitudes, is now totally committed to the implementation of a socialist republic in Australia and of a socialist State in South Australia.

Not even the most hopeful and optimistic exponent of the 'It can't really be happening here, can it?' attitude can now possibly fail to be convinced that it really is happening here, after the combined evidence of the Whitlam years and the Dunstan era. Indeed, some of the exponents of the Whitlam socialist plan are now employed in key South Australian Government departments, as part of the Government's "new establishment". As a community we can no longer afford to keep our heads in the sand and ignore the reality of the threat which now confronts our entire way of life.

I began by setting out the clear-cut choice which now confronts all South Australians. It is a choice between a socialist, State-owned and State-controlled society, and a free society based on private enterprise and freedom of the individual. There can be no doubt about the basic issue. Neither is there any place for personality politics in deciding this issue.

South Australians have become accustomed to the carefully designed personal promotion of the Premier, even suggesting at times that he is apart from the less popular policies and activities of his Party, and its commitment to left-wing socialism. They must not be fooled and they must not allow these personal public relations activities to obscure the fundamental choice that will face them. It is their future way of life that will depend on the decision they make. There is no room for compromise.

If South Australians want the State to run all their affairs, they will support the Labor Party. If they want to run their own affairs, and keep their personal freedom of choice, they will support the Liberal Party. There is no

half-way house, there can be no half-way house, and there can never be any compromise.

With its philosophy of freedom for the individual, the Liberal Party now offers a vision for the future. In the next few months, the Liberal Party will offer a whole range of revised and up-dated policies covering every aspect of State Government administration. The high level of enthusiasm and co-operation of the many interested groups in the community helping to prepare these policies have been both welcome and stimulating, and bear witness to the growing realisation in the community of an urgent need for change.

Our first priority must be the preparation of guidelines and plans to restore our failing State economy. As a Party, we are committed to supporting private enterprise and individual initiative, and a range of private actions such as those spelt out in our eight-point plan for economic recovery will be ready to put into effect. In Government we will undertake those private members' motions and Bills as Government policy, and we will go to the polls on them.

We will provide every help to assist in the development of our mineral wealth in the north of the State. Both of these programmes will significantly improve employment. We will further tackle the problems of restructuring existing industry.

We are preparing working plans for the proper management of Government departments on an efficient cost-benefit basis, with adequate examination and checking of accounts, and with wider responsibilities and opportunities for increased efficiency in the Public Service. With increased efficiency, State taxes will be kept at a reasonable level, with value being given for the taxpayer's dollar. If we put management consultants in to look at an organisation like the Royal Adelaide Hospital, we will listen to that report and act on it and not throw it out of the window because it disturbs some of the people working there.

The Public Service itself will be restored to its former position as a career service, and senior appointments will once again come generally from within its own ranks.

There will be the maximum possible consideration of community opinions in the Parliamentary process, and members of the public will be kept informed about the matters being considered. Legislation which over-regulates, is unduly restrictive, or which intrudes unnecessarily into individual freedoms will be revised.

We will do everything necessary to ensure that there is free competition with equal opportunities for individuals to excel, and freedom to decide for themselves what to do with their lives. The only restriction that we will require is that they accept the responsibility of preserving an equal degree of freedom for every other South Australian. This is true quality of life.

These are the policies of the Liberal Party that will be presented to the people of South Australia during the coming months. The people will decide in the next few months whether they want State control under Labor or individual freedom with the Liberals. I believe, and have every confidence, that they will choose freedom.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I support the motion. By a strange coincidence, I follow the Leader. Some of the aspects he raised dealt with Labor Party philosophies and certain terminologies and, I for one, as a social democrat, feel offended by his definition. I begin by joining with His Excellency the Governor in expressing sympathy to the family of the late Frank Potter, M.L.C. I had known Frank since first entering Parliament in 1970, and had always found him a polite and friendly Parliamentary colleague.

I most certainly join with the Government in expressing my concern and disappointment at the depressed state of the economy of our State and country, and the unacceptably high level of unemployment caused thereby. Believing that previous Government speakers have dealt with this matter more than adequately, I simply adopt the proposals submitted by them.

I was also interested to note the legislative programme. Members will recall that on many occasions I have stressed my belief that Parliamentary involvement in legislation via Select Committees is an extremely useful way of dealing, in particular, with legislative reform of a social nature. This technique can help restore the balance between the Legislature and the Executive—a problem which, at the moment, is causing concern in the community. It provides an ideal venue for ideas to be shared in areas where the basic goals are common.

I notice from His Excellency's Speech that there are new matters that might fall into this category. I refer to criminal law and procedure, evidence, and possibly incorporated associations. Of course, there may be other matters.

This is the yearly opportunity to talk of major issues, to state our position in relation to those issues, and to suggest our goals. Unless we are prepared to confront problems, to see them objectively, and at least to attempt an answer, if not to state a position, then we are hardly worth our places here.

We would do well to remember Cromwell's famous words to a not particularly gifted Parliament: "Ye are grown intolerably odious to the whole nation. You are deputed here by the people to get grievances redressed, and are yourselves become the greatest grievance." For me, the major issue of our world is liberty and the right of the individual freely to think, talk and act. There are fewer and fewer countries on earth where such rights can in any real sense be said to exist, and where they continue to exist they are under attack. Most people on this earth live under the slavery of totalitarian regimes of the right or left. In those countries, repression, torture, boredom, and censorship are the marks of slavery to the State.

The whole of Eastern Europe lies bound in chains to the awful and brutal Soviet State. The U.S.S.R. was recently described by *The Internationalist* as "An armour-plated train going nowhere. It has, moreover, picked up a number of neighbours as passengers and has little compunction about dealing with those who try to get off." The U.S.S.R. was, of course, the first Marxist State and, since its foundation in the revolution of October 1917, the Marxist States of one kind or another have been created by Russian invasion, as in the case of Eastern Europe during the Second World War, by internal revolution as in China, or a mixture of each as in the case of Vietnam. Marxist Parties rule in Cuba and in different parts of Africa. I do not deny that in some countries Marxist Governments have gained power by election.

China has gone its own way with a kind of communism quite different from that of the U.S.S.R. Marxism in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe, submerged in its own brutal bureaucracy, has lost much of its missionary zeal, and its ideological leadership in most Western countries has virtually disappeared. It still maintains its crucial position, however, as one of the world's two greatest military powers.

Other branches of Marxism have certainly maintained missionary zeal and are still active in most countries that can still in some ways be called free, but I deal with that situation a little later on.

On the other hand, when we talk of liberty we should not become hypnotised by the word communism. Brutal

military dictatorships of the right rule in most of South America, notably Brazil, Argentina, and Chile and, of course, the awful situation in South Africa should not be forgotten. In addition, the Islamic States offer precious little in the way of freedom. Apart from these obvious examples, there are dozens of countries which, while ostensibly free, in fact offer their citizens no real freedom of action or thought. This disintegration of the world into groups of brutal dictatorships, whether you label them left or right, is frightening.

In Western countries that still have some hope of maintaining freedom it is critical that the fate of others remind us of the need to be alert in the defence of our own values. I realise that it is all very well to talk of freedom in a country like the United States of America or, to a lesser extent, in certain parts of Western Europe if, in fact, there is no economic capacity to enjoy that freedom. Twenty-five million negroes, unemployed people, and other community groups in the United States are certainly free to talk, speak, and vote how they will. They are also free to live in beautiful homes, eat in swank restaurants, or take a holiday in Miami, if they can pay for it, but they live in slums, barely have enough to eat, rarely leave their districts, and are in economic servitude.

What I want, therefore, is a freedom that will permit the individual conscience to exist and be supreme and for the individual spirit of each free man to defeat the totalitarian State and, at the same time, a society in which economic freedom permits real freedom. First, for all its faults and all its problems it is notable that the Parliamentary system provides the forum in which I can utter these words. Likewise, for all its faults and all its failings the Constitution of our country provides the forum in which political Parties of every kind, religions of every kind, journals and newspapers of every kind, and individuals with all their differences can freely speak.

I choose the word "forum" as being a place of public expression and audience. A forum cannot conceivably pre-suppose rulers meeting in secret to impose laws on citizens who have no choice, and cannot pre-suppose fearful and secret meetings by citizens to avoid the secret police. I repeat, that real freedom means economic freedom, and in Australia this has been progressively achieved largely by the actions of the trade union movement and the A.L.P. over the past 70 years. There have, of course, been the disastrous setbacks of the great depression and the various post-war recessions leading to the current and extremely complex economic crisis that faces the country.

Jimmy Reid, the wellknown Glasgow unionist (whose views I do not share in totality), summed up the gravest part of this problem (which faces Britain as much as Australia) by identifying unemployment, particularly unemployment of the young. He recently said, "There is something utterly obscene about youngsters finishing their education, leaving school, and being told they are not wanted. It must be a devastating, demoralising blow. But the problem of these youngsters is not juvenile delinquency but adult delinquency—it is the adults who have not provided a decent enough society that can provide them with a job."

I came into the Labor Party not as a result of academic theories or philosophical works—I was born into it. It was my family which taught me that the only political Party which could provide some measure of economic justice in this country was the Labor Party. The only way by which this latest economic crisis can be remedied is a continuing redistribution of income. That, however, is a topic deserving a speech of its own. I state it, however, because it must be made clear that, while I am not a socialist but rather a social reformer, I envisage non-violent democratic

reform which, at the same time, will be dynamic and, over a period, immense.

Look at the reforms which the pragmatic non-socialist A.L.P. has brought about even since the 1940's. These so-called "good old days" were dreadful times and the change in society since then has been extraordinary. In the 1940's, the 1950's and during part of the 1960's, there was still a very large economic class division in Australia. Considerable areas of our city and suburbs could readily be identified as "working class" districts, and it was in two of these districts that I lived until my late twenties.

The working class people had their conditions gradually improved by the social welfare legislation of the A.L.P. and by the gradual provision of welfare housing, and finally by the economic resurgence of the 1960's. But, during the time to which I refer, while very few families were in the state described by Orwell in *The Road to Wigan Pier*, there were plenty who were very poorly off indeed. There were certainly many who were badly housed, not well fed, and poorly clothed because of their economic circumstances.

At the same time the middle-class people and what was then called the "Establishment" of our city lived very comfortably indeed. Not for them the icebox but a refrigerator; not for them a broom and dust pan but a vacuum cleaner; not for them a draughty house with salt damp in the walls but the warm and comfortably heated villa; and not for them the weekly worry of spreading out the pay packet but the comfortable problem of deciding when and where to dispose of their shares and what options to take on the market. There was very really the feeling of "them" and "us", as well there might have been.

As I have said, it was by living in these circumstances that I became connected with the Labor Party. I did not then, and do not now, see any merit in being "of the working class". Like George Orwell, who was not of it, I agree that there is a certain honour in maintaining one's pride and personal values in difficult circumstances, but there is no value in economic depression, draughty houses, and the like. Ask anyone who has tried it. What I wanted, and what we all wanted, was to destroy economic inequality and the concept of a working class, a middle class, and an establishment, not to perpetuate it and lead these groups into a violent confrontation. And that could be done only by a redistribution of income, and only the Labor Party offered that measure while advocating freedom. Remember that the Liberal Party never offered that redistribution, and at the same time never offered equal votes or voting freedom in those years.

All that, however, explains my contempt for the middle-class Marxist who prances and postures prominently around the place today as the saviour of the working class. We have all met him. Sometimes he is plausible. He is what I call the "cocktail communist"—that is as close as he ever got to Molotov. He is not of the working class; typically he is the son of a banker, who has always lived comfortably and well, and whose most exciting moments have been his minor successes on the stock exchange or at the T.A.B. You can be sure that he moves in the latest trendy circle, has hair as long as it should be, is moustachioed or not, according to the fashion, and stands elegantly dressed in a very expensive suit at his usual trendy bar near his fashionable villa, blandly quoting from the seemingly endless writings of Lenin.

And this is the person who has the impertinence to urge those people who are economically depressed to join the Marxist Parties and work for them. And these are the people who have the temerity to hold themselves out as authorities on what others should do or think, and indeed to urge them to accept the same gloomy fate that the

workers have accepted in many parts of Europe and Asia. George Orwell identified him brilliantly in *Animal Farm* and predicted the fate of his supporters in 1984.

These same people, if they ever do visit Eastern Europe or Russia, can be relied upon to ignore the fact that the trade unions are political pawns of a brutal Government, to ignore the lack of redistribution of income, and to ignore the brutal repression and all the other sad deficiencies of the system. Sometimes they are even heard to utter some words of praise for it. Most certainly, they will be heard to slander the Labor Party, which has, as I have said, achieved so much in real reforms over the last 30 years. There are, of course, other far more dangerous members of the Marxist groups, and very skilled operators indeed belong to these Parties. I shall deal with these Parties a little later.

Of course, in no way is it necessary to be of the working class to greatly champion its cause, but it is what you offer in belief and produce in practice that counts. However, it was highly appropriate, I thought, to at least identify that particular and most odious of Marxist personnel. Enough of them. Let me continue with positive aspects.

I further believe that the emergence of the highly corporate style of society makes it even more clear that worker participation or industrial democracy is an essential ingredient of economic reform. When huge corporations can have devastating impact, both on their employees and on the community as a whole, it is essential that they be accountable in the same way as the Parliamentary Government is. That does not require nationalisation, but simply an acknowledgment that we all have a responsibility for the total wellbeing of the community. And, if the right-wing critics say my analogy of Parliament is not correct, then let us further democratise the Parliament to make the analogy match.

There are those, however, who, particularly in the current circumstances of economic stress being experienced world wide, would take advantage of the time to endanger our freedom. There are elements both of the left (the various Marxist Parties) and of the right (extremist groups by a multitude of names involved in conservative politics). I have already, in passing, dealt with one Marxist type; I will now look at the institution which houses him. Each of them is dangerous because their solution rests on imposition, not election, and would be best fulfilled by the elimination of individual freedom. The extremists of the right offer a philosophy so blatant and hysterical that they meet behind closed doors, knowing that no rational person would accept their nonsensical messages and so-called solutions. This type of fascist points the road to Auschwitz. Far to the left stand the Marxist groups pointing the road to Gulag. Just recall the so-called trials that even recently led to this camp and the grim similarity to the Nazi political court.

In Australia, as well as in other Western democracies, there are various groupings of these communist Parties. One group claims, like some of its Western European counterparts, to be thoroughly independent of any other communist movement and seeks to achieve a communist State by free election. Another group is Maoist and apparently linked to the Chinese Communist Party. A third remains linked to the Soviet ideology.

Apart from these three main categories there are various splinter groups under a variety of names following various deviants of the Marx/Lenin theory or of the various anarchic "fellow travellers". The total membership of all these groups combined, like their fellow extremists of the right, is quite minute. It is extremely doubtful if between the lot of them they have 10 000 members in Australia. However, the power that they

wield is quite enormous and quite unrelated to their size. In dedication, application to the cause, and capacity to work, they leave most of us democrats in a wretched state by comparison.

One of the Marxist groupings advocates independence from foreign ties and free elections; I refer to the Communist Party of Australia. It seems to have provided, to some apparently rational people, a respectable alternative to Australia's major political Parties. That Party does, however, clearly maintain an undeviating Marxist philosophy, and that philosophy, on reasonable examination, although claiming to be a science, is an anti-science. It locks human beings into a series of historical assumptions and avows unavoidable historical conclusions. It even elevates these forces to a sort of life of their own. Furthermore, while free elections are promised, and could not be avoided in the foreseeable future anyway, the fate of all those in Marxist Government countries that I know should, in practical terms, terrify even those who accept the theory.

I can, therefore, summarise my position by stating that I am a social democrat in the tradition of the A.L.P., unswervingly maintained by successive leaders, at least since the 1940's. There is no need to be a great academic to define what is meant by being a social democrat. It is, first, a total commitment to a democratic society and a pluralist society and, secondly, a total commitment to the reformation of that society on a progressive basis to achieve justice for the underprivileged and equality for all citizens. Commitment to a democratic society is the predominant belief.

I briefly refer to a recent statement by Shirley Williams, the British Secretary of State for Education. She was asked whether those who wish to join the British Labour Party must accept that its objective can be achieved only by democracy. She replied that they must accept that, if the cause for socialism and the cause for democracy should come into conflict, they will stand by democracy. And, she concluded, "Anyone who is not prepared to answer 'Yes' does not belong in the Labour Party at all."

I recall reading with great pleasure Bill Hayden's statement in *The Age* on 9 January 1978: "I am a social democrat." I think there is no doubt that he meant what I mean: that he is proud of our tradition, honoured by logic, tradition and reality. Like myself, he holds his head high against the sneers of the conservative right and the Marxist left.

In international terms, as I see it, Australia has an obligation to do all in its power to assist in maintaining democracy where it exists and to assist those who set out to create democracy where it does not exist. Furthermore, Australia has the duty to involve itself in the issue of poverty in the world and to focus attention on the unjust relationship between the rich and the poor worlds. It also has a duty to involve itself actively in providing aid that will reach those who need it and will not be absorbed into the pockets of the ruling classes.

As I see it, the place to start is with our neighbours in the Pacific, and to our north, in particular Papua New Guinea, the Philippines and Indonesia. To say the least, our record in all these matters is not a good one. A country like New Zealand, much less rich than we are, has a far better record.

Internally, we must continue to maintain the freedom that we have and progressively to extend economic equality. Internally, I am very pleased to note that young members of the Labor Party and of the trade union movement have solidly rejected the blandishments of the multitude of Marxist groups and the theories of those who advocate anything less than democracy first and last.

I now want to deal with two other related and highly important issues. They are the questions of a republican Australia and the reform of the Constitution of the Commonwealth. These issues are related not only to each other but also, of course, to the first issue of democracy in the world and in Australia. In the on-going context of the Australian Constitution Convention and, in particular, with its plenary session in Perth next week, reform of the Constitution is very much under discussion. The convention will be asked to debate the deadlock between the Senate and the House of Representatives relating to Supply, which led to the sacking of the Whitlam Government by the then Governor-General, Sir John Kerr. It will have before it a lengthy report by Committee "D" of which I was a member, which reaches no conclusion but at least manages, in my opinion, in objective terms to state the issues both of fact and of law for both points of view. It was of course, the sacking of the Whitlam Government that has led once more for a call for a republican Australia. It was a recommendation of the State A.L.P. conference held last month that the Commonwealth Constitution be reconstructed to sever ties with Great Britain. The problem involved in this, although I have no difficulty in supporting the concept, is "just who will replace the Governor-General?" Will there be no replacement so that the Prime Minister will fulfil the role of both head of the Legislature and head of the Executive—a sort of Prime Minister and President combined—or will we have a President and, if so, will he be elected or appointed. In my opinion, the choice is really of no Executive head as such at all or an elected head.

This is so, because, to my mind, there would be absolutely no difference between a Governor-General appointed by an Australian Government without reference to the Monarchy as compared with the current system. In a nutshell, as I see it, all the power of office ought to be destroyed or, alternatively, the powers ought to be clarified and vested in an elected Executive head separate from the Legislature.

It should be remembered that the great democratic republic of the United States was born out of revolution and that its Constitution embodied what is, in my mind, some of the best and most practical ideas that mankind has ever had to ensure that men could live in a free society.

The theory of Montesquieu on checks and balances of power is embodied in a federation of States each with residual sovereign powers and the vesting in a Federal Government of certain nominated powers, the implementation of which is in turn split between the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary. A similar form of constitution is to be found in Canada. Both forms of constitution are embodied in the Australian Constitution, together with elements of British constitutional law.

While it may be said that Canada, the U.S. and Australia are all over-governed, certainly it is very difficult indeed, short of internal civil warfare, for any one power group to obtain absolute power in all the necessary areas needed to achieve that power at the one time.

It should be noted at this point that to set up a republican Australia with its own Executive head would require considerable amendment to the Constitution in any event, and it should not be forgotten that the present system of State Governors would be replaced as well, so that basically the same questions asked at Federal level would have to be asked and answered in each of the States. In order to obtain public support, even if that support were there in principle, I would suggest that some more definite proposals would be required on each and every one of the options to which I have referred.

It is often said by advocates of great constitutional

change that there is no greater impediment to that change than the legalistic mind. That might be so, but I think it would also be agreed that those who drafted the Constitution were remarkably successful in achieving their aims. Whatever way the Constitution is changed, unless, of course, judicial power is also done away with, it will always be subject to interpretation, and it is almost impossible in so complex a field to ever draft a document that can be said to be absolutely and definitively clear.

In addition to the question of a republican Australia there has recently emerged in some quarters a demand in Australia for a unitary Constitution. This proposal I must certainly reject. The founders of the Constitution were undoubtedly conservative and suspicious of the powers they were vesting in the Federal Government, but time has proved many of these fears only too well founded and many of their protections very well based indeed.

It can be said again that this leads to too many Governments, but it appears to me that this is really part of the process of checks and balances of power which are essential to maintain individual freedom and to prevent the advent of a centralised bureaucracy which, particularly in a country of the huge area of Australia, could harass people by remote control and leave little opportunity to make them subject to correction. It is sometimes argued that economic reform can best be carried out in a unitary State. Therefore, it is interesting to note that Great Britain under the Labour Party in a unitary State has fared no better than the United States, with its Federal Constitution, or Canada and Australia with their Federal Constitutions. As a sidelight it can be noted that in Britain there is a tremendous demand for self-government in Scotland and Wales, and the process of devolution of powers proposed by the Prime Minister tends to suggest something suspiciously like federalism.

That Australia has such a large proportion of its population placed in the States of Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria, has made the provision of equal Senate representation for the other States quite essential to prevent Federal Governments, of whatever persuasion, from simply buying votes in these States, leaving the other States as blighted areas. In Australia we have never accepted the principle that some regions should be less well off than others: that is utterly wrong. This is yet another area for concern that has been held under reasonable control by the structure of the Constitution.

I would finally say that those who see the unitary State as a simple answer to many of Australia's problems might well remember that the greater power available to the central Government under such a system could be wielded by Conservatives and Labor Parties alike and, under the present system, undesirable proposals by each of these Parties have been held in check by the Federal system. Of course, I am not saying for a moment that federalism in itself is not capable of being made to work more efficiently and effectively.

Because of the centralisation of tax power, and hence, financial power in the Commonwealth resulting from the decisions of the High Court, particularly in the uniform tax cases of 1942 and 1957, federalism is no longer simply a structure. Long after Montesquieu, when the British constitutional lawyer A. V. Dicey considered the various forms of federalism in 1885 he could see it as denoting nothing more than a division of sovereignty, but the control over revenue has now produced different philosophies of federalism. When Malcolm Fraser refers to his "new federalism" he claims a restoration of State autonomy in the expenditure of a predetermined share of income tax revenue. This is in response to what many called "coercive federalism" adopted by the making of

conditional grants for a wide range of specific purposes under section 96 of the Constitution by Commonwealth Governments between 1943 and 1975.

As we have heard the Premier say, the matter is not quite as easy as that. If some device can be discovered to deal with the problems involved in the withdrawal of specific purpose grants, and there can be a more precise method of allocating revenue, introduced at acceptable stages, it may be worthy of a substantial trial. However, in order to achieve this, the States' share of personal income tax would need to be increased yet again so as to compensate for the recurrent grants under the old scheme. Moreover, the proportion of specific purpose grants has varied substantially between the States.

In an article in the *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, Justice Else-Mitchell deals extensively with this whole complex and difficult matter. He said in part:

... a view of relativities will need to take account of several things. First, the pre-existing proportions in which the general revenue assistance is shared and the extent to which these should be preserved; secondly, the revenue and expenditure differentials which the Grants Commission assesses in relation to applications for special assistance by claimant States whose rights to seek such assistance are preserved by the arrangements; and thirdly, the extent to which the absorption of special purpose grants may distort pre-existing relativities or the needs of the States *inter se*. A separate but equally important question is whether it is not too ambitious to expect that the initial relativities will endure until 1980-81, unless, of course, there is substantial absorption of specific purpose payments in the general revenue entitlements.

What has arisen, in fact, is that the Commonwealth has withdrawn from a number of programmes without consultation with the States. Upon the States protesting about this situation they are informed that these are areas for which the States should pick up the tab as they have been given the moneys with which to do so. However, when the States do pick up the tab for continued funding of their programmes, they are then said to be excessively extravagant in spending taxpayers' moneys, and in increasing the size of their Public Services. Consultation, to say the least, is obviously lacking in this area. For all its faults, however, federalism, I am sure as a structure and a financial mechanism, provides far more hope for the majority of people than any unitary system of Government.

Even in the midst of so serious a topic there is room for some small humour as evidenced by Schofield's Alphabet in the *National Times* of the week ending 22 July 1978. A top Treasury official is shown in all his majesty correcting the misguided expressions of two ill-educated underlings. He says: "We are not in the midst of a monetary crisis or a recession or depression. We are simply experiencing a self-corrective, fiscal rolling readjustment."

I resist the temptation to deal with any other matter even though I am tempted by some of the topics now being discussed. I look forward, with His Excellency, to a productive session of this Parliament.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I join my colleagues in expressing regret, with His Excellency the Governor, at the death of the President of the other place, Mr. Frank Potter, who served the Parliament with great distinction. Although I knew him little as a man, his reputation preceded him and will live long after him.

I also take the rather unusual step of expressing regret to this House at the death of a constituent. In this case it is a Mount Gambier and Australia-wide industrialist, Mr. Bob Page, former Managing Director of Softwood

Industries, one of South Australia's and certainly Mount Gambier's largest industrial concerns. Apart from his obvious talents, Mr. Page was extremely well respected for his accomplishments in the timber industry. Apart from that, as a person I always found him to be in every way that most precious of all things, a sincere, gentle man. I express my personal sympathies to his wife and to his family.

I listened with some interest to two of the debaters from the Government side and certainly found it unusual to have some literary relief introduced by the member for Playford. It seems that he was born into a Labor background and remained in that background for the worst of reasons, simply because he was born into it. I share his origins. I was born into a Labor background but, because I gave it considerable thought, I emerged from it, I think to my advantage.

I was particularly interested in the honourable member's reference to the works of Orwell, because I have direct family connections with the Wigan of *Wigan Pier* and everything that that book entailed. It certainly was not a pleasant background when Orwell was writing. I also found it extremely significant that almost every character in *Animal Farm*, whether animal or human, could in the Stalin-Kruschev period be directly related to a real life incident in Russia at that time with the persecutions, purges, deaths, and take-overs and, significantly, in the long term I believe we can look forward to the fact that ultimately the power-seekers with their small number of people who ascribe to political leadership become very much like the capitalists who they persecute and prosecute at times through their personal escalation to power and wealth. I believe *Animal Farm* was a brilliant indictment on socialism cum communism.

In addition to that we have the 1984 story. I was only thinking that the media monitoring system is closely paralleled to the "Big Brother". I have personally had things I have said or written quoted within a matter of hours, if not minutes in some instances, either in this House or in Adelaide simply because somewhere there is someone collecting all the relevant data and putting it together in a dossier to be held against me at some future time, and it has nothing to do with the Federal Telecom system.

Mr. Mathwin: You think you are in Don's file, do you, in a dossier?

Mr. ALLISON: I am absolutely certain of it. I have had Ministers producing copies of the *Border Watch* predicating a question I said I was going to ask only one edition before. The news gets through quickly.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: How does it get here?

Mr. ALLISON: I do not know how it is brought down, I suppose it is on the telephone; it is too quick for me. *Wigan Pier*, *Animal Farm*, and 1984 are certainly closely related to the communist socialist group. I have no shame in linking them because, after all, the person who had the most to do with the doctrine, Marx himself, when collaborating with Engels in writing *The Communist Manifesto* wondered what to call it. Would you believe it, the first name they settled upon, I think in 1841, was *The Socialist Manifesto*. That probably accounts for the similarity between that and the Australian Labor Party's platforms at State and Federal levels. They decided not to go ahead with the title *The Socialist Manifesto*. If honourable members have any doubts about the veracity of what I am saying, they should look at the first edition which is in the Parliamentary Library.

Mr. Groom: Tell us what you understand to be socialism.

Mr. ALLISON: I am just explaining that if Marx and

Engels had doubts about it, you can hardly wonder why we tend to confuse the two, because the originators had the same trouble. If members will just listen for a second I will elaborate on the problems they had. At that stage the socialists were a middle-class group, and Marx and Engels did not want to be associated with the middle class so they called it communist because this was essentially the working class. Lo and behold, the member for Playford said that, although he did not wish to be directly connected with the working class and poverty and all that sort of thing (the same atmosphere I wanted to be out of but which we still wish to help)—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I do not think he said he did not want to be connected with it.

Mr. ALLISON: The next issue is the tenuous one.

Mr. McRae: Is it as tenuous as *Animal Farm*?

Mr. ALLISON: It is not all that tenuous. I am talking about real life. There is no doubt that this is a real life situation, and even members on the Government side are hoodwinked by what they are told to believe and what they are told to say. They are programmed by Caucus every Monday, and if they deviate from that programme the tape is erased and they have to go back the next week for reprogramming. On this side of the House we are given the right to decide for ourselves. That is really private enterprise and the freedom that goes with it.

The member for Morphett, in his lengthy address, said little other than that the recipe for future success under socialism was, virtually, a second very large serve of what we had from 1972 to 1975, the very recipe that threw us into the chaotic situation from which we are now emerging. That situation is to be hashed up again. This shows a complete lack of imagination on the part of the Australian Labor Party, and probably accounts for the fact that in June 1978, despite two years of austerity and despite Senator Carrick releasing his pre-Budget education ideas, the Gallup poll taken at that time showed that the present Federal Government would still have been returned with an enlarged majority if an election had been held. I can only conclude that the member for Morphett was deluding himself. He was deluding no-one else.

Let us look at what happened under the dead hand of socialism. Unemployment under Whitlam rose from zero to 250 000 people in a short time. It was the most rapid period of escalation of unemployment ever experienced. Inflation rose to a point or two less than 20 per cent.

Mr. Groom: Will you give me a definition of "socialism"?

Mr. ALLISON: I will come back to that later. The honourable member was critical of the Federal Government's fund-raising being sought overseas through normal channels and sought in currencies compatible with our own. It is not being done over clandestine pre-breakfast cups of coffee with visiting Arabs whose intentions were not clearly known.

Mr. Groom: How do you know it was being done like that?

Mr. ALLISON: I am just accepting what the media monster regurgitates, and I had no reason to doubt it at the time any more than the public did when they dismissed Whitlam; after all, it was not Kerr but the electors who dismissed Whitlam. Remember that.

Mr. Groom: What is wrong with borrowing money from the Arabs, as opposed to the United States?

Mr. ALLISON: Arab countries' currencies are consistently strengthening. We are borrowing in American dollars, which have been weakening over the past few years. If we borrow in a currency which is strengthening quickly, such as the German or Japanese currencies, at the end of a 20-year borrowing period we will be committed

for far more by way of return of principal and interest than if we borrow in currencies that are reasonably stable. This is why Australia is now being looked on by overseas investors with favour once again. I do not share the air of gloom that the member for Groom (spare the pun) tried to put over yesterday.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is the member for Morphett.

Mr. ALLISON: The member for Morphett. I do not share the feeling of gloom. Let us look at what is really happening in Australia. We have had the Federal Government introducing austerity measures for the past two years to try to compensate for the massive deficit brought in by the fantastic amount of money spent, encouraged by inflation, and spent on social welfare. Who better to quote than Whitlam himself, who said that he went too far, too fast and that given his time over again he would move much more slowly. This is a sensible attitude, but it came too late.

When committed to massive borrowings, spendings, and deficits, the person knows darn well that he will not be the one who has to carry the can afterwards; he hands over the whole burden to the next Government. That is what happened to the Fraser Government. The people appreciate that, even if members opposite do not. It is a question of whether we espouse public spending with money raised through taxation, which is non-productive and, in order to grow, has to get further money from the taxpayers' purse in order to exist, or whether we espouse private enterprise, which does produce something to sell to raise finance, and which is a diminishing sector, whether it is private enterprise in primary or secondary industry, but which is still carrying by far the largest burden of taxes. Are we to wipe off that section altogether, or to encourage it? We think we should encourage it. The Fraser Government certainly thinks so, and for that reason it is asking that public expenditure be reduced, not absolutely decimated as Government members would imply, and the private sector be given a chance.

The Fraser Government gave a 40 per cent remission of tax on equipment purchased up until 30 June last year of which many industries availed themselves. We would like to think, therefore, that the investment on equipment was absolutely essential, because this is a cyclical thing. Britain has just begun to emerge from a pre-war/post-war situation where it was absolutely at rock bottom. It needed to re-tool and re-equip but, having won the war, it lost the peace because it was still equipped with the most antiquated equipment.

Japan and Germany, having re-tooled after the war, are at present faced with a new competitive situation, with almost zero growth in national productivity, so they are on the cycle. Australia, which was one of the best countries in the world to be in economically, got on to the unemployment, inflation, and industrial stagnation bandwagon when it should not have done, during the Whitlam era, simply because too much was spent too fast by the Labor Government. We went into that cycle. We had to re-tool in order to be competitive with overseas products. We have to sell on overseas markets in order to get a balance of exchange of overseas capital. We also have to sell on the home market, where overseas goods are competing with Australian produce. If we do not re-tool and re-equip, then we are completely lost.

This has meant, therefore, that the re-tooling that is now under way should, within the next 12 months, lead to a steady rise in productivity. The people who have been stood down through automation should begin to be re-employed, because productivity will rise and we will be more competitive. It will be a steady rise over the next six to 12 months, I am convinced of that.

More significantly, in addition to that single factor there are several other factors which make things look brighter for Australia. I am not saying that that applies to South Australia, because we have special problems related to this Government that will be elucidated by my colleagues. The general picture for Australia is that, for the first time in many years, the drought has broken, and the primary industry front looks brighter. Sheep, wool, beef, and cereal markets are tending to stabilise and improve, and we have some idea that primary industry, the former backbone of Australia (and certainly the area where people will begin spending when they get money for new equipment) is beginning an upward trend in Australia.

There are hundreds of millions of dollars in overseas capital ready to be brought into Australia to assist in this development.

Mr. Groom: To buy up Australia, and when they have got what they want, go.

Mr. ALLISON: There again, we are at variance. I am quite sure that the Leader of this Government will be the first to admit that he cannot possibly get the Redcliff project off the ground with South Australian money alone. The honourable member may criticise overseas capital if he wants, but the Government should make sure that, if it gets the chance of overseas capital, it does not miss out on establishing Redcliff with Australian, South Australian, and overseas capital because, if it does, South Australia will be in worse trouble than the early settlers were, and we are in bad enough trouble now. Overseas capital is ready and waiting to come into Australia: not necessarily into South Australia, because we do have our own special governmental problems, which essentially originate on the other side of the House.

Mr. Groom: You are continually downgrading South Australia.

Mr. ALLISON: I am not; the Government has already done that, and I cannot get it any lower. This situation has been caused by legislation and a wide variety of factors. It was not me who said that South Australia is like a leper colony. Ask people like industrialists, or people like the Agent-General, who are overseas trying to get people to establish businesses in South Australia, to tell you the bad news.

This is not our fault. We are trying to get people to come to South Australia. Inflation is abating, and even Government members would admit that a reduction from 18 per cent to 8 per cent is significant. Savings are more secure, and are at a high rate in South Australia. People are hanging on to their savings for a wide variety of reasons.

Mr. Groom: Why?

Mr. ALLISON: Many young people have seen the high interest rates rising and realise that they will have to wait longer to own a house. They are committed to saving, and that is a good sign. The decline in interest rates and the increased savings are, I think, a good portent for South Australia and Australia generally, because people are getting nearer to the stage at which they will be able to buy a house.

Mr. Groom: Fear of unemployment has nothing to do with it?

Mr. ALLISON: Fear of unemployment could have something to do with it, but it is not the sole reason. Even during the Whitlam era, people were at certain times saving record sums. The honourable member cannot attribute it to that alone. During the Whitlam era the price of houses was rising rapidly, too. People are approaching the stage where they will have their deposit, begin to buy a house, begin to marry and have a family. This is possibly something which the Borrie Report did not predict, and

the natural birth rate will increase over the next two to five years. I am optimistic about that.

Mr. Groom: What has Fraser done for the young over the past two and a half years?

Mr. ALLISON: We have seen the wages position stabilised as a result of co-operation among unions, Governments and the Arbitration Commission, and that is a good sign, too. The increasing stability right across the board, which is really a form of redistribution of wealth that the Government was looking for, is really what will make Australia take off—not to re-enter the inflationary spiral, as the honourable member is suggesting as the remedy for Australia's ills. The stability will make people feel confident in the future of Australia and make the economic situation look much rosier. I suggest that the recipe is not to reinflate the whole of the Australian economy, but to trust that all the bright signs at present on the horizon will materialise over the next few months and that things will improve considerably in late 1978 and early in 1979. I am always optimistic, and I believe that we have sufficient reasons on the record book for that optimism to be justified.

I think that we have reached rock bottom in the dismissal of people as a result of automation, simply because industrialists have taken advantage of the incentives offered at the Federal level, and industry will pick up rapidly once equipment is installed and working. I suggest that one of the things about which this Government talks but which it certainly fears is decentralisation. After all, if we pay more than lip service to decentralisation in South Australia we would have to take away industry from the metropolitan area, which could ill afford to lose anything. I concede that we are trying to attract industry to the metropolitan area, but let us not forget that all of the large Australian cities, the metropolitan centres of each State, have already reached the stage where they are too large and too difficult to manage. The quality of life in any Australian State capital can be improved only by paying attention to decentralisation. It is a two-way thing, because the quality of life in country centres also improves with decentralisation; we get cultural as well as industrial benefits by expanding regional centres.

It is interesting to note that we are in direct competition with our neighbour Victoria by way of offering decentralisation incentives. Significant is the fact that, whereas last year in the Budget this Government put aside about \$160 000 towards decentralisation incentives (very little of which was spent, as a perusal of the accounts will show), Victoria, on the other hand, during the past 10 years has actually spent more than \$40 000 000 on decentralisation payments. The significance of this for my own district, the South-East, is that we have seen Victorian cities wooing not only international but also interstate industries. This has direct implications for the meat industry, a section of the industrial scene that has been hitting the news in Adelaide recently. We have two abattoirs in Mount Gambier, both of which have been asking for a small share of the metropolitan market—certainly not enough to represent any major threat to Samcor, which has massive problems of its own but which could certainly compete with the Victorian trade. I am assured by those in the meat trade in the South-East that Victoria sends between 3 000 and 5 000 carcasses, depending on the week and the trade, into South Australia every week. All that the South-Eastern abattoirs are looking for is 200 to 250 carcasses each as an allocation to the Adelaide market—not a significant quantity to Adelaide, but critically important for decentralisation and the survival of two South-Eastern industries.

The Victorians must be laughing all the way to the bank over this issue. The South-East of South Australia produces more than 45 per cent of South Australia's livestock, but the Victorians are using this resource to establish decentralised abattoirs in places such as Colac and Donald, and in other western district and northern Victorian towns. They take 80 per cent of the South-East markets every week. They take it to Victoria, kill it there, and sell good South Australian produce to Adelaide on the South Australian market. They take advantage of our primary producers. They kill our stock and take advantage, as Victorian industrialists, of South Australian markets. The South-East abattoirs are Government inspected. One abattoir employs two Government inspectors and the other employs three, representing \$30 000 or \$45 000 in additional expense. I find it significant that a recent announcement by Samcor, in Adelaide, was that one of its abattoir that services the metropolitan area would remove the need to have its meat comply with Government inspection.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: They are Federal inspectors, not State.

Mr. ALLISON: Yes.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Make it clear who that is.

Mr. ALLISON: One is Federal and one is State. Abattoirs, with similar inspection conditions, with high-quality meat, are allowed in Victoria but not allowed in the South-East to compete on the Adelaide market. There is the strange anomaly of this Government encouraging interstate trade to the detriment of the South-East, and certainly doing nothing more than paying lip service to the principle of decentralisation, which it says it espouses. Only recently in the South-East in an interview on Channel 8 with Andrew Noblett, the Premier said that what was needed, following the release of the Green Triangle Report on the South-East of South Australia, were new decentralisation initiatives.

The Liberal Party, as part of its policy at the last two State elections, has said that loudly and clearly. We put forward the incentives which we would implement, and so far we have not heard from the Premier what his own new initiatives will be or when they will be implemented, and so we are unable to assess what impact decentralisation might have on the South-East of South Australia. Certainly, the Green Triangle Report was a disappointment in many ways, simply because it regurgitated what had been given to the researchers by people in the South-East. It contained little, if any, new initiatives. It simply made it quite clear that we had problems, of which decentralisation was the key issue, and that tourism might be one area where there was room for expansion. We are aware of this, but tourism is another area in which the State Government has done relatively little. It has figured low in Budget allocations in the last three years I have been a member of this House.

Mr. Evans: It has a lower percentage now than in 1968.

Mr. ALLISON: I know that my colleague will have much to say about that later, so I chose not to enlarge on it. From his interjection, it has the lowest percentage since 1968, for more than 10 years. That is very significant for the South-East.

We have the question of whether decentralisation will be paid more than lip service, and whether concrete assistance will be given to people who choose to settle in country areas with their industries. The point is not that we wish to steal industry from Adelaide, but that we wish to compete with Victoria. Already, Victoria has encouraged Softwoods Industries, in the South-East, to establish a \$12 500 000 plant for the production of particle board at Portland, Victoria. That was a direct win to

Victoria. We would like incentives equivalent to those listed in the Victorian decentralisation cheque book, which has 18 different decentralisation incentives, so that we, too, could woo industry into the South-East and, in fact, into South Australia, to help this State's economy.

I am quite sure that the meat industry, the timber industry, and any number of other industries would be quite willing to go to the South-East of South Australia, which has a substantial pool of intelligent young people who do not go on to university, although they have the qualifications. It has enough fresh crystal clear water to support 250 000 people, according to the hydrological surveys conducted by the Government and other agencies at Government expense. It has increasing cultural, social, and sporting amenities, thanks to the efforts of this and previous Governments, both State and Federal. It has much to offer, and therefore should, with just a little more help from Governments, become highly competitive for any industry that may wish to come to South Australia.

The field of education is one in which I am especially interested. I cannot resist quoting Senator Carrick, because this relates directly to a point made earlier today by the member for Newland, when he was critical of Federal funding for tertiary and other spheres of education. He made deliberate reference to the fact that South Australia was being undersold, and he used the figures published recently by the Minister for educational spending at Federal level in 1979, and certainly for the present Budget year of 1978-79.

I have before me a letter from Senator Carrick, drawing attention to certain of the matters raised by the member for Newland. The letter was dated 14 July. I had intended to refer to it today, and it happens to be particularly relevant. The Minister points out that many people are deliberately misconstruing what he said and some of the figures. He says that a point which certainly needs to be emphasised in the light of his being misquoted is that the Commonwealth expenditure on education set out in the education guidelines is expressed in what he terms constant dollars, based on December 1977 prices. The significance of the reference made to "constant dollars" is that the amount in dollars actually made available in 1979 will increase in order to cover rises due to inflation. Therefore, the figures for 1978-79, which the Federal Minister made available in a small bulletin called *Talking Points* and which has generally been released to the public, are directly comparable, simply because they have a common base. Adjustments are made for inflation through the arrangements for cost supplementation every six months.

Mr. Klunder: But not in capital spending.

Mr. ALLISON: I shall speak about capital spending at tertiary level soon. There is no truth in public statements by some Government school organisations that, due to inflation, proposed Commonwealth expenditure on education in 1979 will represent a decrease in real terms over that in 1978. Probably, Senator Carrick could be regarded as one of the more courageous and responsible Federal Ministers. I find that his pre-releases and his helpful attitude are the sort of approach that State Ministers in this House might well copy. He releases the information in plenty of time for people to have a go at him. He has not lost much public favour, according to the recent Gallup polls, which were issued in June. Apart from that, he is prepared to reconsider and to adjust where he sees it necessary. He is prepared to fight for his portfolio—another admirable trait.

On to the field of tertiary spending, particularly in relation to capital expenditure. It has been not just frozen, but reduced, but surely the honourable member must bear

in mind that his own State Minister of Education over the past several years has been critically embarrassed by a decision arrived at in 1968 or 1969 under the former Labor Minister of Education, when a number of new teachers colleges were constructed in South Australia, contributing probably 2½ to three colleges of the 26 colleges of advanced education which are now surplus across the length and breadth of Australia. That is a commonly acknowledged figure, irrespective of which side of politics one is on.

Mr. Evans: Are you saying there are 26 more colleges built than we need?

Mr. ALLISON: Yes. Over the past several years we have been landed with 26 surplus colleges. Irrespective of who was responsible—and in South Australia there is no doubt, because we have had one Government for seven or eight years—to suggest that we should have greater capital expenditure, when we have 26 surplus buildings which might well be put to an alternative use, is throwing good money after bad. It might be a cliché, but I think that is probably an appropriate expression.

We can hardly expect an increase in capital expenditure. Our own Minister has, through personal comment, and I think through kite flying, through the Sandover Report, which was released last year and which has been confirmed by the recent release of the Anderson Committee Report, accepted that we have too many colleges in South Australia. In fact, the Anderson Committee has recommended two mergers: one which has been mutually agreed to, following the Sandover Committee kite flying, between the Torrens College and the Adelaide College of Advanced Education, and the other one, not agreed to by one of the colleges, between the Kingston and Murray Park colleges.

There may not be an increase (in fact, there is a decrease) in capital expenditure in the Commonwealth Government Budget in this respect. However, I find it significant that the Anderson Committee Report and the Ministerial recommendations will not necessarily mean a saving in the tertiary field in South Australia, which could be construed as being rather odd. The reasons for this are as follows. First, there is no indication that there will be any retrenchment of staff from any of the colleges when amalgamation occurs. In fact, the colleges are fighting strenuously to ensure that that does not happen. So, ostensibly, there is no saving in academic fees in the expenditure on salaries.

Secondly, if we are to merge the colleges, there will, one assumes, have to be some campus changes and, certainly, over the next two or three years, some major reconstructions on campuses so that, in order to achieve a saving, one will have to spend millions of dollars more in order to accommodate the students on the different campuses; that is, unless we have another problem with different campuses existing in remote areas of Adelaide, with the associated administrative problems that the mergers are trying to remove.

In addition, we have the Kingston college merger with the Murray Park College of Advanced Education, when Kingston is acknowledged as being already one of the cheapest and most economically run colleges anywhere in Australia, where the calibre of students emerging from the college is extremely high, and where (although it is a small college) there is no indication that the quality of students is any less than it is in the larger colleges.

The Anderson Committee Report contains a bald statement that the size of the college is no indication that economy can be achieved by its going larger. Therefore, one of the major arguments for merging the Kingston and Murray Park colleges has been removed. I do not intend to

debate this issue at any length, because I am looking forward to Bills that will be introduced by the Minister.

I also wonder whether the Minister will do as Victoria has done and introduce a tertiary education authority to co-ordinate the universities and colleges of advanced education, just as Mr. Lindsay Thompson, the Victorian Minister, has done, and, if so, to what extent will the autonomy of universities be limited.

There is no question that universities, although they may be duplicating research, are doing no more than universities have done for the past 500, 600 or 700 years, when there is no guarantee that the research done by one university will be any more or less successful than that done by anyone else, or whether identical paths of research might not come out with equally true findings but in completely different directions.

So, to suggest that the autonomy of universities might be completely removed and that there might be standardisation to avoid duplication of courses or research programmes is not necessarily desirable. This, too, is an issue that will be debated later as and when Bills come before the House.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Do you think that that reason should apply to colleges of advanced education, too, or just to universities?

Mr. ALLISON: Since colleges of advanced education have been channelled along far more specific lines, that is, for teacher training, I suggest that the standardisation and avoidance of duplication in those fields at present would be desirable. However, the whole question emerges whether colleges of advanced education, since they are currently producing only teachers (who will be 3 500 in surplus by 1985) might not begin to diversify into different fields. This is a question on which I will resume debate tomorrow. Meanwhile, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I intend to refer to the subject of bees. Before members opposite start to duck because they fear that I will talk about them, I point out that I will not be talking about Parliamentary "b's" or cross-bench "b's": I will be talking about bees that buzz. A situation has developed in Australia that will have serious repercussions on South Australia's bee industry if action taken by Agricultural Council is carried through. Over a period the entomology division of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation has been called upon to investigate the biological control of certain weeds. The 1976-77 annual report of the division gives much information on the types of weeds to which the division has been directing its attention. There is a summary of the different types of organisms that the division is testing for the purpose of destroying the weeds.

The aspect concerning the bee industry is the intention, at the direction of the Agricultural Council, to introduce a type of biological control that will destroy Paterson's curse

or, as it is better known in this State, salvation jane. Over a long period this weed has spread widely and the purple colouration of the hills and far-away places, including the Flinders Range, is attributed to Paterson's curse. It provides useful food for bees. Its nectar is extremely important but, in addition, its pollen content is far greater than that of most other plants available. The ability of the bee to benefit from pollen from salvation jane permits the development of healthy hives. In South Australia, access to salvation jane means that our apiaries are far more healthy than are apiaries elsewhere. The nectar content of salvation jane produces honey which is greatly sought after by the Japanese market; indeed, insufficient honey is produced from salvation jane for the overseas market.

The intention of Agricultural Council is to permit (and the C.S.I.R.O. has already been given authority to proceed with) breeding the biological agent for distribution. The effect of this would be to destroy a multi-million dollar export industry, which would have serious repercussions upon apiaries in all the Australian States, especially southern New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, where large areas of salvation jane are found.

The last meeting of Agricultural Council deferred further consideration or the release of the organism until the matter had been further discussed. I hope that the Minister of Agriculture in this State will seriously consider the plight of the apiary industry (the honey industry) if it is intended to follow through with the biological control of salvation jane, seriously affecting not only apiaries and the health of bees, but also production.

I have been told on good authority that the honey produced by bees feeding on salvation jane is much sought after for blending with other honey, as it has a quality that is unknown in any other honey-producing plant in Australia. It is of particular importance in the honey used in condiments and confectionery production.

At page 118 of the C.S.I.R.O. entomology division's 1976-77 report, we see the following:

Paterson's curse, *Echium plantagineum* (Boraginaceae), is a widespread weed in Mediterranean Australia. It contains alkaloids and is a strong competitor in pastures.

The alkaloids create problems with stock under certain conditions. The work at C.S.I.R.O. by Dr. Wapshere has involved the safety testing of the stem-boring cerambycid beetle, *phytoecia virescens*. That has been completed, and the organism has been found competent to do the job required of it, without spreading to other plants of the same family.

It is important that the requirements of the bee industry in South Australia should be kept well in mind by the Minister when he next goes to Agricultural Council. Government members who may want to follow this matter through can refer to the publication *The Farm* of June 1978, in which at page 5, under the heading "Honey News", there is a synopsis of the information I have outlined.

Finally, I am pleased that there has been a response, particularly from the Commonwealth Electoral Office, to comments made in a previous grievance debate in this House. Representations made by the State Electoral Office to the Commonwealth Electoral Office have led to a provision whereby a person wanting to enrol on the electoral roll can now include on his application form, if he does not live in a particular street or road and has no house number, the section number and name of the hundred in which his property is situated.

As a result of the move taken by the Electoral Department, there should be a considerable reduction in future electoral rolls of the number of electors in outer urban and in rural situations who are wrongly enrolled. I

have indicated previously to the House that about 600 wrong enrolments existed on the Light roll for the September 1977 State election and were carried through to the 1977 Federal election.

A great number of those wrong enrolments were associated with an inability of the Electoral Department to identify clearly the residences of people with the actual electoral maps. I believe that we should give credit where it is due, and I do so in this reference to the actions taken by the Electoral Department to give effect to a suggestion which was made in all good faith in this place and which has now come to fruition. There are other areas of the Electoral Act to which I have already referred that still need—

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

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): This evening I want to raise what I consider is a problem as far as the Opposition is concerned. The main problem is the Leader.

Mr. Groom: Which one?

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is a good question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Morphett is interjecting out of his seat and he will cease to do so.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am suggesting that the present Leader of the Opposition does not know exactly where he is going. This afternoon we on this side of the House were subjected to a barrage of abuse about what we should be doing as a State Government to reduce State taxes and to ease the burden of unemployment, yet we have not heard one word from the Leader of this State's Opposition in condemnation of the present Federal policies of the Fraser regime.

I suggest that the Leader is continuing to support the Fraser Government at all costs in his blind attempt to belittle the Dunstan Government, particularly the Premier. When the Premier, during the Whitlam regime, said openly at times that the Whitlam regime was wrong in its decisions on certain matters, the Leader condemned the Premier by saying that he was the split in the camp. That is the sort of absolute garbage that we have had to put up with.

Now that the Premier attacks the policies of the Fraser Government, the Leader continues to support the very things for which he condemns the Dunstan Government. I want to bring to the attention of the House three reports that appeared in today's *News*. One is headed "500 000 New Year dole tip" and states:

More than 500 000 people could be out of work by January, according to a report prepared by the Federal employment department . . . Australia's unemployment level reached a peak in January this year when Commonwealth Employment Service statistics showed 445 300 people were out of work. The employment department predictions for January next year are based on the assumption that the Government will not alter its present hard-line economic policy designed to bring down inflation.

There is not one word by the Leader against that policy, yet we have had to put up with a barrage of abuse this afternoon about the State Government's supposed support for unemployment. Some time ago when the Leader was in Whyalla and the question arose of closing the shipyard, with resultant unemployment, he condemned the State Government on that matter. When asked what he would do about the situation if he were in power, he commented, "Nothing".

The second matter I bring to the attention of the House is a letter to the Editor of the *News* headed "A cruel blow". Written by a mother of four, the letter states:

That the Fraser Government is even considering reducing or taxing, or means testing family allowances in the August Budget is a cruel and bitter blow to Australian families.

That is not the only thing that has been suggested: television licence fees and other taxation measures have been suggested. Again, I point out to members opposite that the Leader of the Opposition supports that action, because he certainly has not said that he is opposed to it. My third quotation is headed "Car sales tax won't be cut, says Howard", the Treasurer. He goes against the leaders of the industry in that field, such as the General Manager of General Motors-Holden's. The report states:

The Federal Government would not reduce the 27½ per cent sales tax on motor vehicles, the Treasurer, Mr. Howard, reaffirmed today. He said, "I have made previous statements about this matter and I adhere to them—there will not be a reduction in car sales tax."

I point out that the Leader of the Opposition continues to abuse the State Government about reduction of taxes, yet at no stage has the Leader even remotely suggested that there ought to be a reduction in the sales tax on motor vehicles. Anybody with any gumption at all would know that the continuing taxing of manufacturing industries is placing a heavy burden on the consumer content. One of my colleagues reminds me that \$2 500 on a vehicle costing about \$8 000 is involved—not a bad sort of percentage.

I am wondering whether the Leader of the Opposition supports his Federal colleagues in their severe cutbacks of funding for hospitalisation, health, education and payment of pensions. Despite all these cutbacks, the Federal Government is still unable to reduce the overall deficiency in the Budget. Mr. Hamer has got himself into difficulty regarding his support for wage indexation. He has got himself into difficulty because the press has played the matter up, and also because he had the "effrontery" to oppose the Fraser regime's policy on wage indexation.

I question how far the Murdoch press, for example, will go along with the Opposition's blind support for the Fraser regime. I think it is time we started to think about what Fraser has done to get to the position he is now in. He has axed Snedden, McMahon and Gorton; how many more did he axe to get to the position he is in? I am wondering how long it will be before the Murdoch press (and I know it will not support the Labor Party) mounts a campaign saying that Fraser, as Leader of the Liberal and National Country Parties coalition, has to go. I wonder whether that will be the next move.

Mr. Groom: What about the Leader of the Opposition—when will he go?

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is a good question, and I wonder how long it will be before the Leader of the Opposition has to do one of two things or both.

First, how long will he go on in blind support of Fraser? How long will he support the blind concept of unlimited unemployment? In those circumstances, how long will he blindly support Fraser as the Leader of the Liberal Party? I hope that the Murdoch press particularly (and I know that the Leader will not wake up) will somewhere along the line realise that, instead of continuing its blind support for the Fraser Government, it will have to do an about-face soon.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I bring to members' attention a few matters that were forgotten yesterday in speeches made by Government members. I refer particularly to the speech of the member for Morphett, and in some respects to the speech of the member for Mawson. In a long speech made by the member for Morphett, he avoided, when telling us about the history of Australia generally, particularly Federal politics, any

mention of the recent golden boy of the Labor Party (Gough Whitlam). When any interjector mentioned him, the honourable member got away from the subject as rapidly as he could.

I draw the honourable member's attention to an article appearing in a 1977 *Reader's Digest*, funnily enough in the American and United Kingdom editions, but not in the Australian edition. The report, under the heading "The Spending Spree that Rocked Australia" (by Anthony Paul), states:

The three years of profligate Government spending brought one of the world's wealthiest nations to the brink of economic disaster. And then the people rebelled. In April 1975, the Australian economy was in its worst shape since the great depression. The country's Labor Government was running a £1 250 000 000 deficit . . . unemployment had soared to the highest level in 30 years and inflation had accelerated to an annual rate of 13.4 per cent . . . "The only Australian factory working day and night is the Government mint."

Eight months later, the Australian people threw the Labor Government out of office. It is a story of a Whitlam catastrophe that struck Australia and gives a sobering case study of what can happen to such an economically advantaged country as Australia when high-spending components of big Government are voted into power. Australia in the 1960's was regarded as a lucky country. It had one of the highest living standards in the world and the smallest gap between rich and poor. When Labor came to office in late 1972, unemployment in Australia was only 2.4 per cent, and the inflation rate was only 4.5 per cent. It had an economic performance matched only by West Germany. With 70 per cent of its oil coming from local wells, Australia should have been relatively insulated from world inflation, caused to some extent by the oil-producing countries.

The sorry story goes on, and there is no time to point to all the matters raised in this issue, but within one month the inflation rate soared to 28 per cent. The article continues:

Within days of taking office, the Whitlam Government plunged into a socialist-minded restructuring of the Australian economy. New expenditures were voted for free university education, increased aid to schools, higher unemployment benefits and old age pensions, and subsidies for sports and the arts. "Few of us bothered to count the cost in those early days," Fred Daly, one of Whitlam's Ministers, later confessed. "We spent money as if it were going out of fashion." . . . One economist estimated that 10 000 persons stopped working—

because of hand-outs being received at the time. It continues:

As Labor prepared its first Budget (1973-74), senior civil servants warned that the economy could absorb a

Government spending increase of only £750 000 000. Determined to have its new programmes, however, Labor lifted outlays by £960 000 000. It announced an across-the-board 25 per cent cut in tariffs. By exposing Australia's tariff-protected industries to foreign competition, Labor reasoned prices would be forced down. For the same reason, the Government also formed a Prices Justification Tribunal, charged with limiting company profits.

The policies backfired. Many factories, unprepared for the invasion of cheaper imports, closed down. As a direct result of the cuts, at least 23 000 workers lost their jobs. And inflation reached 13 per cent.

No wonder this did not appear in the Australian *Reader's Digest*. One wonders which part of the press is protecting which part of the House, when one reads this material, which was released only in the United Kingdom and America. The article continues:

The Labor Government also set out to boost wages and benefits. It pushed through a 17.5 per cent pay increase and a fourth week's annual holiday for the 245 000 Federal civil servants. In three years, Australian wages rose 70 per cent, while industrial productivity increased less than 1 per cent.

The member for Spence, who made a good speech in the Address in Reply debate last year when he spoke about productivity, would understand what happens when wages rise by 70 per cent and productivity increases by only 1 per cent. I hope he can explain that to his colleagues. The article continues:

During the election campaign, the Labor Party had argued that its trade union links would enable it to negotiate more effectively with militant unions. But in Whitlam's first year, strikes proliferated and 2 634 000 working days were lost (a 31 per cent increase over the previous year).

When the then Treasurer was replaced and the Hon. Dr. Jim Cairns was brought in from the Party's left wing, he was known as Dr. Yes. He could not say "No" to any socialist policies, and while he was allocating the money the mint was working overtime. The article states that, all told, Federal spending reached an estimate of £10 960 000 000 in 1975-76—up a staggering 80 per cent in just two years.

It is appropriate that perhaps a Government so careless with money should pass from the scene as a result of a money scandal and that, of course, was the Khemlani affair. We all know about that. The Government tried to take a loan with no repayments for 20 years. The sum of £1 670 000 000 was to be borrowed, the article states, and the next generation of Australians would have had to repay £7 330 000 000, Khemlani's commission amounting to £37 000 000.

Motion carried.

At 5.56 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 20 July at 2 p.m.