

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 2 August 1978

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

PETITION: MONTAGUE ROAD

Mr. **KLUNDER** presented a petition signed by 39 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Highways Department, when widening the southern side of Montague Road, to leave part of the service road as a buffer between the main road and the houses facing Montague Road.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FATA MORGANA BOUTIQUE

The Hon. **PETER DUNCAN (Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. **PETER DUNCAN**: In a letter to the *Adelaide Advertiser* on 27 July 1978, one Mrs. Evelyn Neis, proprietress of the Fata Morgana Boutique, claimed that she had been victimised by the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, that I had accused her of being an unco-operative swindler of the public, and that I had hidden behind Parliamentary protection to make the statement. In the first place, I reject the allegation that this person has been victimised by the department and that I have made any allegations against her. As members will be aware, I merely tabled the Commissioner's report in this House, without comment, as is my statutory duty.

In the Commissioner's annual report, Mrs. Neis's boutique was mentioned as having been subject to 22 complaints from her customers. She claims that she was unaware of the details of at least some of these complaints and that officers of the Public and Consumer Affairs Department had been less than fair in their treatment of her. She makes the allegation that complaints against her have no foundation in fact, because she has not been charged or convicted by a court.

The facts are these: my department considers that most, if not all, of the 22 complaints mentioned in the Commissioner's report are justified. Furthermore, the branch instituted legal action on a consumer's behalf against Mrs. Neis for failing to supply a promised garment by an agreed date, and then refusing to refund the deposit paid on the contract she had breached. The hearing was on 4 November 1977, and Mrs. Neis failed to appear. The court ordered the refund of the deposit and awarded costs against Mrs. Neis.

She claimed she was not made aware of the 22 complaints against her. The facts are that either she or her manageress was advised of all details of every complaint, except one. In that instance the customer concerned said she would take her own action, after receiving advice from the branch.

Mrs. Neis claims she has been refused a list of the complaints and complainants. The facts are that either she or her manageress was given full details at the time of the investigations. She was also given a list of names, complaints and dates just eight days before her letter to the *Advertiser* was published. That was as a result of a request she made to the branch.

She claims an investigation officer attempted to tape-

record an interview with her. This is correct. It was done to assure her of fair reporting, following her own accusation that false reports were made about previous interviews. When she objected to the presence of a tape-recorder, the officer immediately switched the tape-recorder off.

Evelyn Neis has been the subject of many complaints since 1974, when she first came to the attention of the Consumer Affairs Branch. There were only two complaints in that year. There were 12 complaints in 1975, 10 in 1976, and 22 in 1977. There have been another nine complaints concerning this lady and her commercial activities so far this year.

The complaints have ranged over a number of causes; from a garment made from recycled material in a poor and dirty condition, dresses made from unsuitable material, failure to meet promised delivery dates, poor workmanship, poorly fitting garments, and other grounds. She has caused distress and extra expense to brides-to-be by failing to deliver properly-made wedding dresses.

Evelyn Neis was described in the annual report as demonstrating an unsympathetic and unbending attitude towards people with legitimate complaints. No mention has so far been made of the very many other cases which came to the attention of the branch but which were not followed up, because of the hopelessness of obtaining any degree of justice or satisfaction for the complainants.

Apart from the Consumer Affairs Branch, Fata Morgana Boutique has been investigated by the City of Adelaide Local Board of Health, which reported unfavourably on her shop.

Mr. Millhouse: Was any action taken by the Board of Health?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: Did any action follow?

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

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I should put it on record, Mr. Speaker, that I have every confidence in the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs and his officers, who handle some 2 000 inquiries a week. They are experienced and competent in dealing with consumer complaints.

It is incumbent upon the Commissioner and his investigation officers to make the true facts of such cases available to the public, and in fact he is under a statutory requirement to do so. As Minister responsible for this area, I feel it my duty to ensure that the public of South Australia are fully aware of the dubious practices that occur from time to time.

QUESTIONS

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

HENLEY PEDESTRIAN LIGHTS

In reply to the **Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL** (18 July).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Consideration has been given to the installation of a pedestrian crossing in the vicinity of Henley Square. Present indications are that the pedestrian refuge mentioned by the honourable member will constitute the only pedestrian facility required for some considerable time. However, when Henley Square is fully developed and pedestrian patterns are established, pedestrian and vehicular surveys will be carried out to determine whether the installation of a pedestrian crossing

is justified and, if so, the most appropriate location for such a facility.

FROZEN FOOD

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say how the Government justifies the prices charged by the Government Frozen Food Factory when similiar goods from private enterprise are up to 40 per cent cheaper, and will he say what action the Government is taking to obtain from this project maximum value for the taxpayers' money? The Government Frozen Food Factory at Dudley Park was built at a cost of about \$9 000 000 to supply Government institutions and possibly other organisations, including Meals on Wheels. In March, the Minister of Community Welfare told the member for Hanson there would be identifiable savings of up to 20 per cent in food wastage, but the Corbett Report says that control over frozen food will be difficult to maintain when the supply of all meals is taken over by the frozen food factory.

I have a comparison of price lists from the frozen food factory and an independent food distributor, and it is in table form. The price given first is the frozen food factory price a kilogram and the price given second is the independent wholesale outlet price from a private enterprise firm. Also, a supermarket purchase price a kilogram is shown. Roast beef from the frozen food factory cost \$5; from the independent wholesale outlet the price was \$2.93; from the supermarket the wholesale purchase price a kilogram was \$1.59. Roast lamb was \$6.10 from the frozen food factory and \$3.70 from the independent suppliers. Steak and kidney was \$3.71 from the frozen food factory and \$2.42 from the wholesale outlet; curry, \$3.20 and \$2.42. There are other examples, and I seek leave to have the table incorporated in *Hansard*, but I have read out the fundamental facts from which the Premier could be expected to answer the question.

The SPEAKER: Is the table purely statistical?

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

FOOD PRICE COMPARISONS AS AT 1 JULY 1978

| Description | Frozen Food Factory Price kg | Independent Wholesale Outlet Price kg | Supermarket Purchase Price Wholesale kg |
|----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Roast beef | 5.00 | 2.93 | — |
| Roast lamb | 6.10 | 3.70 | — |
| Steak and kidney | 3.71 | 2.42 | — |
| Curry | 3.20 | 2.42 | — |
| Peas | 1.50 | 0.91 | 0.73 |
| Beans | 1.89 | 1.22 | 0.86 |
| Chip potatoes . . . | 1.85 | 0.82 | 0.85 |
| Cauliflower | 2.50 | 1.24 | 1.05 |
| Broccoli | 3.67 | 1.63 | — |

Mr. TONKIN: In each case the Government factory price is grossly in excess of the private enterprise price, and it seems that the entry of the Government into another private enterprise field is clearly another financial disaster for the taxpayers of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader knows that he must resume his seat when the Speaker is standing. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not possible for me to

comment on the prices quoted by the honourable member, when I have no information immediately before me on the matter. I certainly would want his allegations investigated, and I will have that investigation made. Without checking, of course, I cannot accept the prices that the honourable member has given as being properly comparable, but we will investigate the matter and I will make a report to the House.

INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE

Mr. DRURY: Will the Premier say whether the South Australian Development Corporation's ability to assist South Australian industry financially will be reduced as a result of the real reduction in Federal funds to this State? It concerns me that some industries in this State, which have been heavily assisted by the corporation, may be casualties under the recent reductions from Canberra.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The South Australian Development Corporation will not be limited in that regard. We are able to maintain funds to the corporation. I point out to the honourable member that, in the majority of cases, the assistance given by the corporation is in form of guarantees rather than the provision directly of funds. Some funds are provided directly and we have ensured that sufficient funds will be available to the development corporation for that purpose.

TRESPASS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Attorney-General investigate the situation that has developed in the Adelaide Hills, where dozens of drug users enter properties to collect varieties of mushrooms which have hallucinogenic effects to see if the law of trespass can be strengthened? I attended a meeting at Forest Range on Monday night, where a hall packed with landholders from a wide area in the Hills was addressed by the Inspector of Police in charge of the district, giving advice on their rights as property owners in relation to people who come into the area seeking the two varieties of mushrooms, which have an hallucinogenic effect. The mushrooms concerned are known as "gold top", which apparently go blue when they dry, and the "magic" mushroom, which is red spotted with white. We were told by the inspector that they are cut up and boiled, and the liquid is drunk. Local people stated that often they are eaten raw and that intoxication is soon apparent, resulting in danger on the roads. There has been a considerable increase in theft and the litter problem in the district has become serious. There are two difficulties apparent. One is that there does not seem to be any test readily available to detect drug intoxication for drugs except for alcohol and, secondly, the law of trespass states that properties must be fenced for trespass to occur. The penalty for trespass is not to exceed \$20. The Act has not been amended since it was passed in 1951.

Although most orchards in the Hills are not fenced, because fencing makes it difficult to work the orchards for regular spraying, etc., it is obvious that they are private property. The other areas concerned are Government forest reserves between Lenswood and Cudlee Creek, and land adjacent to fire track number five in this area.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has hardly done the people of South Australia a great service this afternoon in raising this matter in this public forum. I roundly condemn him for going into some details about how to identify these mushrooms and how to actually use them to obtain the hallucinogenic properties

from them. I believe that that information was not necessary to the question. The honourable member simply raised it so that he could assure himself some headlines in tomorrow's press, and I condemn him for that. This matter is one that should be examined, but it could well have been dealt with by a letter from the honourable member to me or from the people concerned with the matter. I think that the Opposition's attitude in raising this type of matter in the House is completely irresponsible in all the circumstances.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You wouldn't put your hooks on it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader of the Opposition: if he continues I will name him.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the Attorney-General?

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg. If he continues in that way, I will name him, also. The honourable member knows what to expect when the Speaker is on his feet.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I will certainly examine the matter raised by the honourable member, but I plead with the Opposition to show a little more responsibility in dealing with these matters in future.

WHYALLA HOSPITAL

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health to comment on the recent criticism levelled at the Minister of Health by some Whyalla councillors as to the right of the Minister to appoint five representatives to the board of the Government-owned Whyalla Hospital? The councillors in question have been vocal in their opposition to the Minister's right to do this, although I find it interesting that councillors do not seem to object when the Whyalla council has a similar complete right to appoint members to bodies controlling council-owned properties, nor are councillors backward in accepting appointments to committees when made from time to time by the Government. I further point out that, in my opinion, the recent appointments to the Whyalla Hospital Board have been made on the basis of having actively interested ordinary citizens partake of a chance to run an important every-day facility within their own community.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I have every confidence that the Minister would be acting responsibly, as is required by his office, but I will certainly ask him for more details for the honourable member.

INDUSTRY STUDY

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier release publicly the Industrial Opportunities Study, 1971-72, which was a confidential study carried out to attract new manufacturing industry to South Australia, and will the Premier now admit that, despite this excellent study, the objective of attracting many new industries has failed?

The Industrial Opportunities Study, 1971-72, was commissioned by the State Government to determine the manufacturing industries most suited to South Australia, to search a list of prospective interstate and overseas companies, and to attract the most favourable companies to establish manufacturing facilities in South Australia. The study listed 190 prospective companies, 26 of which apparently had immediate prospects for new development in South Australia. One of the few companies to eventually establish manufacturing facilities was the

Pressed Metal Corporation Limited, a subsidiary of British Leyland, but this company simply took over facilities occupied by an existing manufacturer which left the State. As this study has been the basis of the industrial development strategy of the Government for the past six years, the failure of this strategy has serious consequences for South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know what point there would be in my releasing a study which is years old and which the honourable member obviously has. It has not been the basis of the Government's strategy because, unfortunately, it was not a good study. Because it was not a good study, I have ordered a completely new basis of study within the department. We found that outside consultants did not have the expertise necessary for an effective gap study for South Australia; that was proved by the previous study, and by this study. That was the report to me, effectively, of the department's officers, and I see no purpose in dealing with the matter. If the honourable member wants to pursue it, of course it is open to him to do so.

VANDALISM

Mr. OLSON: Has the Minister of Community Welfare any additional information about progress being made by the Community Welfare Advisory Committee into vandalism? As there is much community concern about the problem of vandalism, the report of the committee is being awaited with much interest in the hope that it will be able to propose some solutions to the problem.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I can provide the House with more information, and I thank the honourable member for raising the question. The matter was raised recently by the member for Fisher but, at that time, I did not have the information that I can now give to the House. The draft report will go before the full committee for consideration next week, and two other meetings, a week apart, are planned to enable the final draft to be approved. By 25 August the report should be ready for printing, and I expect to receive it early in September. After I have had a chance to examine the report, I will take it to Cabinet with any recommendations I may have.

NATIONAL PARK

Mr. WOTTON: Will the Minister for the Environment inform the House of the Government's intention regarding the future of the unnamed national park known only, I understand, as section 50, north out of hundreds, which lies south of the Amata Aboriginal Reserve on the border of Western Australia? The Minister would be aware that the International Union of Conservation recently recognised the value of this area as a national park by presenting a certificate to the Minister. It comprises over 2 000 000 hectares and is the twelfth largest national park in the world.

It is an uninhabited wilderness where no man could live permanently without special provision for food and water. Its remoteness, however, enhances its value for conservation. Much concern is being expressed by conservationists at this time about the future of this national park. If the Government has any intention of revoking this area as a park, which, according to section 43 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act can only be done by resolution passed by both Houses of Parliament, it will be not only a severe rebuff for conservation in this State but

also a loss of our overseas standing regarding conservation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am amazed that the honourable member has been given information by conservation groups in South Australia about this matter. I have heard nothing from them, and I would have thought that, if they were as concerned as the honourable member attempted to indicate to this House, that they might have at least been in touch with me, as Minister for the Environment. It seems strange, but I certainly cannot recall any approach being made about this specific question.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I wonder if he made it up!

Mr. Wotton: You'll soon find out.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He is threatening me now!

Mr. Wotton: Just answer the question!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked his question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: How can I, when I know nothing formally about the concerns that the honourable member has raised in explaining his question? Knowing nothing about these, I do not see why the honourable member need be concerned. I certainly have no concern about the future of the area to which he has referred, because I do not know anything of the threats he has either created in his own mind or someone has told him about. However, I will see whether I can ascertain anything from the department that needs to be examined or should cause concern.

INNESTON

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister for the Environment say what are the intentions of the National Parks and Wildlife Division of the Environment Department in relation to the town of Inneston, which is situated within the Innes National Park at the toe of Yorke Peninsula and which has been a popular wilderness recreation area for many years and which has been visited by numerous holiday-makers in search of fishing, surfing, and nature rambling, and whether the town will be used as a tourist attraction?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: From memory, I think it is intended at this stage to leave the buildings, to which the honourable member has referred, in the town of Inneston within the national park. I think that it would be far too costly to restore completely all the buildings that make up the town. However, they will not be permitted to deteriorate, but will be maintained at the present standard. The area at present, as I understand it, is restricted to pedestrian traffic only, and it is intended to erect signposts that will point out local features to parties on foot.

SLAUGHTERHOUSES

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Minister of Agriculture when legislation will be introduced to detail new regulations and conditions for country slaughterhouses? Some butchers who have their own killing works in rural towns in my district are concerned (and I know this concern exists in other areas, too) that, with the passage of time, these works have to be upgraded, purely in the interests of health. It would help these people to know what is required of them or what will be the legal requirements by the enactment of legislation envisaged by this Government.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall refer the matter to my colleague and obtain a report for the honourable member.

BLAIR PARK PRE-SCHOOL

Mr. HEMMINGS: Will the Minister of Education consider setting aside a part of the Blair Park Primary School at Craigmore as a pre-school for young people in the area? I understand the Blair Park Primary School will be opened for the start of the 1979 school year. Initial investigations have shown that the first enrolment will not take up all the space available and, as there is a need for an additional pre-school in the area, perhaps this space could be used to its best advantage. I understand that at least 80 children in the area could use such a facility.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Certainly, we would be prepared to investigate this matter. I see no problem about any space available at the school in the initial period, as enrolments are building up, being made available for pre-school purposes. Our problem will be to find the salaries required to staff such a facility. I have already told honourable members of the very difficult situation we will face, over a two-year period, going from a situation in which the State was finding 25 per cent of the total costs in the pre-school area to one where we will have to find 68 per cent to 70 per cent of those costs, because of the drawing back of Commonwealth commitments. Our ability to expand staffing in pre-schools in the coming year will be drastically limited. I am aware that this should be a priority area: it is a growth area, with many young families. Given that the capital facility will almost certainly be available, we will do all we can to commit salaries but, without pre-judging the matter, I indicate that it may be very difficult, in terms of our anticipated budget, to find the staff necessary. However, I shall consider the matter and report back to the honourable member.

DANGEROUS DRIVING

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question, I think, should go to the Premier, because it is a matter of policy, but perhaps the Attorney-General might like to answer it, or even the Minister of Transport. However, I shall direct it to the Premier. Will the Premier say whether the Government is satisfied that the penalty for causing death by dangerous driving is adequate and, if not, is it proposed to invite Parliament to increase the penalty?

Under section 14 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act the maximum penalty for causing death by dangerous driving is imprisonment for a term not exceeding seven years or a fine not exceeding \$500, or both. That section was enacted, I think, in 1927 and, so far as I can tell from the marginal note in the Statute, it has not been amended in any shape or form since then. This morning a constituent telephoned me following a report in the *Advertiser* of certain sentences that were imposed by the District Criminal Court and one by His Honour Mr. Justice Wells in the Criminal Court yesterday. This man compared the 12 months imprisonment imposed by Senior Judge Ligertwood on a New South Wales driver whose prime mover crushed a small van killing three people and injuring two others, and His Honour is reported to have said that the driver in question was affected by liquor. This was compared with other sentences which the judge imposed on a larrikin who assaulted a motorist at Darlington and got 12 months, a man who stole a camper van and went to gaol for two years, a robber of \$25 000

worth of jewellery who went to gaol for two years, and a man whom Mr. Justice Wells in the Criminal Court sent to gaol for three and a half years for forging three cheques totalling \$1 200.

I told my constituent that, in my experience, Senior Judge Ligertwood did not as a rule, in sentencing, err on the side of leniency. The Government has, of course, as have all of us, repeatedly pointed to the link between alcohol and driving offences and accidents. The penalties for such offences under the Road Traffic Act have been made substantially heavier in the last few years. I have mentioned that section 14 has not been amended for a very long time. I must say that I am aware that the Government just now must be in a dilemma because of the—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —recent conviction of Mr. Casey for an offence under the Road Traffic Act.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have not finished; I thought you were—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member will cease commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Transport told me to behave myself. I do not know whether this matter is taboo in the House, but I am prepared to debate it at any time. The curious—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member has explained his question fully. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The question of penalties under the criminal law in South Australia is the subject of a general review to see whether the monetary penalties ought to be altered. In this case the honourable member is referring to the penalty of imprisonment. In the case of causing death by dangerous driving, of course, the maximum penalty is seven years. I would presume that the honourable member's constituent is suggesting that we should impose on the court a provision for a minimum penalty.

Mr. Millhouse: No, that's not it, but if we increased it it would be an indication to the court that we regarded it as serious.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order; he has asked his question. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot believe that the court, looking at the maximum penalty of seven years imprisonment, does not believe that the Legislature considers the matter seriously. What does one do— increase the penalty to 15 years imprisonment and say, "Well, in that case they will increase the penalty imposed more because the maximum is very much more"? The penalty of seven years is considerably in excess of the penalty imposed in the case to which the honourable member refers. The honourable member, as a member of the legal profession, would know perfectly well that, where a charge of causing death by dangerous driving is brought, it is regarded as being the least of the charges that might be brought in the circumstances. A man who is grossly negligent in the circumstances could be charged with manslaughter.

Mr. Millhouse: Come on, you've been out of practice too long to remember.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sorry, but perhaps my practice goes back a little longer than does the honourable member's. I had to deal with manslaughter cases in circumstances—

Mr. Millhouse: When was—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Hugh Hudson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy is out of order. I also warn the honourable member for Mitcham that if he continues to interject I will name him.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member also knows, as a member of the legal profession, that it is unwise for anyone to compare cases simply on the newspaper reports of the circumstances and without all the material for sentencing that is before the court.

Therefore, he cannot really suggest to his constituent that a proper comparison has been made by reading out the material which he has read out to the House today, because the full material which was before Judge Ligertwood, who as the honourable member said is not a judge who tends to err on the side of leniency, is apparently not before the honourable member and certainly not before the House. I do not believe there is a case for increasing the maximum penalty of seven years imprisonment for causing death by dangerous driving. It appears to me that that is a considerable penalty indeed, and it is available to the courts in those cases which they consider to be the most serious. Quite obviously, in this particular case the judge did not consider this to be one of the most serious cases of causing death by dangerous driving.

PORT ADELAIDE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister for Planning provide any information about the Port Adelaide redevelopment programme? I have received numerous inquiries from people in the Port Adelaide district, mainly the Retail Traders Association and the Historical Society, as to when the programme will be started.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member was good enough to indicate that he wanted further information on this matter, and it follows questions he asked about this matter in November last year, as well as contact he has had with the department itself. The process of amending the Port Adelaide council regulations covering the Port Centre and the Myer site at Queenstown should be completed in the next month. The new regulations provide for the zoning of the Myer site as R2c and the establishment of a Port Adelaide centre zone within which development will be subject to the consent of the State Planning Authority. It is likely that development control will be delegated to the Port Adelaide Centre Joint Committee, which has continued to manage the centre.

In view of the need for general co-ordination of the redevelopment tasks in the centre, a Project Manager has been appointed for a two-year term, from 10 July 1978. The manager, Mr. Hugh Davies, will be located in the Port and will have responsibility for negotiation with developers and landowners for new facilities (especially in the core precinct), the promotion of tourist, cultural and recreational development, the co-ordination of proposals for the provision of community facilities and Government offices, and the preparation of detailed proposals for use of the funds. A number of advisory groups have been established to support the joint committee on matters of transport, social needs and environmental management. These groups report progressively to the joint committee. The South Australian Housing Trust is evaluating its role in the old Port Reach precinct and has purchased some residential properties and land with a view to rehabilitation and infill development. The Port Adelaide conservation study which is a photographic record of historic buildings in the centre and which outlines guidelines for conservation is now available for public purchase. I

recommend this document to anyone interested in Port Adelaide and its past history.

PITJANTJATJARA LANDS

Mr. GUNN: When will the Minister of Community Welfare release to this House and to the public the report prepared by Mr. Cocks dealing with the Pitjantjatjara lands in the North of this State? An article appeared in today's *Advertiser* from which it is obvious that the journalist had in his possession a copy of the report. However, on inquiring of the Minister's office, I was told that the report was not available either to me or to the Leader, even though we are both interested in this matter.

My colleague, the member for Mount Gambier, has also shown an interest in this area, and we wish to have the opportunity to examine this report. I should be pleased if the Minister could explain the situation in view of the article that appeared in the press today.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The answer to the honourable member's question is that the report will be made available when Cabinet makes that decision.

OIL SPILL

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister for the Environment inform me what was the result of the investigations undertaken following an oil spill at Port Stanvac during July of this year? It was reported that that oil spill was the worst that had occurred since 1975. As oil spills represent a major community problem, I think the public would like to know exactly what the department did in respect of this matter. Further, can the Minister say whether the investigators considered a resident's claim, which was reported in the *Advertiser*, that there were "10 or 20 blokes there and they were working so hard that it looked like they were trying to clean it up before anyone saw what had happened"?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know whether I can comment on the last statement made by the honourable member. Officers of my department have been involved in an investigation into this matter. Because of the number of people who had to be interviewed (witnesses and others who were involved) the inquiry has taken a little longer than I thought it would take, although I do know that it is now completed. I think the report will be made available to me tomorrow, and I will certainly study the recommendations made. From discussions I have had with the Director of Marine and Harbors, Mr. John Griffiths, it would appear that there is sufficient evidence to launch a prosecution in this case. If that is the recommendation, that is what I shall be proposing to do.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether there were any special problems associated with the local government elections held on 1 July this year, for example, preparation of rolls, etc.? If so, what were the problems and what steps have been taken to prevent a recurrence?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I was not in Australia at the time, but there have been no reports to me of any unusual problems other than an apathy on the part of electors. However, I will inquire of the Director and let the honourable member know the outcome.

CREDIBILITY FUND

Mr. BECKER: My question is supplementary to the one I asked on notice yesterday about the Premier's credibility fund. Can the Deputy Premier, in the temporary absence of the Premier, say whether a fund that has been established for the Premier to draw on at his discretion for political promotional purposes attracts gift duty and taxation on interest earned? I understand that political Parties pay taxation on interest earned on income.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Does the Liberal Party?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BECKER: I have just made the statement that political Parties must pay taxation on interest earned on their income. I hope that the A.L.P. has been doing this. A press report in the *Advertiser* of 19 June, headed "Credibility Fund set up for Premier", states:

Recipients are asked to make donations to a fund— and \$50 000 was mentioned. The Premier was reported in the *News* of 19 June as saying that the fund would be used at his discretion for promotional and political purposes. Therefore, I believe it is important for the taxpayers of this State to know what is happening in this general area and whether gift duty and taxation are being paid in respect of this fund.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I recall the reply given to the honourable member, the Premier stated that there was no such fund.

Mr. Becker: A credibility fund. I used the wrong name.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member might have been talking about the wrong fund, too. I know nothing of what transactions take place in relation to any such fund, nor do I know whether the Premier, if he has a fund, does as the honourable member has suggested. He talked of political Parties having to pay taxation on interest derived from funds invested. I do not know whether the Premier, great though he is, could be described as a political Party.

Mr. Tonkin: You mean that it's a political fund?

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections, and action will be taken. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am certain that the Premier will examine the contents of the query raised by the honourable member and, if he thinks it is necessary to reply to it, he will do so.

MR. CONNELLY

Mr. VENNING: Will the Premier outline details of the employment of an ex-Speaker (Mr. Connelly), details of his duties, salary, and the expenditure sheet allowed for such employment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although I think that that information has already been given to the House, I will obtain it for the honourable member. Mr. Connelly, as Chairman of the Outback Areas Development Trust, is attached to the office of the Minister of Local Government.

TOURISM

Mr. EVANS: What reasons can the Premier give for South Australia having the lowest contribution from tourism to the gross domestic product of any Australian State or territory? The latest figures show that the contribution to gross domestic product from tourism in Western Australia is 11.2 per cent; in Queensland, 6.2 per cent; in New South Wales, 5.2 per cent; and in Victoria, 4.8 per cent, whereas in South Australia it is only 3.7 per cent.

cent (the territories and Tasmania fall in between the Victorian and New South Wales figures). As South Australia has the lowest contribution to gross domestic product, can the Premier give the reasons why?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I would have to check the basis of the honourable member's figures. Figures are frequently being produced to this Government that show that over a considerable period South Australia has had the highest domestic surplus in tourism of any State.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether the Government will regionalise the National Parks and Wildlife Service in keeping with other appropriate Government departments? It is considered by many South Australians that the regionalisation of this department would dramatically improve that department's public relations and that, by providing regional offices with the necessary responsibility and autonomy, much would be achieved in the management of this State's national parks. Not only is this necessary, as has been the case with the Lands Department and the Agriculture and Fisheries Department, but it is even more necessary now because of the virtual phasing out of the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council. Does the Government intend to regionalise the service in order to achieve a more efficient operation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Some work has been done by the department on the basis for the department's regionalisation, but the Government's decision to freeze manpower will have a direct bearing on any decision in this regard. As desirable as it is, the honourable member will appreciate that it would require additional staff. Because of the Government's decision, I have yet to assess whether it would be possible to proceed with any plans to regionalise.

STUDENT-TEACHER ALLOWANCES

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Minister of Education say how much the Education Department spent in the year 1977-78 on student-teacher allowances for students studying at colleges of advanced education, following last year's substantial reduction in allowances payable by the State?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

Mr. CHAPMAN: Does the Minister of Transport realise that, by procrastinating from joining with all other State Transport Ministers in their combined venture to legislate against the operation of straw companies, he is condoning a practice of breaking the law, because he knows that road maintenance tax avoidance is occurring, and that a deterioration of heavy transport safety standards, which he has also had drawn to his attention by the industry, is taking place? I am aware of approaches that have been made to the Minister pleading that he take action, and incorporated in those pleas has been evidence direct from the industry demonstrating the two areas of irregular practice. However, in a report in this morning's *Advertiser* the Minister is identified as "still examining the matter, but no legislation had been drafted" in South Australia. The issue of road maintenance tax avoidance is well known to the Minister as the basic reason for establishing a

transport straw company.

The other issue of road safety has been drawn to the Minister's attention, and occurs simply because, unlike the other States (Victoria and New South Wales, in particular), South Australia has no initial roadworthiness certification requirements on heavy transport rigs, but merely a weight and identification certificate requirement by the Highways Department. It has been reported to me also that interstate truck sales are resulting in registrations in South Australia, under the guise of South Australian based straw companies, thus not requiring the standards applicable to the State of origin and sale. Hence, the strong industry claims about safety standards of heavy transport on our highways and of certain vehicles traversing South Australia's national highways and, thereafter, being subject only to actual roadworthiness inspection if apprehended following observation by inspectors or police on the highways.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Throughout the explanation of the honourable member's question, he used the term "the industry" rather loosely, I thought, but failed completely to indicate precisely whence the request had come. I presume that that was an oversight. I hope it was, and that it was not a mischievous statement, because I put to the honourable member that there has been no request made to me from the recognised and reputable trucking industry for legislation to be introduced to cover straw companies, because people in South Australia realise, as indeed the honourable member should if he aspires ever to be the Minister, that simply to overcome the problem of straw companies is to deal with the tip of the iceberg. He referred to the evasion of road maintenance charges. It is recognised throughout the Commonwealth, by all State Ministers, and indeed by Mr. Nixon (and I suspect that he or one of his officers has fed this question to the honourable member), that wholesale evasions are going on. That is why I have consistently advocated that road maintenance charges should be replaced with an additional excise duty on fuel, so that there can be no evasion.

Mr. Gunn: We all agree with that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member says that we all agree, but his colleagues do not agree with it: indeed, Mr. Nixon has refused point blank to introduce a levy, despite the request of the Australian Transport Advisory Council. Before the member for Alexandra and the member for Eyre start shooting off their mouths on this, they should get the facts straight. Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution inhibits quite extensively the introduction of legislation to which the honourable member has referred regarding straw companies. I have persistently said (and I would have expected Mr. Nixon to have told the honourable member this) that, if and when the Crown Solicitor in South Australia is prepared to advise me that an amendment to deal with straw companies would be lawful and would stand up constitutionally, then and only then would I introduce the amendment required.

Mr. Chapman: You are running last. In Western Australia—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Alexandra to order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not concerned with the constitutionality of what is done in Western Australia, Victoria, Queensland, or anywhere else. I have a Ministerial responsibility in South Australia and, until the Crown Solicitor in this State is prepared to revise the advice he gave me, and which he has given the present Attorney-General and his predecessor, His Honour Mr. Justice King, that it would be unconstitutional to do as

required, it would be ludicrous to introduce the amendment the honourable member has suggested. I have told the Australian Transport Advisory Council that, and I have told Peter Nixon that. I am rather disgusted that the honourable member should be used as a Nixon tool in this House.

CHIFLEY MEMORIAL LECTURE

Mr. WILSON: Will the Attorney-General say whether, in his recent Chifley Memorial lecture given in Melbourne on 26 June 1978, he advocated that the Government should look to gain some measure of control over supply, especially of those industries which are profitable; secondly, is this the policy of the State Government; thirdly, did he also advocate investment by the State in new industries and new ventures and, if so, will he give some examples; and finally, at the recent State A.L.P. conference, did he support a motion by the Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union, reaffirming the Party's union and socialist foundations, and was he opposed in this motion by Mr. Howard O'Neill and the Deputy Premier?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes, yes, and yes.

HART REPORT

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister for Planning say whether Mr. Hart has concluded his planning inquiry and, if so, what major changes are proposed and when action will be taken to implement any or all of these changes?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Hart Report has been completed, but it must be considered by Cabinet before it is released. It will take a few weeks, I imagine, before it can be printed and therefore before it can be released. Until that time I do not propose to go into details, unless the honourable member would like a three-minute burst on the general problems associated with this area of Government activity.

INDUSTRY STUDY

Mrs. ADAMSON: Will the Premier explain the new basis of study for industrial opportunity, to which he referred in his reply to the question of the member for Davenport; what is the reason for a new basis of study; and has it anything to do with a need to compensate industry for coming to South Australia as a high-cost State?

The SPEAKER: Before the honourable Premier answers this question, I note that a preceding question contained four parts. It is almost impossible for a Minister to answer four questions at once. I hope that honourable members will not ask four-part questions. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The basis of the new studies for industry potential in South Australia is the expertise now assembled in the Industrial Development Department for doing effective studies on the gaps in industry. The expertise assembled has been extremely useful to us in the provision of material to assist industry in South Australia, particularly in applications before tariff inquiries. We alone of the States have assisted local industry very markedly in those areas, in such areas as the inquiry into the motor vehicles industry in Australia, in shoe manufacturing, in textiles, and in domestic white goods products. As a result, we now have the expertise, which was quite clearly shown, unfortunately, that private sector consultants simply did not have, to do studies in any depth. The department has been instructed to provide a

new industries studies group, which is therefore looking at the resources of South Australia and the potential for development, given the basis of those resources, and the existing manufacturers' supplies within the State. That is the basis of the new study.

It is not the case that South Australia is a high-cost State, compared to the other two manufacturing States, and that untruth, which is constantly peddled by members opposite, is peddled on the basis of their endeavouring to harm the State, and not on the basis of any truth or concern for the State whatever. I draw the honourable member's attention to something on this score that shows just how untruthful are the kind of statements which have emanated from honourable members opposite and from some of their supporters in the private sector.

The normal allegation in relation to South Australia as to increases in costs here is related to increases in costs of workmen's compensation. Only recently the Legal Officer of the Victorian Chamber of Manufacturing Industry published in the journal of that body a bitter attack on increases in costs of workmen's compensation in Victoria and pointed out that those costs and the rate of increase in the cost of compensation to manufacturers in Victoria were the greatest in Australia and markedly bad in comparison with South Australia.

Mr. Tonkin: What was the basis for his figures?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader can ask a question tomorrow.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The basis was the premiums paid and the increase in those premiums. South Australia is fourth on both scores in Australia: it is not a high cost State as compared to the other manufacturing States.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STATE FINANCES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yesterday, I was asked a question by the member for Alexandra concerning payments to the State by the Commonwealth Government, and I undertook to give the figures today, and I now do so. The following report has been provided to me by the State Under Treasurer:

The figures given below are for total Commonwealth payments to South Australia under tax sharing, Loan Council, and specific purpose grant arrangements. For 1975-76 and 1976-77, the figures are taken from the Commonwealth Budget Paper No. 7 "Payments to or for the States and Local Government Authorities 1977-78". For 1977-78 and 1978-79, the figures have been derived from estimates by the Commonwealth Treasurer at the June Premiers' Conference for Australia as a whole. More accurate figures for these two years will be available when the Commonwealth Budget is brought down in about two weeks time.

| | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 |
|---------------------------------------|---------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| | \$'000 | \$'000 | Est. \$'000 | Est. \$'000 |
| Payments to South Australia | 975 822 | 1 033 467 | 1 163 517 | 1 222 905 |
| Rate of increase . . . | — | 5.9 | 12.6 | 5.1 |
| | | per cent | per cent | per cent |
| Wage increases . . . | — | 14.6 | 10.8 | 8.0 |

The figures for wage increases are those calculated by the Commonwealth for the purposes of the formula guarantee which underpins the tax-sharing arrangements. For 1978-79, the estimate used by the Commonwealth at the June Premiers' Conference has been adopted.

The comparison between the rate of increase in payments to South Australia and the rate of increase in wages, which are by far the greatest element of State Government costs, demonstrates clearly the extent to which the real value of Commonwealth payments to South Australia has declined over the past two years and is expected to continue to decline.

The apparently favourable allocation to South Australia in 1977-78 is an artificial figure produced by an earlier Commonwealth decision to prepay certain of its liabilities under hospitals cost-sharing arrangements. If the necessary adjustments were made to the figures to allow for this aberration, the overall result for the period would be slightly more favourable to the Commonwealth, but the real value of payments to South Australia would still show a significant decline.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: STATE FINANCES

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: Before the honourable member for Alexandra speaks I should like to remind him that he may explain matters of a personal nature but he cannot debate the matter. Recently, I have found that members have been debating the matter, and I hope that he will stick to the rule of the Chair.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, particularly for drawing to my attention exactly what is required on such occasions. With some deliberate conviction, the Premier, when answering my question about State finances yesterday, made a personal attack on my ability to operate an oriental instrument known as an abacus. In my own defence I take this opportunity to tell the House that I do not own such an instrument, I have never seen one, nor am I aware of there being one available to members for their use, in particular, for such calculating purposes.

Mr. Millhouse: I can show you mine.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I appreciate the offer that has come from my friend. Seriously, though, I should, in my own defence in this instance, remind the House that, apart from that false allegation made yesterday by the Premier, my calculations, without such instruments, were not out after all. The figures I gave to the House yesterday not only were right but were extremely conservative with respect to the actual funds provided by the Commonwealth to the State. Without debating the matter, I simply say that the figure I gave for last year, as being received by the State, happened to be \$8 500 000 less than South Australia actually received from the Commonwealth in that year. Accordingly, my calculation of 11.81 per cent turned out to be better for South Australia, with a 12.6 per cent increase in the funds received from the Commonwealth last year as against the previous year.

At 3.14 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 1 August. Page 225.)

Mr. BANNON (Ross Smith): In rising to support the motion I would begin by saying that I have complained previously about the time it takes the House to deal with it

and about the dreariness of many of the contributions (from which I certainly will not exempt the contribution that I make today), based partly on the fact that once the key speakers have had their say on the content of the Governor's Speech, one finds that there is very little to be dealt with in the course of a 60-minute address other than what one might call parochial or parish-pump matters.

While we go through this process one by one, we are delaying the more important business of the House, the major business, namely, Bills sponsored by both Government and private members. While there certainly is a place for a general debate of the nature of the Address in Reply, to have it every year at this stage over the length of time it takes is really quite wasteful of public resources and of members' time and energy. However, there may well be some who disagree with that, and, no doubt, they will go for their full 60 minutes on whatever matter comes into their head or meets their fancy at the time.

One important thing that has emerged from the debate to date has been the clear definition by members of the Opposition of their ideological position. By doing this (and the Leader in particular stressed in his contribution what he and his Party stood for) I think they have highlighted the differences between this side of the House and their side of the House, and some very important and fundamental differences they are. I intend to deal at some greater length with those differences and with the philosophy as it has been espoused by members of the Opposition.

I should like to begin by dealing with the contribution yesterday by the member for Davenport in which, as part of his discussion of what one might call "creeping socialism" or "the growth of Government bureaucracy", he spent considerable time regurgitating material that he has already submitted to the House on South Australia's relative position in relation to numbers and growth of the Public Service, using figures either selectively or misleadingly or, in some cases, quite inaccurately.

I think that the record ought to be set straight yet again, although I remind the House that that was done effectively by the Premier on 18 July, during Question Time, in relation to certain figures presented by both the member for Davenport and the Leader of the Opposition. I suppose, as a starting point, one must ask the member for Davenport and his colleagues just precisely what is wrong with the concept of public employment and the fact that the State does employ people. The member for Davenport and his colleagues assume that any growth in public employment—in fact, any work undertaken by people in public employment—involves some wasteful or inefficient activity and bad administration. According to them, it is to be deplored that we have public servants. By analysing that attitude and the question "What is wrong with public employment?" we ought to consider who they are talking about.

True, there has been a significant growth in the Public Service in South Australia. There has also been a significant growth in Public Services in other States over the periods under discussion. We are meant to infer from the way public servants are talked about by the Opposition that they are clerks, base grade or otherwise, sitting behind desks, shuffling reams of paper, issuing and collecting forms, and engaging in this kind of clerical activity, which is based on a plethora of legislation that is unnecessary and useless. Clearly, that is absolute nonsense. The growth in public employment has been in areas such as education, where teachers are employed, health services, where nurses are employed, and community welfare services, where social workers and others actively involved in the community are employed.

These are the areas in which numbers have increased.

When we talk about growth in public employment and public servants, we are really talking about people like teachers, nurses, community workers, etc., who are all providing vital and essential services to the people of our community. They are being employed as the result of the demand by people in our community for those services. If there had not been an education lobby, and if parents and people involved in education had not insisted that our education standards be improved and that the numbers employed in that sector not be increased, such improvements and increases would not have occurred. Education in South Australia was neglected for many years, and it has been only in recent years, both here and in other States, that there has been a significant increase in the standard and quality of education services to the community. That needs public servants, who happen to be called teachers, and a similar case applies in any other area we look at. The logic in the demand by the Opposition for improved services or better delivery of services and the logic of the lobby groups in our society asking for these things is that people are to be employed to deliver those services. We are not talking about clerks shuffling bits of paper: we are talking about nurses, teachers, social workers and policemen, etc., and we should remember that. There is nothing basically wrong with an increase in public employment and the Public Service in the community today.

We are told by the member for Davenport that South Australia has the highest Public Service growth rate, and it is interesting in that context to note that he has adroitly shifted his ground. A while ago he was speaking of numbers; now he is speaking of growth rates, because that suits his purpose better. It follows, he claims, that this growth rate in the Public Service has harmed private industry. In any discussion on the growth of the public sector comparatively in Australia, the honourable member neglects the growth rate in private employment. The significant manufacturing States in Australia (Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia) have, of course, been the hardest hit by the current economic down-turn and decline. It is interesting to note that, of those States, Victoria has been consistently under a Liberal State Government during that period of decline; New South Wales has been under a Liberal State Government for much of it and from 1976 under a Labor Government; and South Australia has been under a Labor Government throughout that period. So there has been a different mix of Governments and ideologies in those States. If we take the period selected by the member for Davenport, June 1971 to April 1978, and we look at private employment in those manufacturing States, we find that in Victoria there has been a decline of 1.03 per cent, or 9 700 jobs have been lost, in the private sector in that period. New South Wales has had an even worse situation: minus 4.18 per cent, or 51 500 jobs lost in the private sector in that period. The Australian average is minus 0.12 per cent or 3 900 jobs lost overall in Australia. Private employment in South Australia has increased by 0.6 per cent, or 1 700 jobs, during that period. We are doing much better than the Australian average, and as a manufacturing-based State we are doing much better than the other two major manufacturing States.

The second contention by the member for Davenport is that any growth in the Public Service which he demonstrates has taken place in South Australia means that private industry will be harmed, but the facts are totally at odds with that conclusion. It seems to be to the contrary, that where there is a healthy growth in the public sector it has been accompanied by a similar growth in the

private sector. New South Wales, which has had a massive minus 4 per cent decrease in private employment, has also been the State in which public employment has grown at the slowest rate of any State. Western Australia, which has had a public employment growth similar to South Australia's over that period, had seen a considerable growth in its private employment. South Australia, with a significant public sector increase, has shown a private employment increase, contrary to the experience of Victoria and New South Wales. The facts are that manufacturing industries' problems in Australia affect the States in which there is a manufacturing base, irrespective of the type of Government in those States, and that South Australia under this State Government has done much better comparatively than have the other States.

A table was published in *Hansard* on 19 July which was the basis for the figures and statements made by the member for Davenport yesterday, and certain things are wrong about those figures. It wrongly gives the total of public sector employees by including 1 800 Tasmanian railway employees who were transferred to the Commonwealth. By taking the total transfer of Commonwealth employees, the honourable member has, inadvertently or otherwise, included a further 1 800 who were not employed in South Australia. The honourable member has also included in that table persons employed under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. While it is true that those employees are public sector employees (they are being paid by public money), they are being paid in different circumstances from those involving the normal public servant. They are not permanent employees: they are employed for short periods for a specific purpose in a specific economic climate.

It seems unreasonable to include, for instance, the 1 700 persons employed under SURS as at April 1978 in the total figure of public sector employment when one is trying to demonstrate the growth in that public sector. That effect is exacerbated by the fact that, if we take the period used by the member for Davenport, beginning in June 1971, the impact of the rural relief scheme in other States is involved. In other States, there were more employed under that scheme than in South Australia, and therefore the public sector growth rate may be under-estimated in other States because of the short-term impact of those rural relief workers in that period of time.

As with most figures and statistics, interpretations can be placed on them which sound compelling, useful and relevant, but on closer examination the conclusions being drawn from them prove just not to be true, and this is so with the figures used by the member for Davenport. If we are talking about trends in the growth of public sector employment, why use the period used by the member for Davenport? I believe he used it because it was the one that best suited his purpose. Let us be more contemporary and look at the growth rate in public employment in the various States between June 1977 and April 1978: Tasmania 3.6 per cent, Victoria 3.5 per cent, Western Australia 3.1 per cent, New South Wales 2.8 per cent, South Australia 2.3 per cent, and Queensland 2.2 per cent. We are at the bottom of the table, .1 per cent above Queensland.

That is the contemporary situation; that is what is happening to our State Public Service now, whereas the growth rate that the member for Davenport is talking about includes a period in the early 1970's when South Australia was desperately battling to get its public services up to par and when it needed to employ a lot of people because our services had been so under-staffed and so undeveloped that a massive effort was needed. So, of course, we had a large growth during that period, but that

growth has tapered off and is reducing because we do have those services in some sort of order now. If one looks at the most recent period, the June-April period I have just quoted, one sees that we are right at the bottom in terms of growth. Whatever one grants to the figures that are shown by the member for Davenport, they certainly do not show that recently South Australia has been increasing its Public Service at the expense of anyone or comparatively with the rest of Australia.

What is the current combined total of State and local government employment? I have introduced local government here, so I had better explain why. As was pointed out clearly by the Premier recently in his response to the member for Morphett, one cannot just look at those employed under the Public Service Acts of the various States and cross-compare them, because each State has a different way of employing, or providing specific services.

In the field of local government particularly (and this is borne out by Grants Commission and other reports) in South Australia the range of services or employment provided, by and large, does not measure up to that provided in certain other States. Other examples, of course, of how figures can be misrepresented in this area occur when one tries to exclude public authorities from a calculation of public sector employees. In South Australia we directly employ, through the Engineering and Water Supply Department, a large work force which in other States, such as Victoria, is employed by a statutory authority, not therefore coming directly under the Public Service Act. The employees are there, all right, in the other States but, if one extracts figures looking superficially at Public Service Act employees, one does not get any valid comparison.

It makes sense, when trying to compare services, their delivery, and the numbers employed, that we combine the State Government and local government sectors. The figures here reveal that Tasmania has the highest proportion employed in this area, 29.5 per cent; Western Australia has 27.9 per cent; South Australia, 27.4 per cent (although if we exclude the unemployment relief scheme workers it reduces to 27 per cent, which is almost 1 per cent less than Western Australia); Queensland, 26.4 per cent; Victoria, 22.7 per cent; and New South Wales, 21.8 per cent.

There are two significant points in that table: first, that the South Australian figure is by no means the highest and, in fact, roughly lines up with Queensland; secondly, that the ranking in the table seems to depend less on the economic or social policies of the Governments concerned and more on their size and the need to deliver services in their States. The smaller States have to provide much the same sorts of service as the larger States, but because they are smaller they usually find that the range of services to be provided necessitates a higher proportion of the work force being employed in the public sector providing those services. The figures I have quoted bear that out quite clearly, because the table roughly follows the populations of the various States, although, as I have said, Western Australia should be not as different from South Australia as it is, and South Australia should not be as close to Queensland as it is, if the Opposition's thesis about our massive and unrestrained growth in the public sector is true.

I am afraid that we have seen the member for Davenport's technique demonstrated all too well in his speech by the way he has used and misused the figures, and the way, for instance, when talking about Government controls and legislation, he moves on to the point of ever-increasing Government bureaucracy, and Government taxes, and then proceeds to produce figures

on increasing Government taxes. It is only if one looks more closely that one realises that what he is talking about in the tax area is the total taxation situation of all government, mainly, of course, the Commonwealth Government, but the slide from the State to general is not signalled by him because he wants to leave us with the impression that this horrendous tax situation he goes on to talk about solely involves and is due to the State.

He also used terms such as "authoritarian bureaucracy" to describe the Public Service. It is always "authoritarian", and he contrasts Government bureaucrats with free citizens. He says that the bureaucrat cannot really create wealth. In direct production terms, some bureaucrats do not create wealth, but of course the services that people in the bureaucracy provide by aiding the health, welfare and development of the community produce wealth. If they did not, we would not have such services. If education was not an investment in the future, an investment in our productive wealth, then we would not put such resources into education. If social work did not help people in need and improve their opportunities to stand on their own feet, providing that kind of economic benefit, certainly those on the other side would not sustain such services, and we would be questioning them closely. To put the Public Service and its services to one side and say they do not contribute to the wealth, health or welfare of the community is nonsense. However, the member for Davenport, referring to these "authoritarians", is keen to do that. Coming from a former public servant, and somebody who is still paid by the taxpayer, it seems rather odd. I hope that in his period as a public servant with the Agriculture Department he kept his tendencies to "authoritarian" and other actions under control.

I think this is an appropriate point to move to the question of the philosophies of the Party and to the Leader's speech. While the Leader is able to express some of his own stands, that is, his beliefs in the private enterprise system, the freedom of the individual, and the provision of equal opportunity (although I am not sure how he reconciles the provision of equal opportunity with some of his proposals for the role of Government), he also tries to state the Labor Party's stand and, through that, the Labor Government's stand on control and ownership of the means of production. This was dealt with by you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in your important contribution to this debate.

The Leader, of course, misinterprets (I would say quite deliberately) the so-called objective of the Labor Party by quoting it only in part. According to him, 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. I am afraid that the Labor Party has made a secret of that plan, partly perhaps because that plan does not exist. He should refer to our platform and our objectives, which are:

The democratic socialisation of industry, production, distribution and exchange—to the extent necessary to eliminate exploitation and other anti-social features in those fields—in accordance with the principles of action, methods, and progressive reforms set out in this platform.

We in the Labor Party do not have some blanket approach which says that all State control, all socialisation of the means of industry, production, distribution and exchange, is good at this point of time in our society. We say quite clearly that that object is read in the context of being necessary to eliminate exploitation and other anti-social features. Where it can be demonstrated that it is so necessary, then we will move and act accordingly, but not

otherwise. That is the policy of our Party, and it is clearly spelt out in detailed planks at each election when the Premier delivers the policy speech. To misinterpret it and put it into the shorthand which suggests that it aims to control every aspect of our lives is so much nonsense. Fortunately, I do not think many people are tricked by that approach.

Unfortunately, while our policy is misrepresented, there is still some confusion amongst members of the Opposition about their particular philosophy, partly because it is a philosophy based on pure pragmatism which does not have much ideal or principle in it. I thought that was extremely well demonstrated by the member for Mount Gambier in his contribution to the debate—that sort of strand of cynical self-interest, which I think is a feature of the Liberal philosophy—when he explained to the House that he had emerged from a Labor background, he said.

“I think to my advantage”, he said. He has rejected it because it seemed to be to his advantage to do so. I applaud his frankness in admitting that, and I can understand why he wants to kick away the ladder by which he ascended. I find it scandalous that he quoted George Orwell in order to aid his cynical self-interested philosophy. If he wants to know what George Orwell was saying, I suggest that he read his works, and he will find that Orwell always was a socialist. However his books, such as *1984*, may be misrepresented or misused by members such as the member for Mount Gambier, socialism was the guiding light of his life, and that was what he was promoting. What he was opposed to were authoritarian and totalitarian regimes, which he saw so clearly exemplified by the Nazi regime in Germany, and through direct personal experience in the Spanish civil war, by the Stalinists. That is what he talked about in his books. That was quite consistent with his socialist objective. If the member for Mount Gambier is interested in George Orwell and his philosophy, I suggest that he should re-read Orwell's books, particularly the book about his own home town. What Orwell was talking about was well demonstrated by you, Mr. Acting Speaker, in your contribution.

The member for Kavel indicated his approach to this philosophy when he talked about the Government's role in building and construction. He was outraged that there were 2 527 persons employed as daily paid workers by the Public Building Department, but he did not say that he wanted them all sacked. That would misrepresent his position. He wanted the numbers scaled down. What is to be done with them? The answer is what the Government is doing: putting them to productive work on important development projects. If that work force is fully occupied on those projects, naturally the Government must look to the private sector to do work for it, as it does consistently.

I find it ironical that people in the building and construction industries who are writing to members about “sunset” legislation, abolishing Government departments, and complaining about the taxes they pay are at the same time holding their hands out for Government contracts and work. There is no problem in this mixed economy for them to get such work. I wish they were more consistent in their attitude. The Opposition claims that we should somehow waste away Government paid employees (not sack them), and have them sitting around doing nothing while the private sector takes up the slack, are unreal and scandalous.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: They want them sacked, but aren't prepared to come out and say so.

Mr. BANNON: No, but the logic of the position is that they be sacked. Their philosophy is that the Government should intervene, where necessary, to maximise the profits

of the private sector in these areas. The Leader went further and attacked democratisation. He made a sneering reference to the Premier, for stating his belief that every aspect of our way of life should be democratised. I find that difficult indeed to square with the ringing praise made elsewhere by the Leader and some of his supporters, such as the member for Davenport, about our democratic system and how important it is that it be preserved.

Democracy in life does not just mean going to the ballot box and electing members of Parliament, but getting people to participate in their day-to-day life, in their recreation, leisure and work, and in decisions surrounding it. If that is not what we are on about, we are not talking about democracy, but some kind of elite society, in which those who are most privileged and affluent are on top and are able to run society for their own benefit, free from any Government interference, and the rest can go to the wall. The philosophy of freedom of the individual that is talked about is, I believe, in the way the Liberal Party puts it, anti-democratic.

True freedom for the individual lies in active Government involvement and intervention and in industrial democracy, so that people have a say in the control of their working lives. It does not lie in the elite concept of letting the legislators decide to the extent they feel necessary what should be done in our community.

The philosophy of freedom of the individual, as espoused by the Opposition, is not true freedom of the individual; it produced the slums, because there was no planning, or building standards or controls in the past century not only in Australia but in many other countries. It was that kind of freedom of the individual which allowed child labour to be employed and which allowed industrial injury and disease to be rampant. It also caused unregulated working hours; caused poverty to go unsupported by social security or useful work; and a lack of education, except for those who could afford it. It created cartels and monopolies that were able to join together, free of any Government interference, to bleed the consumer dry for their necessary products.

That is the kind of freedom of the individual envisaged by the Opposition. It is not our freedom. Our freedom is based on active and important Government control and intervention in the economy and not the philosophy of the devil take the hind-most. Regarding the sort of system the Opposition is talking about, I quote from Mr. P. P. McGuinness, Economics Editor of the *Financial Review* writing in the *National Times* and referring to a High Court case, as follows:

This means that there is no longer such a thing as a firm tax base, or a tax law which affects all taxpayers equally. If a taxpayer has the brains to think up a new loophole, or the training in the law, or the size of income to justify the high fees of a legal specialist and sufficient financial resources to take any ruling by the Taxation Commissioner as far as the High Court, the odds are that he can avoid a part (or even all) of the income taxes which are intended to fall on him.

I instance the way crocodile tears are wept over the tax revolt and increasing taxation in our community by the Opposition, when it knows that the only sector of our community that is honestly paying taxes are those in employment, where the actual wages or salaries are determined and laid down in awards or by the employers' returns. People who do not have the facilities or abilities to find loopholes for tax saving and other deductions include public servants, many of whom are on wages or salary, and all of whom pay their full tote odds.

It is the affluent people who have the brains to think up a loophole, who have the training, or who can pay someone to do it who are not paying their full worth in

taxes. If those loopholes were effectively closed, the general level of taxes could be dropped substantially, and we would hear fewer moans from the Opposition. We had from the Leader selective examples under the guise of simple examples of the way in which taxes are higher in this State, and I will not go into them in great detail.

Having talked about democracy, freedom of will, etc., we got an insight into the way in which the Leader and his colleagues think about people. In response to an interjection about how long the Government would fool the people, the Leader responded by saying that it would continue to fool the people of South Australia for as long as the people of the State wanted to be fooled. I find that an interesting statement. In other words, what the Leader and his colleagues are saying is that the only reason they are sitting on the Opposition benches is that people in the electorate are fools, because they voted for us and gave us a majority support in this State. If that is the way in which they characterise the electorate, I hope that they will say it more loudly and more often.

I have greater trust in the people, and one would have thought that, in its current parlous state (what is probably a semi-permanent Opposition), they would not go as far as to say that people are fools and are being fooled. That is not true. People are smart, and are awake to the fact that the Government has the people's interests at heart, and is protecting those interests. That is why the people give the Government support—not because some kind of confidence trick has been played on them, as the Opposition tries to suggest.

The Opposition, of course, is working very hard to frighten business off by inventing threats from the Government, and by talking about how volunteers are to be eradicated. I liked the Leader's reference to volunteers. He said that the Government's ultimate aim was to phase out all voluntary work. That is clearly nonsense, and he could give no examples of that at all. On the contrary, the sneering remarks he made about democratising society, getting people more involved and more active, show that he does not like the situation that is encouraging and increasing voluntary work and activity in our society today. It is a good example of how this Government is promoting voluntary activity.

Mr. Wotton: Don't you support it?

Mr. BANNON: We certainly do. I think the crux of the Leader's point, and the points made by other Opposition members, came when the Leader referred to the new establishment that is being created. He was aghast at the fact that there seemed to be a new group of public servants, officials, and others, who in some way represented a new establishment in that they seemed to be committed, in his view, either to socialism or to the Government's particular philosophies, or whatever. For a start, it is good to see him admitting the existence, by implication, of an old establishment. He would like to see its return, because he and his colleagues have consistently spoken for it and represented it—except, perhaps, the member for Mount Gambier, who threw away his Labor background, so he told us.

I thought that fear of what he believes to be the new establishment came out most clearly when he was talking about the Premier's "credibility fund". I put those words in inverted commas; they are his words, not the Premier's words, and not the facts. Why does he get so upset about the disclosures made in this area? First, because there seems to be some financial support for the Labor Party and for the Premier from quarters that normally the Leader and his colleagues would expect to be totally supporting them; secondly, because there seems to be tremendous indignation that the A.L.P. will have some

funds at its disposal with which to fight elections. That is what it is all about: the thought of the A.L.P. having money to try to counteract the massive propaganda donations made by people on the other side appals them.

It is interesting that all this huffing and puffing about slush funds and credibility funds comes from people, such as the Leader, who opposed a Bill to try to deal effectively with the disclosure of interests of members of Parliament. Let us get rid of this hypocrisy. Let him talk plainly about disclosing the pecuniary interests of members, and we might begin to believe something of what he has told us about slush funds. He has demonstrated once again the arrogance that marks many Opposition members, their attitude of being born to rule.

That attitude is part of what I call the process of destabilisation being undertaken by members opposite. It is an ugly American coinage, but it adequately describes the sort of political tactic being adopted by the Opposition in an attempt to shape what seems to them, following the loss of elections in recent years and being on the verge of seeing control of the Upper House slip from their grasp, to be a means calculated to dislodge a competent and effective State Government.

Destabilisation worked with the Whitlam Government: rumours, innuendoes, invented scandals, with the active aid and intervention of the media, all helped to create an atmosphere surrounding that Government that, when it was sacked by the Governor-General (and that very act contributed to the feeling of unease about the Whitlam Government and what it was doing), managed to obscure the fine and fundamental contributions made by that Government to Australia. Destabilisation seemed to work, because the electorate rejected the Whitlam Government in 1975. Members opposite believe it might work in South Australia, but if it does not they will have a damn good try.

The Salisbury Royal Commission is a classic example of the kind of tactics used. Having stirred up as much smoke and public indignation as was possible at the time, having been behind all the major moves to try to obscure the fundamental issues as to whether or not a Government has a right to dismiss one of its public servants, the Opposition saw the Royal Commission set up, much to its chagrin. It began by not being sure it wanted one, but then decided it did when it thought the Government would not appoint it. When the Government set up the Royal Commission, members opposite said they did not want it anyway.

The Royal Commission sat and heard evidence. On the day on which its findings came out, the day on which it reported that there was no basis for the accusations and the implications against the Government made in the course of the public controversy surrounding the Salisbury dismissal, on the day on which it found that the actions of the Government were justified, the Leader of the Opposition, not having read the report, said that many would not be reassured. In other words, like it or not, people will not be reassured; whether the report is convincing, whether its logic is compelling, whether it has done all that is required of it, there is no way we will be reassured, because we want to keep it alive as a political issue. The Leader said:

The release of the Salisbury Royal Commission report would do nothing to reassure many citizens of South Australia.

The Commission need not have sat, and the report need not have been written; the Leader had determined his attitude. I continue my comments about the destabilisation atmosphere. There have been warnings to industry about industrial democracy, but the ultimate warning came in a news item in the *Sunday Mail* on 28 May 1978,

under the following headline:

Change Policies or else—Tonkin.

Fair enough—a legitimate statement by the Leader of the Opposition. He warned of a crisis. Leaders of the Opposition do that frequently. However, this is the crucial part:

The State Opposition Leader, Mr. David Tonkin, yesterday refused to comment on the likelihood of the Liberal Party attempting to unseat the Government by withholding Supply. In a statement yesterday, Mr. Tonkin said that unless the Government changed its policies, "it must be dismissed".

We know as well as anyone that the words "it must be dismissed" invoke immediate memories of the action of Governor-General Kerr in 1975, and the question of withholding of Supply. The newspaper reporter speculated that Liberal members were trying to scare the Government by invoking that threat. In the face of resolutions passed unanimously by this House in the wake of that crisis, and of all the constitutional conventions in this State, where, whenever Labor has governed, there has been a hostile majority in the Upper House, to say something like that and not comment on the implications is quite irresponsible. The reasons were, first, that he was too timid to say that he would withhold Supply, and, secondly, that he wanted to create an atmosphere of unease as to whether or not there was something fundamentally wrong.

Another tactic of the Opposition is strident opposition to anything that is going, and it sometimes leads Opposition members to quite inconsistent stands. A typical example was illustrated in the *Advertiser* on 8 June. An unsuspecting member of the public who reads his paper critically finds on page 8 the following headline:

Long-term costs in A.L.P. plan, says Tonkin.

It turns out that he was commenting on the A.L.P. State convention motion, which called on the Government to have direct Ministerial control of statutory authorities.

The Leader went on to instance examples of what this policy might lead to. For instance, he said:

ETSA, with power charges the lowest in Australia, was proof that statutory authorities were efficient. It would be disastrous for South Australia if the Australian Labor Party were to use the Electricity Trust as a plaything to implement social policies.

The reader of that article would say, "Clearly, the Leader is rejecting the idea that the Government should be able to direct statutory authorities such as ETSA and, if it had that power, the result would be that costs to the consumer for electricity and so on would be increased." If one kept flicking through the paper and eventually got to page 17 (and the article to which I have just referred was on page 8), he would find another little item from the Leader headed "Contracts should go to locals". The Leader stated:

The South Australian Government—the Government, mark you, Sir—

has a moral obligation to give priority to local firms in letting contracts for the Port Augusta power station.

The Leader said that the Government has already hurt local industry by allowing the contract to go to Japan. "The Government's decision to down local tenders had been a bitter disappointment to the Iron Triangle," he said. The interesting thing about that statement is that the decision as to where the contract should be let was made by the Electricity Trust and, more interestingly, was made and has been subsequently justified by the trust on the grounds of the large cost differential between letting the contract overseas and letting it within Australia.

In other words, the trust was saying on that occasion

that, like it or not, costs to the consumer would be far greater if the contract were not let outside Australia. The Leader deplored that. He said it should have been done in South Australia and the Government should have directed the Electricity Trust to do so. On page 8 of the newspaper he says that it would be scandalous if the Government was able to direct ETSA because it might increase power costs, whereas on page 17 he says that the Government should direct ETSA whether or not it increases power costs. That is the sort of inconsistency he constantly gets into.

There has been one exception, that of Redcliff, where the Leader has done a handstand or a triple somersault and has come out as a great supporter of the scheme. You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, made clear how the Leader has dealt with Redcliff over the years and how inconsistent the current support for it is. It is interesting to see that it was only when there was a hint of some kind of support from Canberra for the project that he came out and said something like that.

Another aspect of this destabilisation process has been the whipping up by means of petitions or any other kind of ferment, public statement, or controversy in areas where the public is being asked to comment or assess critically proposals that have been made. There have been several examples of this: the report of the working party on the control and registration of dogs; the reports on shop trading hours, both generally and in relation to fuel distribution; the North-Eastern transport study; and the study by the Royal Commission on the use of the drug, Cannabis.

All of these things, in a mature democratic society, have been released and put before the public in order that there could be public response and public debate in some kind of neutral or non-political atmosphere. In every one of them, where it has seemed as if there were some kind of public resistance to the proposal (and that is reasonable), we have seen members of the Liberal Party scurrying around fermenting the issue into some kind of anti-government action.

For instance, time and again on the dog legislation I have had to tell my constituents that a Select Committee was dealing with that matter because the Government did not have an attitude on it. I am not dealing with the substance of the issue but the way in which it has been treated. That issue is open to debate. Similarly, if we take the study paper on Cannabis, we are told by the Opposition that it demonstrated the Government's long-term plan to legalise the drug. That is plainly not true. What that study paper aims to do is to set off a reasonable, objective discussion within our community of the facts surrounding the drug.

If the reaction is to turn these into Party-political issues, one can only say that that is the Opposition at its most irresponsible, and its absolutely anti-democratic logic has clearly come out. Constructive opposition certainly, but this kind of destabilisation must be rejected.

Finally, I make brief reference to the substance of the Governor's Speech and that aspect that has been criticised, namely, the detailing of Commonwealth cuts in programmes that have been undertaken under the auspices of the State. Cuts have been made in housing, hospitals, dental facilities, water treatment, public transport, and pre-schools. One hears the cry, "Don't keep blaming the Federal Government for these things," but the fact is that all those projects were embarked upon by the State on an understanding that they would be contributed to by the Commonwealth. The projects have been up and running and have been successful because of that co-operation between the State and the Commonwealth. If one of the partners in that joint exercise

suddenly pulls out the rug and withdraws its finance, those projects are immediately in jeopardy. Why is it not moral or proper for the other party that is still committed to the project, that is still prepared to finance it, to criticise the renegeing party, in this case, the Commonwealth Government? That is not blaming the Commonwealth for not doing something it never said it was going to do or never undertook to do: it is not blaming the Commonwealth for anything other than effectively sabotaging important projects.

What can be done in this situation? We can certainly raise State taxes. The Opposition would dearly like that, because then it could hammer the Government as hard as it possibly could on an outrageous increase in State taxes, but there would be no reference whatever to the projects and proposals that were being financed from those taxes. Alternatively, we could cut services and those projects. Again, I think we would find the Opposition joining with any pressure group or any institution that is affected by those cuts in opposing them loudly and vociferously to tell the Government that what it is doing is outrageous.

Because they can pick a project at a time and ignore the overall financial position of the States, they will probably get away with it. In one sense the Opposition is in a no-loss situation, provided it plays its cards properly. The Opposition can either try to provoke the Government in the State taxes area and criticise it for that or provoke the Government in terms of programme slashing. Consequently, it must be drawn to the attention of people in the community that, if services are to be cut, if there are to be restrictions in the programmes being carried out by the State Government that are valued by people (and I revert to my initial theme, not forms and regulations and paper shuffling by clerks in offices, but actual, real-life services in the community), we ought to see quite clearly why that is happening.

Rather than criticise the State Government for those cuts we should see more support, not only from Opposition members in this State but also from their colleagues on the Government benches in Canberra, for the maintenance of the Federal commitment in those areas where the Federal Government has been committed in the past or has promised in the future to do so and is now renegeing on its promises.

Mr. WOTTON (Murray): I support the motion. I join with His Excellency and with members from both sides of the House in expressing condolences to the family of the late Hon. Frank Potter. Frank Potter served this State with distinction. He loved the people whom he served and he loved serving those people, and was in turn respected by them. He loved his profession and he loved his work in Parliament House. He will be sadly missed as a legislator in Parliament.

This afternoon we have heard the member for Ross Smith give a magnificent example of how best to be on the defensive. Of course, that is what we are seeing all the time from Government members, particularly Ministers.

They are not prepared to be constructive but are, in fact, practising the art of being continually on the defensive. We have seen a glorious example of a smokescreen and self-praise in regard to the Government. For some time now we have seen the inability and unwillingness of this Government to face realities and to recognise the difficulties that its policies are causing the people of South Australia. Until recently, it has got away with it to a certain extent through its propaganda machine and its empire-building (the member for Ross Smith suggested that that was not happening), but the people of South Australia are aware of the extent of the

establishment construction that has been going on in this State.

Until recently, these things have been enough to hoodwink the people of this State into believing that the State of South Australia is, in fact, a State of firsts. Now, people are at last starting to face reality, even if the present Government refuses to do so. They see clearly where they are going and what the Government is doing to them. They can see what the policies of this Government are doing for industrial development and employment, in regard to providing positive incentives, and for industry and decentralisation.

The people of South Australia can see at present that workmen's compensation, long service leave, holiday loadings, penalty rates, pay-roll taxes, worker participation, and compulsory unionism are doing nothing, and are all combining to keep industry out of South Australia and, as a result, bringing about lower productivity in this State.

People can see what State taxation is doing to the person trying to help himself, and what the Government is doing to assist people involved in small businesses and in the rural community. They can see the lack of interest that the Government is showing in regard to young people starting out in life, and what it is doing in regard to housing costs. People can see how ineffective the Government is in regard to looking after personal security, and in improving the quality of life of people in South Australia. This Government is fleecing the people of South Australia with Government charges and State taxes. It is not putting value back into the dollar, and that is what I believe the people in this State want more than anything else. They want value put back into the dollar, and they are not getting it under the Dunstan Government.

People can see through the propaganda machine and the public relations exercise, and they are not happy with what they see. It has been all right while the Government has been able and in a position to hand out financial carrots. But there has been a drought and the carrots have stopped growing and now people are able to think things out for themselves.

They are now thinking at last in regard to value for the dollar: they are at last facing reality. They are fed up with being told that everything that happens in this State is because of mismanagement by the Federal Government: they are thinking for themselves. They are fed with poetry reading and with cookery, but they realise these things will not help them in the situation in which this State now finds itself. They realise that this Government has no plans for the future of this State and it has no plans to restore the State's prosperity; it has nothing that will provide individual or business incentive.

We have been told that we face a heavy programme in this session of Parliament, and that the session could run until February of next year. For the three years I have been a member of this House we have been told that we face a heavy legislative programme. However, this is something that we still have to see because, most times when we have been told we are facing such a legislative programme, it has puffed out after about six weeks. I presume that from the way we are going this session, it will be the same thing again.

The Government has run out of wind and it has run out of ideas. It is too scared to introduce legislation that might not be popular. People are sick and tired of all things sweet that are being presented by this Government; they want substantial food, they want something to grow on and on which this State will grow, and they want freedom returned to the individual. They can see that this Government has lost control of where it is going, and this, I believe, worries the people of this State more than

anything else, because they can see that the Premier and Ministers of this State have lost control to the trade unions. We have yet to see the Government come out and prove itself in this regard, and I challenge the Government to speak out over the voluntary agencies issue, because it has been too scared to do so up to now. I would suggest that it is too scared to do anything about it.

People are becoming more worried about this spreading influence, about the control by and interference of Big Brother government in this State. We have had so many of these matters raised before that I do not intend to go into them in any great detail. We have seen a massive growth in the Public Service and a rapid deterioration of morale in Government departments. We have seen a massive build-up of empires. We have seen the Government refuse to use the expertise that is available through various departments in the Public Service, and we have seen concern being expressed by people in this State in regard to the welfare State that we have at present.

One of the greatest concerns that I have for the future of this State relates to the Dunstan Government's attitude towards its fundamental approach in persuading people that this Government is becoming more and more indispensable and that there is no way any person can hope to manage without its help and its support in every aspect of his daily life. I think it is referred to as Fabian socialism.

The ultimate object is to make people as dependent on the Government as possible, even to the extent of hoodwinking them into not being bothered to think for themselves any more. The welfare State mentality has resulted in a situation in which many people have become totally unaware of just how dependent they have become on the Government. A look at the growth of the public sector in this State shows clearly just how significant the Dunstan Government's intrusion into the everyday lives of South Australians has become.

If this practice is allowed to continue unchecked, ultimately the people of this State will suffer. We have always shown in this State an independent initiative and a willingness to work; it is evidence, I believe, of the pioneering spirit, and our State and country have prospered in the past because of it. Now we are being licensed, controlled, protected and propped up as never before. Concern for others, which is after all the true meaning of the perhaps over-used word "community", is at the heart of a healthy society, and we have been indeed fortunate in the past in having a strongly developed spirit of community responsibility.

It is vitally important that this responsibility should not only continue but, in fact, be nurtured. The freedom of the people to think for themselves, and indeed be encouraged to do so, must surely be one of the greatest concerns for our future in this State. Where there is no freedom, there is no choice and no concern for others. I have spoken previously in this House about the need for voluntary agencies. It was my intention yesterday, if private members' time had been permitted, to move the following motion:

That, in the opinion of this House and in recognition of the most valuable voluntary services rendered by so many dedicated and concerned people in the community, the Government should take action to preserve and protect the status of voluntary workers in the community and charitable organisations.

I intend to move that motion at the appropriate time. I have spoken, and will continue to speak out, in this House on the need to foster a strong spirit of community responsibility, pointing out that such a responsibility felt within the community should be encouraged. Voluntary

agencies and all bodies who serve the community must be free to expand their services to the people concerned on a voluntary basis. I believe it is a tragedy that Government intrusion and trade union interference in voluntary organisations is threatening to destroy the whole basis of voluntary service on which those organisations are founded.

Voluntary agencies have a real role to play in providing a range of services to the community. However, the role they play in community development goes further than providing a service. Voluntary agencies are accessible and people can be directly involved in their activities. Local agencies also have the ability to identify local needs and to communicate those needs to all levels of Government.

I want now to bring to the notice of the House my concern about the extremely low morale of members of our Public Service at this time. It is my opinion that there is a higher rate of frustration being experienced by officers and staff of the Public Service now than at any time in the past. While I believe that this is so in almost every department of the Public Service in this State, I am particularly aware of the acute situation which exists, and has existed for some time, within the Environment Department. I will comment in more detail on that later.

At the outset, I stress how very fortunate we are in this State to have the dedication and efficiency shown by what is widely regarded as a highly competent Public Service. My only wish is that the Government could see the service in the same light. It is becoming more and more obvious that there is a growing concern within the Public Service, and a general feeling of frustration and unrest throughout. There are, I believe, a number of reasons for this frustration, but the most obvious is the Government's increasing interference in the Public Service, a practice that I believe should be deplored. Recently, we have seen a large increase in the changes of personnel between Government departments. As a result of the deterioration of the morale, and the growing concern about frustrations and unrest, many have felt it necessary to resign from the Public Service.

There are far more (and I suggest far more than we will ever know about) public servants who have sought a transfer from one department to another in the hope that the situation in another department may be better only to find that the situation is identical to that which they have left. Such is the story of the Public Service in this State. The majority of members in this House would have to be aware of what is happening. We have seen example after example of loyal, dedicated and well qualified officers of various departments being pushed aside when they should have been receiving a justified promotion. We cannot blame any officer of the Public Service for expressing concern or feeling frustrated when he can see so clearly at some point the brick wall of Government interference, so that he realises that the likelihood of promotion is limited and that he must forget about the expertise and experience he may have and be prepared to have his career virtually wither away. Of course, it is important in theory that senior officers in all departments should be well qualified, but that does not mean that they all have to be lawyers or academics. I suggest that, surely, practical experience is recognised in some form or another as being an important attribute, as well.

A recent *Advertiser* editorial accused me of scoring political points because I was, in fact, condemning a Government which so actively and obviously was undermining what the editorial referred to as "one of the basic props of our system of government", that is, "that the Public Service is apolitical". Of course it should be apolitical; nobody is doubting that, and I am certainly not.

I should have thought, however, that the writer of that editorial would do his homework, because a few phone calls to the Public Service would have made him aware (if he was not already aware) of the true facts about what is actually happening within the Public Service in this State.

Mr. Tonkin: Don't you think he wanted to do his homework?

Mr. WOTTON: No. While I agree with him that it is vital that our Public Service should be, "serving elected members of differing outlooks with equal competence and loyalty", he should know, if he is completely honest with himself and with the people of South Australia, that the present Government in this State can and should be rightly accused of interfering with the promotional opportunities of public servants who see Government appointments as a real threat to their careers.

The Minister for the Environment, the friend of the Public Service, has made his position quite clear regarding the Public Service as it applies to the Environment Department. He said in this House during the previous session that, if anyone in the service was disenchanted, let him take the proper course and resign. Those are warm words of comfort for an already frustrated department! There have been many resignations from that department because employees have been disenchanted. There have been constant examples in that department of officers and staff moving to other departments for that reason.

Then, also, during the previous session, we saw the Minister drop the gag on public servants: "open Government" I think they call it, when we saw just how far this Government was prepared to go in a murky attempt to hide its own mismanagement. We saw the door slammed on the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the penal clauses of the Public Service Act brought in and, in fact, used to reinforce the threat made by the Minister that any officer who spoke about departmental matters without his permission would be sacked. Just imagine what that action did at that time for the morale of his department, comprising people with qualifications, integrity and honesty who had worked for years under various Governments, with loyalty to their department and to their State.

I could go on and on about the actions of the Minister for the Environment within that one department, such as his vindictive witch hunts involving innocent public servants in an attempt to cover up his own shocking neglect and mismanagement. Surely it is not difficult for the Government to see the importance of having a satisfied Public Service, which is an important part of our system of government and which should be seen as such by the Government. I suggest that that could best be achieved by acknowledging the fact that its expertise will always be needed and that its members' dedication to work is appreciated by this Government.

I now refer to matters relating to the Environment Department particularly, and I express my concern at the Government's handling of this important department. A *News* editorial of 9 March 1978 states:

An environmental agency of government must go one of two ways—it must be a powerful conservation lobby, a dangerous course in development-orientated Australia, or it will wither into a department of nostalgia, fretting about parks and ruins.

In a letter to the Editor in response, Barbara Hardy wrote:

It seems to me an Environment Department must do both these things, and other things also. It must be a powerful conservation lobby to offset the trend within Australia for development regardless of its effect on the environment, urban, natural, and the quality of life. The broad thrust of policy within an Environment Department should be the

reconciliation of growth demands with conservation principles, especially taking into account the wise use of resources. When assessing planning procedures, conservation restraints should always be looked at, as well as economic restraints, and social restraints. These should carry equal weight. Please don't question the need for an Environment Department. The need is paramount, and Mr. Corcoran must urgently attend to its proper policies, proper objectives, and proper aims, and prove that this is the direction that the department should go.

This letter spells out the needs and the purpose of the Environment Department? It is a very important and worthwhile department. Environmental effects are produced by the activities of all Government departments and their policies, for example, planning, transport, public works, health, community welfare, mining, and industrial development, etc. This department must look carefully at the environmental impact on areas of planning involved in the policies of all these departments—policies which are worthy of a plan that will conserve a quality of life for our children and our children's children.

But what is happening to this department under the present Government? What purpose does the Dunstan Government see for the Environment Department? I suggest that it is little more than as a rubber stamp to be used for the sole purpose of supporting Government policy. There is no doubt in my mind or the minds of South Australians generally that the Dunstan Government set up this department not because it was felt to be needed but purely because it was trendy; a good public relations exercise. The department's lack of involvement in the NEAPTR project confirms that.

There is a need for greater attention to be paid to the economic cost of environmental decisions and for closer co-operation between economists and environmentalists. The community's expectations of higher living standards have made us more aware of the impacts of economic activity in the environment in which we live. We are bound to find increasing problems in attempting to promote policies that will achieve physical and social as well as economic objectives, particularly when we look at improving environmental quality in the more densely settled and industrialised parts of our State. Evidence from economic studies shows in many cases that prevention of environmental problems is often cheaper than the cure. For example, greater economic efficiency results when production processes are designed to minimise the outflow of destructive effluents rather than trying to modify the wastes after they have been generated. In its constitution, the Australian Conservation Federation states the first of its objects as being:

To make every effort to ensure that the land and waters of the Commonwealth and its territories are used with wisdom and foresight and that competing demands on them are resolved in the best long-term interests of the nation.

The object of conservation is to develop the means whereby man can fit himself into his environment so that his physical, intellectual and aesthetic needs can be satisfied from the resources of the environment, without spoiling its capability to go on satisfying these needs from one generation to another. Its achievements will depend on how well we know the characteristics and capabilities of our land and water and what we can do with them to satisfy the broad range of need of the community now and in the future. Conservation does not preclude modification of some environments or the development and use of the resources that can be obtained from them, but it does demand that modifications made to achieve specified objectives should not impair the capability of the environment to continue to serve the community.

The community needs land from which its physical needs, such as food, timber and water, can be produced. It needs land for urban and industrial purposes, for transport systems, roads, railways and airports, for the distribution of power by transmission lines and pipelines, for the production of minerals and building materials. No less important are the community's needs for national parks and wildlife reserves, as well as open space for recreation. These areas are needed for ecological reference and for the preservation of plant and animal communities. Land for open-space recreation is required to satisfy an increasing demand for such areas, because more and more people are becoming inhabitants of larger and larger urban areas that are less and less suitable as human habitat. Furthermore, without such areas undue pressure by visitors is placed on national parks and wildlife reserves, and this in time will destroy them.

Each of these uses of land is important for the welfare of the community. Apart from those required for subsistence, none is inherently more important than the other. The relative importance of the various uses may change from time to time, but it is wrong to assume that any should have undoubted pre-eminence for all time. Conservation is a man-made concept that has been developed because of the need to educate or engender in people a proper attitude to their environment and its use.

It is a concept made necessary by the problems we have created through our ability to alter and modify environments for our own immediate purposes, often even without contemplating that there could be some undesirable reactions. Today, we have the power to make great changes very quickly, and in making such changes without a proper environmental study and deliberate action to avoid trouble we can do irreparable damage. We can produce so many examples of damage that has been caused. However, the recognition of the misuse of our environment has aroused increasing interest among all kinds of people, including many who have never considered previously man in relation to his environment. Many in the past have had overwhelming confidence in our ability to do what we choose with our environment without cause to regret it.

I hope that we will recognise the need to have a department in Government administration which, rather than taking the part of a rubber stamp or a public relations exercise, would promote the policies of the Government in conserving our State resources for the use and appreciation of society, so as to derive optimum present and future benefits. I suggest that those policies are vitally important.

The Environment Department should not only be needed, but it should play an extremely important part in implementing our policies to conserve, for the maximum present and future benefit of society, the use and appreciation of State resources. We need to ask ourselves what sort of a world we will be living in in the year 2000 (only 22 years from now), what sort of world our children and their children will live in, and what their living conditions will be like.

The part played by conservation and the care of our environment during every-day living is significant, and is not recognised by many people. Items and letters in newspapers draw attention to the many ways in which the state of the environment affects people. During the past few weeks, many issues have been reported and commented on. To name a few, there is the possibility of a paper mill being established at Albury, on the Murray River, which may or may not affect the quality of Adelaide's water supply. We have read about the finding of 800 metres of abandoned fishing net in an aquatic

reserve near St. Kilda, suggesting that large numbers of fish may have been taken from what is supposedly a protected area. There are little things, like improving the amenity and appearance of the Adelaide city area, with landscaping of Hindmarsh Square, and more important matters relating to soil erosion, particularly regarding problems on Eyre Peninsula which have been greatly increased by the recent drought conditions, but which could be improved by the judicious planting of native trees and deep-rooted perennials in certain areas. We have seen the concern of seven authors in the July issue of the ANZAS journal *Search*, about the dangers of desertification in surprisingly widespread areas of Australia. All these things and many more draw attention to the need for continual vigilance by the Environment Department, either directly or through close liaison with other Government departments.

Many people think that the Environment Department is concerned only with national parks, when in fact it is involved with all pollution and conservation measures which are needed to control deterioration of the environment—a world-wide problem nowadays, and increasingly apparent in South Australia. The department needs to be an environmental watchdog, as well as a body to advise and assist interested people and industries in how to go about their business in a thoughtful way which will cause the least possible undesirable side effects to other people and their working and living conditions.

The Minister for the Environment has continued to refer to the need for more money and more staff in the department. Yesterday, I received the following reply to a Question on Notice regarding management plans:

Obviously, with more trained staff the rate of management plan production could be increased.

What is the Minister doing to utilise the broad expertise that is available in the Public Service to meet land management, particularly in park management requirements? We all realise the importance and the significance of land management in connection with our national parks. What is the Minister doing about using the expertise of the soil experts from the Agriculture and Fisheries Department? What are they doing to help the National Parks and Wildlife Service with soil conservation? What about veterinarians to assist in the study of native fauna? What about plant pathologists from the Agriculture and Fisheries Department, and weeds advisers and vermin control officers from the same department? All these people could be used, and their expertise could assist in the management of national parks. What about resource centres involving people in the Education Department, and what about the Engineering and Water Supply Department as regards water management? They could help in the management of our parks. Many other officers from various departments could solve the staff and financial problems relating to the desperate need for the management plans. The expertise available within the full Public Service could be used as an alternative, utilising the Public Service more efficiently and more effectively and offering us an alternative to increasing the size of the Public Service.

I turn now to matters relating to community welfare, and particularly what we have learned through the media connected with changes in the treatment of young law breakers, or family care for young law breakers. I would wish to know much more about the Government's proposals regarding the introduction of further reform in the treatment of young offenders before I comment in detail. However, from what we have read in the media recently, it would appear that major moves are to be made, to be phased in over a two-year period.

They involve the closing of Brookway Park and the transfer of its operations to Vaughan House, McNally, and other community centres, the development of McNally as a South Australian youth training centre, and the introduction of intensive neighbourhood care, a community-centred network of families providing special intensive care services for young offenders. We have been told by the Minister that, with intensive neighbourhood care, juvenile offenders would be released in the community on a contractual basis. I suggest to the Minister that the Opposition will be watching very closely indeed the implementation of any such proposals. It is true that people in the community have received suggestions of such changes with a certain amount of caution. People who have been associated with similar moves in other places, particularly overseas, tell of demonstrable mistakes made in the past in these matters.

I am concerned about the need for extreme care when we look at the quality of probation officers, social workers, and other people in this field. I say without hesitation that we are extremely fortunate in this State in having so many people of quality and dedication working in this area, but I suggest that much will depend on the quality of these people if new methods of reform are to be successful. I refer not only to the effects on the offender himself but also to the acceptance by the community of such moves.

I am particularly concerned about foster care and the placement of foster children. Many arrangements are working well, but many others result in disaster for all concerned. I am of the opinion that not enough support is being provided by the Community Welfare Department or the Government for men and women who are opening their homes and, indeed, their lives to cater for such children. I do not believe enough is being done to assist or train would-be foster parents to enable them to cope with the problems that can occur. Many people see fostering as a wonderful way to contribute something to society. That is exactly what it is, but some people are blinded with kindness and thoughtfulness in their efforts to assist people less advantaged than themselves.

I am aware of cases where seriously disturbed children have been placed with families who I believe are not receiving effective support for the troubles that have arisen through fostering. I am aware that such cases are seriously affecting the life of the families involved. One case relates to the placement of a seriously disturbed child. In my opinion there has been a lack of effective handling of the problems that have arisen in that case, in which an intense and demanding relationship existing between the child and foster mother has seriously affected the life and health of the mother. I am also of the opinion that very little responsibility is taken by the Government in relation to harm suffered by foster parents.

With the closing of such institutions as Brookway Park Training Centre, problems arise associated with the destructive behaviour of some children being fostered, behaviour that can be difficult to control and can be extremely damaging to a foster home. Few would dare deny that any Government might have problems relating to the care of behaviour-problem children, particularly those under foster care. I am afraid that the Government's policy as it affects the Community Welfare Department lacks discipline and practical training for children.

I refer also to the concern that has been expressed regarding inter-country adoption, a matter of importance, I would hope, within the Community Welfare Department. The concern relates to the new regulations applying to the Adoption of Children Act, particularly the Minister's handling of this matter of inter-country

adoptions. When the original criteria were drawn up, inter-country adoptions were not included in the terms of reference. During interviews with the Minister, representatives of the Australian Society for Inter-country Aid Children and the Australian Adoptive Families Association Adoption Agency were told that the omission was an oversight. Even if that were the case (and I would suggest that it was not), the Government was not prepared, and has not been prepared until now, to separate completely inter-country adoptions from the in-country criteria for professional and independent evaluation.

We appreciate that one of the main reasons for formulating new rules for inter-country adoption was to shorten the list of people on the adoptions register. I am sure that any person who has had anything to do with the methods of adopting children realises the necessity of reducing the size of the list to those who can be successful. The other reason is the reduced number of children available for adoption now.

However, both ASIAC and AAFAAA are to be commended for the way they have rallied and called for inter-country adoption to be divorced from the regulations under the legislation that will apply to in-country adoptions. I quote from a letter that was written by ASIAC and AAFAAA, as follows:

We in ICA (inter-country adoption) look at adoption in a different light. We attempt to place orphaned, abandoned, neglected and underprivileged children (the majority of whom are destined to a premature grave) with suitable couples or families in Australia. It is not necessary to reduce the number of waiting parents because people wanting to adopt overseas have given, in the main, much deep thought. Those who happen to "bounce" light-heartedly into the situation are soon detected by our interview and assessment situations. We do not exist to satisfy the paternal needs of would-be adopters. We exist solely for the children overseas who haven't a home, who aren't loved or wanted, and who, through no fault of theirs, haven't a hope in life without ICA.

We agree that much of the criteria to apply to in-country adoption could—indeed, should—apply to the inter-country situation. But we abhor the Government's decision to transplant virtually all criteria to us. No-one here (in South Australia or Australia) has the right to say that a person becomes too old for inter-country adoption at 40 years. Surely it's up to the country from which the couple is adopting. Likewise, no-one here has the right to say that a couple should be married for five years, if they happen to be mature, suitable people, to adopt overseas. And, again, likewise, no-one here has the right to demand that couples already approved for inter-country adoption should have to forego that approval because they don't happen to meet part or parts of the defined in-country criteria.

On reading the enclosed submissions and letters—these were letters and submissions sent to all members of Parliament—

and we ask, please, that you do—you will see that ASIAC and AAFAAA are not united on what they would like to see in those areas we jointly vigorously oppose being transplanted *en masse* and without due consideration to inter-country adoption. The reason we haven't a joint policy is because we have just joined forces over this issue—because to us it is crucial. If the in-country adoption criteria is transplanted *en masse* to our scene, scores of suitable couples will be eliminated—and, as the years go by, scores of children will perish unnecessarily.

Since that letter was written and as a result of much pressure that was applied to the Government by those organisations, including a public meeting that was extremely well attended, the Government has reconvened the Community Welfare Advisory Committee on adoption

matters to enable recommendations to be made on the criteria that should be used to determine the eligibility of people who apply to adopt children from overseas. I again commend these organisations for the work that they have done. They are now preparing a further submission, which is representative of the views of a large well-informed and deeply concerned section of our community.

It is not my intention to go into all the details required to explain the feelings of these organisations in regard to the regulations, but I quote as follows from a letter received from a concerned person in the community (and I have received many letters from people who are particularly concerned about the inter-country adoption situation):

I have enclosed a copy of my letter to Mr. Payne, Minister of Community Welfare, listing my objections to the legislation. If this legislation is approved, it will affect many families who are now approved as adoptive parents. It seems very unfair that the Community Welfare Department could approve of these people one day, and say they are not suitable the next day. Would it not be more reasonable to make the legislation effective on a specific date? The people concerned have spent many long months on the "waiting list", and now they will be told they cannot adopt.

In her letter to the Minister, she stated:

If all adoptive parents must be between the ages of 25 and 40, it will be difficult to find homes for older children, who need the benefit of "experienced" parents. An older child who has been orphaned and institutionalised, sometimes for years, needs parents who have an understanding of their needs and fears. It would seem more realistic to suggest that no parent be more than 40 years older than the child they wish to adopt. This is the criteria used by most major worldwide adoption agencies.

The letter continues:

When my husband and I decided to apply to adopt a child from another country, we were quite amazed that the procedure was so informal. After lodging our application, we were visited in our home by a D.C.W. social worker, who stayed less than one hour, and did not ask anything relevant to the adoption of a child from outside Australia. There was more interest shown in the size of our house, than there was in our ability to cope with parenting. Several weeks later, we were interviewed in Adelaide, again for less than one hour. At that time, we asked about adopting from Vietnam, and were told that D.C.W. did not place children from other countries. Our approval letter arrived within one month, and we later made contact with a group of parents who provided us with relevant information about inter-country adoption, and who suggested some excellent reading material which covered all aspects of adoption. In April 1975 the airlift of children took place, and we were delighted to become parents. Our son was not allocated to any parents, and was placed with us by D.C.W. He was severely malnourished and suffering from spinal tuberculosis. At present he is a very healthy and happy three year old. However, I must point out that we felt we were not asked enough about our reasons for adopting.

I am quoting from this letter to show the concern of most people who are interested in the adoption of children from overseas. The letter continues:

Most people who decide to adopt a child from another country are fully aware of the problems involved. Racial prejudice, ignorance and non-acceptance by his peers will be faced by most adoptees. However, all applicants should be made aware of the varied health problems, some of which are very serious, and not easily diagnosed. Applicants who wish to adopt older children should be referred to families who could prepare them for the arrival of the child, by discussing the problems of withdrawal from the family, possessive behaviour, fear of the dark, dietary problems, etc.

This is only one of many letters I have received from people who are particularly concerned with and who have examined closely into matters relating to inter-country adoption. I would hope that the Government and the Minister in particular will study this situation closely and will provide the necessary assistance to help people who are concerned with the adoption of children from overseas.

I am particularly concerned with problems of intellectually handicapped people. I believe that the community has tended to think of such people as being ill and, for this reason, their care in the past has been medically orientated. I believe this is wrong. The problems of the intellectually handicapped are not mental; they are in most cases educational and as such need social teachers and education rather than doctors to help them manage by themselves in the community.

It is vitally important that our intellectually handicapped should be provided with appropriate assistance to enable them to live in the normal community. It is not at all desirable to lump our intellectually handicapped people in institutions. I do not believe that organisations such as Minda Home and Strathmont are the answer to all the problems associated with these people but, at the same time, I would refer to the magnificent work that these organisations have already undertaken for people who need assistance.

The trend overseas, and in Western Australia particularly, is to provide social trainers to facilitate the integration of the retarded into the community. With the right type of assistance, with help with transport to get to the workshop, and with assistance for home duties it is quite possible for intellectually handicapped people to live with their families or to live together. It is quite possible for them to work satisfactorily, and I believe that is most desirable. From the financial side, we are fast reaching the stage when the community can no longer afford to keep these people in institutions. I believe it would be cheaper to provide various forms of care and assistance in private homes and, in supporting them in this way, I believe that, eventually, they would be much happier.

Another matter of concern to me relates to the special disadvantages of handicapped persons and their families living in country areas. I believe the Government and especially the Education Department should examine this problem, and when I say the Education Department I also refer to the need for the Community Welfare Department to consider this matter, because grave concerns are associated with handicapped people or their families who live in outback areas of this State. In answer to questions in this House both the Ministers of Education and Community Welfare have referred to the need for the Government to study this matter, but I believe up to now very little has been done. I hope that, soon, we will see positive action being taken by this Government in helping in the treatment of intellectually handicapped and handicapped people generally who live in the outback of this State.

Mr. KLUNDER (Newland): I support the motion. I refer to the speech made by the member for Murray, even if it is only because I do not think anyone else would think it worth the trouble, and I do not want him to feel neglected.

Mr. Wotton: If you are not concerned about those things, that's your problem, and the Government's problem, too.

Mr. KLUNDER: I am sure when I am finished the honourable member would rather I had not spoken. The honourable members started off with a mish-mash of unsubstantiated and unfounded allegations in a true

Liberal tradition, and I do not intend to answer hyperbole. He gave many reasons for the importance of the Environment Department. That is hardly surprising news to a Government that set up such a department in the first place. After that, he went off on irrelevant generalities like the need for eternal vigilance, but he did have one distinct election winner. He indicated that staff from other Public Service departments would help mitigate the shortage of staff and money in the Environment Department. But somewhere along the line he did not argue that this would produce an equivalent shortage of staff and money in other departments.

If he can institutionalise that particular argument and make sure that all Public Service departments merely lend out people to other departments without any cost to anybody, I think he has a definite election winner. Apart from that particular matter, I do not think that he produced a case to answer.

I now turn to the speech made by the member for Mount Gambier a couple of weeks ago. I am sorry he is not in the Chamber as I am sure that I would enjoy his interjections almost as much as he would enjoy my speech. I must say in fairness to him that I suspect he was dropped in at the wrong time. One would expect the Deputy Leader to follow the Leader with his Address in Reply speech. The fact that that did not happen, and the quality of the speech produced by the member for Mount Gambier, makes me suspect that he was asked to speak at short notice. I will be kind and start by complimenting him: he did realise the difference between the words "voracity" and "veracity", which puts him well ahead of the rest of his colleagues, who consistently confuse the two.

He raised again that hoary old nonsense that Liberal Party members can decide for themselves how to vote on each issue before them. He may have forgotten that, when the Liberal Party was in Government with a majority of one, all Liberal Party members voted consistently the same way on all major issues. If one takes the member for Mount Gambier's word, that was a situation where 19 people (one of them an Independent) consistently thought and acted in exactly the same way. To me that is reminiscent of a group of zombies, and I thought it rather odd that the member for Mount Gambier should be casting aspersions about 1984 at us when the members of his side consisted of such an incredibly conditioned and non-individualistic group.

The member for Mount Gambier then moved on to unemployment, and stated that the Whitlam Government had raised unemployment from nil to 250 000. I do not have the Federal unemployment figures handy, but for another reason I have the South Australian unemployment figures for much the same period. In 1971-72, the last year of the Liberal Administration in Australia, there were 12 328 unemployed persons in South Australia alone. I do not know whether that means that the member for Mount Gambier was prepared to discount unemployed people in South Australia when he mentioned a figure of nil unemployed during that period.

In 1974-75 there was 19 119 unemployed in South Australia. That is an increase of 55 per cent. I must add a rider that the earlier figure included the figure for the Northern Territory and the later one did not, so the actual increase in unemployed in South Australia was probably more of the order of 60 per cent. In May 1978 there were 40 435 people unemployed in South Australia. That means that there was an increase under the Fraser Administration of 111 per cent. I would like to hear some comment from the member for Mount Gambier about that matter. There has not been any slackening of the unemployment

situation's upward trend, and I suggest that members opposite remember that the three years Mr. Fraser required to put all problems in order will expire next December.

The member for Mount Gambier moved on to economics, and promptly got into deep water after an interjection by the member for Morphett. The member for Mount Gambier claimed that one should not borrow from countries with strong currencies such as Germany and Japan, because we would be required to pay a higher return. That statement did not do much to enhance his reputation with economists because the one or two I told what he said doubled up with laughter.

The unfortunate point is that, even within the Liberal Party, that group of people who always tend to think the same way and act the same way, there is no unanimity about this particular point, because, on the very same day that the member for Mount Gambier told us his views about borrowing, the Federal Treasurer indicated in a report that was printed in the *Advertiser* the following day that Australia was arranging a large loan from a major Swiss bank and was about to join the queue of borrowers on the Japanese capital market. This leads one to suspect that the member for Mount Gambier might be in for a reindoctrination programme, because he is obviously out of step with his Liberal colleagues.

I will pass lightly over his re-tooling statement, except to mention that it might be unwise to encourage industry to replace people with machines at a time of high unemployment, because people who are unemployed do not buy the goods that the machines produce. When members opposite talk of killing the goose that laid the golden egg, they must remember that it is consumers who buy goods at the manufacturers' profit that they make for that manufacturer in the first place.

At that stage the member for Mount Gambier moved to education, a field where one would have hoped both by interest and training he would have some degree of expertise. It is a pity that the facts that came out in his speech militated against that particular view. He claims that 2½ to 3 colleges of advanced education are now surplus in South Australia alone. As usual, he did not tell us which colleges he would close and which people he would put out of work.

He then suggested that the colleges of advanced education might well begin to diversify, showing total ignorance of the fact that that is happening and has been happening for the past five years. There I find myself in a dilemma: usually the member for Mount Gambier, in his educational thinking, is somewhere around 10 years behind the times. This particular time he only happens to be five years behind the times, so I do not know whether to condemn him for being behind the times or praise him for being five years ahead of himself. Certainly, we have to pay credit where credit is due, and what turns out to be a very small step for mankind may well turn out to be a very large one for the member for Mount Gambier.

For the honourable member's benefit I will read a list of the courses available in colleges of advanced education that are, in fact, not associated with education. Salisbury College of Advanced Education has an associate diploma in recreation, an associate diploma in parks and wildlife management, and a graduate diploma in recreation. Sturt College of Advanced Education has a diploma in applied science and nursing, an associate diploma in diagnostic radiography, and a Bachelor of Applied Science in speech pathology.

Adelaide College of Advanced Education has several courses that are marginally on the outskirts of education. It has graduate diplomas in reading education, educational

administration, and religious education. It also has an associate diploma in interpreting and translating. Murray Park College of Advanced Education has a diploma in art, a diploma in journalism, an associate diploma in liberal studies, and a graduate diploma in arts and music.

Torrens College of Advanced Education, as it incorporates the South Australian School of Art, has for many years produced graduates who are not in the least involved in education of any kind. It even has of recent years, introduced associate diplomas in theatre arts and associate diplomas in Aboriginal studies, and, I think, also the normal associate diplomas in design, performing arts, and so on. Here one can see that we have a case like the famous Duke of Plaza Toro in The Gondoliers, where a Liberal shadow Minister of Education is leading his educational regimen from behind.

The member for Mount Gambier then defended Senator Carrick, which I would have thought was something most people would try to avoid doing: it does not say much for his common sense. He stated again that deft global statement that schools will not suffer under Carrick guidelines.

I will deal with that matter later in my speech, and I will deal with that peculiar statement of Senator Carrick that States are better off under the new Federalism. I will not argue with the next point raised by the honourable member, namely, that under previous State and Federal Liberal Governments the primary sector of education received a raw deal. I hope he noted that under a State Labor Government there has been a rapid improvement in conditions in junior primary and primary schools. I am pleased to see that he wishes State and Federal funding to be maintained for pre-school education, especially as the Federal Government's contribution is dropping in real value. It leads again to the very worrying question: is the member for Mount Gambier out of step again? Are his Federal big brothers watching him, and will we have a reconditioned member for Mount Gambier in the House in the next session?

Then the shadow Minister of Education moved into educational research, and surprised us with his statement, backed by a university study no less, that better teaching produces better results. I thank him humbly for that profound statement, and assure him that the shock waves of that brilliantly original thought are still reverberating around educational circles. There is even more to come.

He next moved into mathematics, and told us that it was a sin that 20 per cent of students entering secondary schools were below average in literacy and/or numeracy, and he assured us that he had not plucked that figure out of the air. Perhaps it is my lack of college education, but I have always understood that, by definition, 50 per cent of a given sample in a top-hat curve distribution would be below average for that particular sample. It is distinctly possible that the honourable member's four years of primary school followed by a college education brought him in advance of my understanding of mathematics.

Allowing for his lack of knowledge of mathematics, one still ends up with his lack of knowledge in educational matters. Twenty years ago, it was usual for about 30 per cent of students to be retarded one or more years of schooling if in the 12 to 13 years of age bracket. Is he claiming that we are doing better than that? Most certainly, from the tenor of his speech, I suspect the opposite, but it is possible that he did not have time to do his homework, and that the Deputy Leader, whose place he took in the line-up, had some things to answer for: not that I think that the Deputy Leader's contribution was enhanced by his delay in making it. The honourable member then claimed that we had gone backwards in our

educational system in no longer retaining the Q.C. and P.C. certificates, which once determined one's chances of promotion from primary to secondary school.

I must admit that, at that time, I lost my normal perfect control and interjected that, in those days, one could still have been at primary school at the age of 17 years. The shadow Minister of Education, now present in the Chamber, replied that that interjection was definitely wrong, and that he would not accept it. For his benefit, my interjection was that 17-year-olds could still be in primary school. I am pleased that he is now present in the Chamber, and I will give him an opportunity to eat his words.

I have with me the *Education Gazette* dated 15 October 1956, page 278 of which shows the age grade table as at 1 August 1956. It shows definitely that there was a 17-year-old student in grade 7 in primary school as at 1 August that year. There was also an 18-year-old student in primary school at the same time.

Mr. Allison: Quite a lot of them were teachers, too.

Mr. KLUNDER: I will not accept that interjection.

Mr. Allison: They were junior teachers. I was teaching at the time.

Mr. KLUNDER: Perhaps the honourable member was included in the primary school lists I have. There were two 18-year-olds in grade 6 that year; in addition, two 18-year-olds in grade 5; and two 18-year-olds in grade 4. To cap it off, there was a 15-year-old in grade 1 in a South Australian primary school on 1 August 1956. If that student had been promoted promptly and carefully, he would have been only 22 years of age by the time he reached grade 7. What this leads to is that the honourable member again has not done his homework and, for some reason or other, apparently he wishes to return to those good old days. I regard the shadow Minister's public declaration of his ignorance as a cry for help. He can rest assured that I will do my utmost to continue to educate him for a job to which he aspires.

I now wish to deal with that rather extraordinary document released by Senator Carrick on 9 June 1978, in which he sets the guidelines for the education commissions from 1979-81. It purports to be a document on the basis of which planning can proceed on a triennial basis, yet its major premises are false and it is so inconsistent with the previous document that should have allowed sensible and continuous planning for the triennium 1978-80 that I pity anyone who is naive enough to believe that one can carry out educational planning on the basis of this document over any period exceeding the time between now and the next set of guidelines in 12 months (if one wishes to be optimistic), and between now and the Federal Budget (if one wishes to be realistic).

The economic base that underlay the guidelines last year came in the Schools Commission's guidelines of 3 June 1977, in which Senator Carrick stated:

The Government notes the significantly improved capacity of the States under the revised Commonwealth-State financial arrangements to contribute to these activities from their own resources.

I do not know how many times it has been pointed out in the House that that is a downright untruth, but the Opposition continues to raise that hoary bit of nonsense. In my maiden speech last year, I indicated that, whereas the money to the States that year had increased by about 8 per cent, the inflation rate of 13 per cent meant that, in real terms, the purchasing power had declined by 5 per cent or more.

Mr. Nankivell: Do some research into the finances of the provinces of Canada and see how it can happen.

Mr. KLUNDER: I thought that I was talking about

South Australia. Is the honourable member sure that he is not in the wrong House?

Mr. Nankivell: It has a Federalism policy.

Mr. KLUNDER: It is only remotely similar, because Canada has all sorts of problems in terms of language difficulties. If I can remember offhand what the unemployment figure for Canada was in 1976, I am fairly sure that it was about 7 per cent. If the honourable member wants us to follow that example, I suggest that he try to sell that in his district. This year, the economic centre-piece of the guidelines is as follows:

We have had regard also to the financial responsibilities of the States in education, particularly for schools, and to the capacity which the States now have to contribute to their own priority areas of expenditure from their own revenues.

That is fairly meaningless and innocuous, and it is intended to convey a cosy impression that the States are financially secure in their arrangements with the Commonwealth, but that is not so. In the press statement on 12 June, Senator Carrick was much more explicit. He said:

The funding available to the State systems in 1979 should be more than sufficient to maintain and enhance their progress. Clearly, there should be significantly increased spending power within the States.

Let us now look at the financial capacity of the States in terms of the share of tax offered to the States in 1979. The *Advertiser* on 23 June of this year carried the headline, "Government squeezes States", and went on as follows:

The Federal Government yesterday imposed on the States one of the toughest monetary squeezes for more than 40 years. In 1978-79 the States will get 5.1 per cent more in total funds from the Commonwealth with an expected inflation rate of about 7 per cent.

The only reason the States are guaranteed that figure is because they are guaranteed a fixed proportion of the general revenue funds, and the general revenue funds rose by 10.8 per cent. That is no credit or reflection on Mr. Fraser, as it was a Whitlam provision which made sure that the States got a fixed proportion of the general revenue fund. This political chicanery of the Federal Liberal Government is such that it continues to promote the myth that the States are better off under the generosity of a Federal Liberal Government. I do not think there is any excuse for that bit of hypocrisy by Senator Carrick. He is aware that the States have not significantly improved their financial position over that of the previous financial year. One notes that—and one has to be kind to Senator Carrick, although not many people are nowadays—his guideline statement was dated 9 June, and that the squeeze on the States did not occur until 22 June.

This leads us to three alternative possibilities as to his description of the rosy picture of State finances, as given on page 1 of the guidelines and in his press statement on 12 June. The first alternative is that, on 9 June and 12 June 1978, Senator Carrick was not aware that a further crunch on the States was coming on 22 June. The only reason for such ignorance could have been that Mr. Fraser did not want to trust him with that information. The second possibility is that he knew, but chose deliberately to mislead the public. The third possibility is that he knew, but was not bright enough to realise that what would happen on 22 June would totally invalidate his statements on 9 June and 12 June. None of these alternatives leads one to have a great deal of faith in either the ability or the consistency of the honourable Senator.

To give some idea of the consistency of the Federal Liberal Government's planning in education, we should examine the way in which the tertiary sector has been treated over the past two years. I refer members to the

Guidelines for Education Commissions 1978-80 Rolling Triennium dated 3 June 1977, page 2 number 7, as follows:

For the years 1979-80 the planning guidelines provide for a real growth in the base programmes of 2 per cent each year for the tertiary area . . .

That 2 per cent was subsequently removed for universities and colleges of advanced education at very short notice, and caused considerable dislocation in those institutions.

The tertiary sector has now been confronted with a decrease in funding of slightly more than .5 per cent, and since the TAFE sector has had its allocation increased by \$18 900 000 within the tertiary sector, universities and colleges of advanced education have suffered a decrease in funding of about 2.2 per cent. It is difficult enough to cut back on expenditure; the Federal Government, over its 2½ years in office, has managed to prune only \$200 000 000 from its \$3 500 000 000 deficit, despite some of the most Draconian measures introduced in this country since the depression. It, however, expects universities and colleges of advanced education to knock \$33 600 000 off their capital expenditure budget within one year. This is obviously a case of "Don't do as I do, but do as I say."

To add the usual insult to injury, at the same time as the Federal Liberal Government slashed \$33 600 000 from the capital expenditure of universities and colleges of advanced education, it invited the commission to "explore the possibility of making a start on some new projects in 1979." In other words, "You have \$33 600 000 less, but you had better do something extra." It is like cutting off someone's head and then telling him to think harder.

After all this, the guidelines still offer advice as to what will happen in 1980 and 1981, as if anyone in any sector of education will still believe Senator Carrick, or Mr. Fraser, or any Liberal statement on education.

I now turn to the Federal Liberal Government guidelines on the Schools Commission. Again, on page 11 of the guidelines, the good Senator refers to the "enhanced financial position of the States in terms of the new tax-sharing arrangements." I have already dealt with that. Also on page 11, considerable mention is made of the fact that, by the end of 1978, most States will have passed the resource targets set by the Karmel Committee. Oddly, no mention was made of another group of schools which, many years ago, surpassed these resource levels and now operates well above them.

Before I start on the way in which the funds for Government schools have been hacked about in these guidelines, it is necessary to digress for a moment to deal with the nonsense one hears from the uninformed regarding the cost to the Government system if non-government schools closed and forced the State to take up the burden of educating these children. It is the old threat, repeated by Senator Carrick, that, if the private schools all closed down, the State Governments would have to find that much more money to educate those children, too.

We need to distinguish between average cost and marginal cost, two fairly elementary economic concepts, and I must say that I am most surprised that the member for Mount Gambier chose to associate himself with such a spurious line of reasoning.

Mr. Venning: What a man to pick!

Mr. KLUNDER: I didn't pick him; he picked himself. He did so on page 1273 of *Hansard* on 7 December 1977, when he said that the cost of maintaining 19 300 students at about \$1 000 each would cost the State Government an extra \$19 000 000. I think he more or less quoted Senator Carrick, who made that same sort of comment in a radio broadcast a few days earlier. I have here a transcript of the interview with the Federal Minister of Education on the A.B.C. radio programme A.M., recorded on 27 June

1977, considerably earlier. Senator Carrick indicated that it was better to keep the kids with a handful of dollars in independent schools rather than to be forced to pay \$1 000, which is the cost of keeping the same child in a State school.

Mr. Chapman: He's been a very successful Minister, hasn't he?

Mr. KLUNDER: If one measures it by the number of throats he has cut, yes, he has been very successful. To deal with such nonsense, let us first establish the facts. The cost of educating a child in a Government primary school in South Australia is \$845 a year, and educating a Government secondary school student costs \$1 564 a year. The non-government schools in 1979 will receive money from both State and Federal Governments and, according to the various documents I have been able to consult, this amount varies from \$488 to \$629 in primary schools and from \$606 to \$902 in secondary schools.

In other words, the total Federal and State assistance to children in non-government primary schools varies from 58 per cent to 73 per cent of the cost of educating that child in a Government school. The corresponding range of percentages in the secondary sphere is from 43 per cent to 58 per cent. In all but the higher levels of support in the secondary sector, the State Government provides approximately half of the financial aid.

Let us in the first instance consider the case of a single child who transfers from a non-government school to a Government school. What is the cost to the Government school system of educating this extra child?

One can perceive that the cost is minimal in economic terms: the provision of books, marginally extra wear and tear on school equipment and other sundry items is hardly worth \$845 or \$1 564 a year. The marginal cost of transferring a single child is thus seen to be negligible. This marginal cost rises as more children transfer to a given Government school. These costs include extra furniture and, at given points, extra buildings and extra staff. It is unlikely that the marginal cost would equal, or even get near, the average cost, as such things as central administration staff, buildings, school ovals and grounds would not have to be increased proportionally to the influx of students.

What level the marginal cost would reach is open to conjecture. Certainly, in the low transfer region, the State may well benefit from such transfers, as the marginal cost added by a limited number of transfers may well be outweighed financially by the reduction in the support the States give to the non-government schools. If one could be sure that the transferees brought their Commonwealth financial support with them, the State system would be able to absorb a large percentage, if not all, of the non-government school population without cost to itself.

Whether Senator Carrick would transfer the funding from the non-government sector to the Government sector I would not wish to guess, but he did say that these children were Australians, too, and that they were entitled to Government support just like other Australians. I would hate to think that these Australians of whom he was so fond would suddenly attract less of his subsidies merely because they transferred from a non-government school to a Government school.

For schools there is to be a 1 per cent increase in funds, that is, \$6 300 000 extra. Oddly enough, at the same time as the schools are getting extra money the amount that is available to Government schools, instead of rising, drops. I would like to indicate to the House by how much the Government schools will be deprived and, in doing so, I shall be able to show members what a work of art this document of Senator Carrick's really is. On page 3 of the

document, for instance, the worthy Senator indicates that about \$9 000 000 will be cut from the capital grants to both Government and non-government schools. It is not until page 13 that one finds out that the non-government capital programme will suffer by \$1 000 000. By the process of subtraction with which the member for Mount Gambier may be familiar the Government school capital programme will therefore be cut by \$8 000 000. I do not wish to accuse the Senator of having deliberately tried to hide that figure, although it is not related to anything else on page 13, but I think I could be excused for considering his style a rather unusual one.

However, so far the Government schools have lost \$8 000 000. There is the continued loss due to the failure of the Federal Liberal Government in 1977 to continue with cost supplementation on capital works. One notes in passing that the guidelines in the 1978 edition carefully state that cost supplementation arrangements in 1979 will be the same as in 1978. Nowhere does it say that this amounts to only partial supplementation.

The Government, in accepting the recommendations of the Galbally Committee, will generously provide, from within the existing \$631 000 000, \$1 000 000 to Government schools and \$500 000 to non-government schools to provide funding for migrant and multi-cultural education. Had that sum come from outside the \$631 000 000 I would have been happy, but even as it is it implies that the ratio of migrant children in Government schools to non-government schools is the same ratio as funding, that is 2:1. Unfortunately, that is not the case. The correct ratio of Government schoolchildren to non-government schoolchildren who are migrants is not 2:1 but 4:1. In South Australia in 1976, there were 42 561 migrant children in South Australian Government schools and 10 193 migrant children in non-government schools, and I have no cause to believe that the situation is vastly different in other States or that the proportion has changed materially since 1976.

It is difficult to gauge the exact amount of the loss to the Government school system inherent in this carve-up, but a loss it definitely is. The Government has finally accepted the commission's view, and that of every Australian, that the bulk of non-government schools, those in category 6, the very poorest of the non-government schools, require urgent additional assistance, and it will provide \$5 per primary student and \$6 per secondary student to category 6 non-government schools. I applaud the move but I am disgusted with the method by which it has been implemented and the amount of money available. The \$2 500 000 to do this will come from within the \$631 000 000, that is in effect from the Government schools.

It should, of course, have come from outside the allocation of this \$631 000 000, and it should have been bigger. Even the guidelines themselves acknowledge that is a rather poor amount of money to grant to the category 6 schools because it will only just enable them to keep marking time. The final transfer from the Government schools is of course the truly disgusting one. At a time of financial stringency, amounting to catastrophic proportions announced by the Federal Liberal Government, to be implemented by the Federal Liberal Government, and paid for of course by everyone else, unless one happens to be rich and can hire lawyers to deal with it, the Federal Liberal Government has the hide to increase the share of taxpayers' money to the very richest schools in the land, the ones that passed the resources index figures many years ago.

The cost of this obscene little favour to the old boys' network schools will be more than \$2 400 000 in 1979 and

considerably more in 1980. Here I do have faith in the Liberals—this is one promise that they will keep! Now from whom has this \$2 400 000 been taken? From the Government schools and to a large extent from the Catholic system which is struggling to keep going. Whereas the poorest schools in category 6 benefited to the tune of a mere \$5 or \$6 a pupil, the richest schools (categories 1 and 2) will gain up to \$17 a pupil. The rise of 1 per cent in the schools' budget did not help the Government schools at all. Instead of gaining a proportion of that \$6 100 000, they lost at least \$7 000 000. All this is, naturally enough, a con trick or as the South Australian Institute of Teachers has said "a pea and thimble trick". By claiming that a section of the Australian school population, namely the non-government sector, is short of funds it desperately needs, Senator Carrick diverts from the Government sector and makes sure that a fair whack of it goes to further the privileges of the sons and daughters of the rich. Who will suffer?

Mr. Venning: Who are the rich? Name a few.

Mr. KLUNDER: I could name the member for Rocky River, for a start. The rich section of our population cannot suffer; they were already well off and have come out with more, and with the promise of much more to come. The poor non-government schools will continue to suffer because the help that has come to them is only just enough to keep them marking time. The Government system suffers through a quite drastic reduction in funds and marginally related industries, such as the building industry, suffer through a decrease in the capital funding made available, amounting to \$41 600 000. The building industry cannot take too much more of that sort of cutback.

Children, except the children of the rich, suffer because their education is not as good as it could or should be. Ultimately, this country will suffer from lack of investment in its most valuable resource. I conclude with three quotes. One is a rather plaintive one from the Schools Commission Report for the triennium 1979-81 dated April 1978, and is as follows:

Because of the undesirability of a future involving continuing transfer of Commonwealth funds from Government to non-government schools . . .

The second quote is from the Federal Liberal Party education platform, page 28, as follows:

There will be continued expansion in all sectors . . .

The final quote is from the *South Australian Teachers Journal* of 21 June, where John Gregory is reported as saying:

The Federal Government has abandoned its responsibility to the Government school sector . . .

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I support the motion. We have before us in this debate Parliamentary Paper No. 1, which incorporates His Excellency the Governor's Speech delivered when opening Parliament on 13 July this year, the Second Session of the Forty-third Parliament. Early in that Speech the Governor referred to the passing of the late Hon. Frank Potter, M.L.C., who joined the Parliament in 1959 and became President of the Legislative Council in 1975. I join with my colleagues in expressing sympathy to Mrs. Potter and her family. Every member is remembered for his contribution to the Legislature in one way or another, and I am sure that members on both sides of the House would agree that the late Hon. Mr. Potter made a sizeable contribution to the Parliament. Indeed, his advice to new members in particular was ever ready when they were seeking a grasp of procedures.

I take this opportunity to convey to the House my

personal appreciation to both the late Mr. Potter and Mrs. Potter for their concern and effort to assist me in 1975 when I suffered a serious leg injury. Outside my immediate family, on that occasion the Potters were the first to attend at the hospital and offer their assistance, a gesture that I shall not forget in a hurry. Indeed, would Mrs. Potter or any member of her family be in similar circumstances I shall be only too pleased to return the sort of genuine offer that was extended to me on that occasion. It is unfortunate, I think, that far too often appreciation is expressed about members after they have passed on and not often enough when they are serving in their office.

In accordance with practice, reference was made again to the seasonal conditions that are prevailing in the State. In this instance widespread rains were reported, in contrast to the severe drought and its effects over the past several years. The brief reference in his Speech to the rural situation, I believe, demonstrates the Government's lack of regard for the importance of the State's rural sector.

The Government is quick to take comfort from widespread rainfall and, of course, we all recognise the need for this as an essential ingredient of primary production. Let me remind members on the other side of the House that it will take some country townships and rural residents of South Australia several years to recover from the battering they have experienced during the droughts and the consequent low income period. Many have suffered and will suffer extreme hardship, yet already we see signs of complacency creeping in among those who seem to accept that, because it has rained, the problems of the rural sector have been solved.

This is far from the reality of the situation, and certainly cannot be established. In fact, now more than ever before support and assistance are required to rehabilitate after probably the worst drought in South Australia's agricultural history. Government, along with banks and other lending authorities, must recognise that in most cases real contribution to farm income will not be forthcoming automatically nor in some cases for several years.

Soil recovery in the low rainfall districts, restocking, overdue maintenance of pastures, fencing and structural improvements are all areas that will require time and money before a real profit return can be enjoyed by the farmers and their families, let alone the continued requirement to service loans that have accumulated in the interim period.

I believe a further problem that has occurred has been the youth drain to metropolitan centres from rural districts. Indeed, not only will there be a labour shortage in some parts of the outback, but, more importantly, we will be left without an essential youth element to perform that work.

Above all, the current level of capital debt in our rural sector is more than alarming, to say the least, and it ill-behoves any member of the Government to assume that success and good times are around the corner for the farmers, simply because they have heard reports of good rainfalls in the outback. When assessing applications for assistance our Government departments are all too ready to brand the rural applicants as unviable. This attitude is in stark contrast to the many advances made to urban and metropolitan ventures which have been propped up by Government grants and loans, that is, of course, where it is politically convenient to do so.

An example of this was reflected in a public speech recently by a leading South Australian producer, Mr. John Kerin, who said in his President's report to the U.F. and G. conference last week:

One in eight applications for drought assistance were

refused carry-on finance because of non-viability. As approximately 1 400 applications had been received, where then, do the 175 go for their very basic living expenses if all else is denied them?

That is a good question. Those farmers, who are in trouble, do not qualify for unemployment benefits, and if the case of Kangaroo Island's soldier settlers is any example of departmental viability assessment it is about time the Government engaged some expertise to advise them. Certainly in that 1976 Kangaroo Island case, where 21 settlers were declared unviable by the Minister of Lands, the Government made a serious error of judgment. As was subsequently proved by the Land Settlement Committee, the majority of those settlers should never have been on the common list of financial failure. I agree that six or seven of the 21 were in a financially difficult if not hopeless situation, and they have been rehabilitated accordingly, but, of the rest, the vast majority should never have been subjected to the indignity and distress caused by the original announcement of that Minister.

Mr. Whitten: Did you tell Sinclair about that?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I served on that committee with the honourable member who interjected, and he should know better than to interject on that subject. He knows, as well as I (and as do others of the committee), that I am still of the opinion that, if the Minister of Lands, in conjunction with the Federal Minister for Primary Industry, had been allowed to continue with that war service land settlement investigation, without the interference of the Premier of this State and his ill-informed officers, in particular Mr. Danny Bayles, then much of the hurt and distress suffered by my constituents would have been avoided.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN: Before adjourning for dinner, I was talking about the Government's assessment of the Kangaroo Island situation. I am pleased to report that, in accordance with the recommendations of the Land Settlement Committee, most of the settlers who were allowed to retain their broadacre holdings are doing extremely well in the circumstances and that those six or seven to whom I referred earlier and who had been relieved of their broadacre holdings and debts are satisfactorily rehabilitated in their own homes with access to small allotments on licence.

The matter of lease-rental reduction to a point of parity with other like war service schemes in this State must be resolved this session and a realistic approach determined to the saline land problems experienced by some of the settlers in that community.

These are matters to be taken up in another place, and I hope that all members will support me in having them resolved when debated in this Chamber.

Finally on that subject, I would agree with the many representatives of primary-based organisations in South Australia that a rural bank with a charter to lend moneys at realistic interest rates is essential and urgently required. For far too long trading banks and stock firms have feasted off the farmers and graziers of this country. Farm and station development is a long-term process, sometimes taking the efforts of several generations, and, accordingly, long-term capital funding is required. It takes hard-working, patient and tolerant men to make the grade in this particular practice and, accordingly, their backers and bankers must be made of the same stuff.

Generally speaking, farmers do not seek handouts. They do not seek to be propped up with subsidies; what they expect from the State Government, however, is relief from succession duty on property assets passing particularly between their family members. They also

expect the opportunity to grow what they like and to market their produce where and when they like, without blackmail or interference from politically-motivated unionists. Given time, I shall come back to that subject later, but I am sure that all members know exactly what I mean on that issue.

Having addressed the House in reply to the first couple of paragraphs in the Governor's speech, I now turn to the body of the document which, as we all know, was obviously prepared by the Premier and his band of Fraser knockers. The Speech has been used as a "tool of the Executive" on this occasion to slam the Federal Government. This Government has abused its authority in preparing such a document in that vein. Paragraph after paragraph refers to the Federal Government-State entitlement of funds, restrictions on the State, cut-backs, severity of constraints, pressure and hardship, extreme courses of action, persistent refusals by the Commonwealth, etc. No credit whatsoever is given for the assistance that we, as a State, receive from the Federal Government: only direct and implied criticism from cover to cover.

No fewer than eight times in paragraph 4 of the document reference is made to the depressed and gloomy state of our economy caused by the present Federal Government, thereby abusing the forum of opening day for this biased Party-political purpose. It is disgraceful that this should be allowed to go on, and it sets the stage for Government members to continue the debate in this same abusive vein. We have learned to expect personal and one-eyed abuse from the member for Stuart but unfortunately the new member for Morphett, who has recently returned from the mumps and should know better, has descended to the same low-level attack.

In fairness to my Federal colleagues, it should be remembered that, before going to the polls in 1975, Mr. Fraser warned all Australians of the need to tighten their belts. His financial policies were designed on that theme. His Government was elected, and the A.L.P. socialist philosophy and Mr. Whitlam were dumped on that occasion. Again, in 1977, Mr. Fraser warned the people of his intentions to curb inflation, revitalise the private sector and cut Public Service growth and expenditure, and again his Government was returned with a record majority.

Mr. Groom: Why didn't he tell the truth?

Mr. CHAPMAN: That is the truth. I have much information to bring to the attention of the House, and I do not want to be interjected on by Government members in that rude fashion.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I think that he is possibly out of order. He does considerable interjecting, too.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Surely, in the meantime, it is fair to recognise the mandate that Mr. Fraser has in this regard and co-operate to the extent at least of giving credit where credit is due. Regarding the claim of a significant curtailment in the availability of funds, etc., the truth of the matter is that the overall reduction in this year's Commonwealth allocation to South Australia is 5.1 per cent, which includes general revenue funds and specific purpose payments. General revenue funds rose by 10.67 per cent, but there is no increase in the specific purpose capital funds. The increase of 10.67 per cent can be used by the States any way they like. That information was incorporated in the question I asked in the House yesterday and referred to again in Question Time today. The progressive increases in the State's funding share over the past several years has been as follows: 1975-76, \$975 000 000, of which \$ 365 000 000 was untied; 1976-77, \$1 033 000 000 total funding, of which \$433 000 000 was

untied; and 1977-78, \$1 163 000 000, of which \$507 000 000 is untied. In 1978-79, the current period, the untied grant has been increased by a further 10.67 per cent to \$560 000 000, which is available to the State for spending in any area it chooses.

At page 5 of the Speech, we see the words, "In 1978-79 it proposes to cut . . ." By adopting more market-oriented policies, the State Housing Commissions should be able to recoup some of the claimed cut-back of \$60 000 000. As to page 6, paragraph 13, "The lower level of funding by the Commonwealth," etc., the Commonwealth is committed to provide \$200 000 000 over the five years 1978-79 to 1982-83 for water resource projects in the State. In line with page 7, paragraph 18, "This severe reduction in funds . . ." the Commonwealth is still committed to spend \$300 000 000 over the five years from 1978-79, and I have no doubt that that will be done. All in all, the message I gain from the two sides of the political argument is that the Federal Government is committed to careful management of the public taxes and aims to uphold its promises in that regard, and this State Government is committed to a welfare vote-capturing programme which it can no longer afford without raising State taxation dramatically and extending service fees in a whole host of non-producing areas simply to keep public servants in jobs, and retaining schemes such as the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, and the like.

The expressed view of the member for Stuart last week, at page 143 of *Hansard* of 20 July 1978, demonstrates quite clearly the hatred of the Government for industrial profits, and indeed the hatred of that member for a healthy free enterprise system. He said:

This lack of work opportunities in the manufacturing industries is a direct result of the capitalist system. The free-enterprise ethic, based on the need to continue to make high profits, operates its activities with that goal in mind.

The sooner Government members realise that profit in all forms of industry is essential and that they fight for this cause, the sooner we will get down to solving the unemployment problem. Healthy, wealthy business is vital to the welfare of all, both employers and employees. Profit is the axle grease of the nation. The pride of employees of attachment to profitable industry is almost a thing of the past with this Government and, until that pride returns, industrial unrest will fester and economic disaster will result. People like some of the left-wingers on the other side of this place have deliberately and maliciously wounded industry in South Australia, and they seem hell-bent on keeping that wound open. A frustrated constituent of mine wrote the other day, making certain observations. I do not have too many frustrated constituents, but I am sure honourable members will appreciate the position of this person when I read what he had to say. He said:

If I have an article to sell and you are a prospective buyer, we get together and negotiate an agreed price. If you accept the price I ask, or I accept the price you offer, then there is a sale. If neither gives way, then there is no sale. This same principle applies in the labour market, complicated by law. If I have labour to sell, a deal only takes place if the buyer of labour believes that you can make a profit on the price of that labour. If he does not believe that, he does not employ.

That principle is what we call the unemployment problem. That is the situation we are in, and it demonstrates how far apart are employer and employee in this State and how wide the gap is becoming. The work force has so far priced itself out of jobs in industry that employers are retrenching and withdrawing from development and expansion at an alarming rate. I do not blame the employees as much as I do their union leaders and those in Government who

promote the cause of the worker against, instead of for, the profit-seeking employer. Some degree of balance is desirable, but there is a deadlock in the field.

Every week, I meet people in rural industry who tell me that they have a tremendous amount of work to be done but they cannot afford to employ, not on the basis of the wages they have to pay, but on the basis of the ancillary costs that go with wages in this State. It is not that we have not got the work, but the gap is far too wide. Probably their greatest concern is that they must see value for that expenditure, and they must also see some degree of profit from the whole exercise, otherwise it does not happen. There is no question about the fear of investors and would-be employers in South Australia.

I refer now to a short press release from Australia's biggest family fishing organisation, A. Raptis and Sons, on 22 November 1977, prior to shifting their fishing and processing interests from South Australia to Karumba, Queensland. This is what Mr. George Raptis released in the form of a public document. He said:

The company was forced to move to an area where it could develop and expand.

That is what is occurring amongst an alarming number of investors or would-be industrial investors in South Australia. It will take years for industrialists and commercial interests to live down the Government's earlier expressed desire to have worker participation in management. Despite the Premier's desperate attempts to soften the impact of the initial announcements, his own Minister of Labour and Industry in South Australia has never clearly negated that originally announced intention. The Minister has withdrawn from debate on the issue and has been strangely quiet on the whole subject of employee participation in management, either by legislation or voluntarily. Indeed, the same Minister was noticeably quiet and then absent altogether—I understand in Queensland, by his own admission recently—during the live sheep show-down earlier this year, as was also the Minister of Agriculture. I understand the Minister of Agriculture was in South Australia during the time, but was underground. The Minister did not surface at Dry Creek, at Wallaroo, or in Victoria Square, as did my colleagues, metropolitan and country, to support those growers who were only seeking to sell their own produce where and when they felt so inclined.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CHAPMAN: Before departing from the subject of the Governor's Speech and dealing with matters of concern to the electorate at large, I again express disappointment that the Government has not seen fit to drop from this type of prepared document those parts that reflect a Party-political bias by implication. That type of speech, in my view, should deal with matters pertaining to straight legislative programmes and matters of interest to the public, without Party-political bias.

I am satisfied that the majority of South Australian people have had a bellyful of the A.L.P., and I am sure they will demonstrate that at the earliest opportunity. We have been told that we are stuck with the Premier and his bandits for some time yet, and so we are for the duration of this term, but hopefully in the interim period he will set out to manage the people's money, the tax revenue in this State, a little more responsibly, and account for its expenditure a little more properly than has been the case in recent years.

For a number of years, the Auditor-General has publicly reported mismanagement, unaccountability, and a serious lack of sound bookkeeping in a number of Government departments, as well as malpractices of a

more serious nature. The censure motion against the Minister of Health in another place the other day in my view was years overdue. All the weaving and ducking by the Premier, administrators at hospital level, and other officers will not erase from my mind the shocking and disgraceful unaccountability of certain public hospital affairs in this State over the past several years.

Last year, few people wanted to know about this subject. Curiously, the Premier was the first one after the 1977 election to raise the issue. He did so with a deliberate view in mind. It was clear to me, when I heard him in this House, that he intended to bury the subject from public ventilation, but he failed to do so. Slowly but surely, more questions were asked, and now the media has become more inquiring, and not even the Premier himself can keep the lid on the issue, even though he has engaged a committee to cover the ground previous committees and the Auditor-General's officers have covered. I do not have time to go through all the findings, and I do not intend to do so, but I draw to the attention of the House, very briefly, the following finding reported by Mr. Epps, from the Auditor-General's Department:

The audit examination disclosed that internal control was weak or non-existent, budgeting was poor, and reporting ineffective. The records failed to furnish information necessary to determine and supervise policy. As a result of these deficiencies, the department incurred losses through thefts, excess wastage, and lack of quality control. It is estimated that the extent of these losses was approximately \$80 000 per annum.

Following further reported detail of his findings, Mr. Epps said:

This would indicate that a large proportion of estimated losses were due to thefts.

That finding has not been negated; indeed, as the Government's own admission that it has not been negated, it appointed the Corbett Committee, and we all know the content of that report, which has been tabled in the House recently. After six weeks, and a scratch of the surface by those officers, they brought down a report with virtually the same findings with which we were equipped last year, the year before, and the year before that by the Auditor-General of this State.

The subject is far from covered up and it will not be covered up, because the public of South Australia will not allow that to happen. It is no good the Premier, anyone else on the Government side, or anyone outside the Parliament trying to tell me that this is a historic event, because the recent Corbett Report reveals that these problems are not two, three or four years old: the findings that have been revealed in that report are happenings within the past two months, so there is no way, in my view, in which that subject can or should be buried.

I should like to draw to the attention of the House some other matters that are disturbing the public. They are identified financial mismanagement, administrative breakdown, and wastage of taxpayers' money. Collectively, they will bring down this Government. The specific matters that I have been requested to draw to the attention of the House are worrying issues and are of a dictatorial flavour. Take, for example, the letter that was sent out from the Minister of Labour and Industry some months ago to all district councils during the expenditure of State unemployment relief funds. The letter stated:

A non-unionist shall not be engaged for any work on a State employment scheme project to the exclusion of a well-conducted unionist. The provision shall apply to all persons other than those who have never been previously employed or now seeking employment under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme.

In other words "comply" was the message from the Minister, "or no money for the project" and "no money for the council concerned". The next matter in the same vein appeared in the *Education Gazette* on 31 May 1978, where again a message with a dictatorial flavour was delivered to the public and to the readers of that gazette. The extract was headed "For the use of State banks by schools" and is as follows:

On 11 October 1977 Cabinet approved of a policy that all departments and statutory bodies should bank either with the State Bank or the Savings Bank of South Australia.

That was directed to school councils and welfare groups and so on out in the field. We all know that the infringements of discretion at school council and parental level, and adherence to the direction denies the opportunity for a school council to shop around for the best interest rates on deposits. Of course, deposit rates vary considerably across the trading and savings bank spectrum; indeed, that is another area of control-seeking by the present Government. In this case, it is the first step towards nationalising banks.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What's the date of that instruction? Come on!

Mr. CHAPMAN: I will come back and answer all the Minister's interjections. I would appreciate it, Sir, if he would support me if I should run out of time and help me to get a little more time.

I will deal now with the subject of fisheries. The managed fisheries in South Australia at 30 June 1978 consisted of 378 A class and 446 B class scale fishermen licensed to catch and sell fish. In addition, there were 365 A class licensees authorised to catch and sell lobsters, 51 A class licensees authorised to catch and sell prawns, 8 State Ministerial prawn permit holders, 3 Commonwealth Ministerial prawn permit holders, 37 A class licensees with abalone permits, 62 A and B class reach or Murray River licensees, and 63 A and B class lakes and Coorong licensees. Also drawing from that same natural resource are thousands of amateurs who fish from the wharves and beaches and from the balance of about 40 000-odd registered boats that are not used solely for water sport, and by the professionals mentioned earlier.

Concern in South Australia has been expressed by both professional fishermen and interested persons and authorities, that South Australia's fish resources are deteriorating as a result of excess efforts. Accordingly, some years ago, the Fisheries Department set out to measure that effort and its effect on the resource. That was a tremendous task, if I might say so.

However, part of the study includes the requirement for professional fishermen to furnish catch returns. The survey also embraces a biological study, which is expected to be collated in the form of a State resource report and presented to the Minister, I understand, early in 1979.

I am not in a position to know whether the alleged deterioration is really so and, if so, to what degree. I do not think for that matter that anyone else in the meantime, or any other authority, knows with any degree of accuracy to what extent any particular section of the industry resource has deteriorated. In the meantime, however, the Minister has sought to take action to limit the extent of the professional fishing sector. On this occasion, I aim to deal specifically with the effects of recent Ministerial action taken in the scale fishery area, more particularly as the current policy affects the B class licence holders.

Incidentally, section 30 of the Fisheries Act, 1971-1976, or at least former S.M., W. Harniman's interpretation of that section on 25 November 1975, holds that section 30 (1) (b) disqualifies a person in full employment or engaged in full-time business as his ordinary occupation and,

accordingly, such persons cannot be granted a B class fishing licence. Be that as it may, many persons now holding B class fishing licences have been in the practice for many years, are dependent on the income derived from their efforts in the industry and, indeed, they have designed their lifestyle in accordance with their single or joint sources of income, whichever the case may be.

In a positive attempt to reduce the effort, the Minister directed correspondence to 259 scale fishermen on 31 May 1978 advising that, according to departmental records, they would not be eligible for licence renewal for the year commencing 1 July 1978. Upon disagreement, those recipients were invited to show cause why they should be reissued with a licence. Of those who have replied, a few have been relicensed but most have received further correspondence advising them that they are still not eligible. No regard has been given to the term the person may have had in practising within the industry (in some cases a lifetime) and no regard has been given to the amount that that person may have invested in equipping himself to fish, or to the extent of debt that he may have saddled himself with in the meantime. The determining criteria appear to rest heavily on interpretation and to involve another full-time job on shore.

However, there is another element relating to a form of means test that the Minister has introduced. That is that a person may be eligible whose income from personal exertion (excluding fishing income) is significantly less than the average earnings in the community. Accordingly, a further appeal may apparently be lodged on the grounds of hardship. I say "apparently" because I understand that in the interim the Minister has granted dispensation to a certain selected few applicants under consideration, thereby allowing those few to carry on fishing while the whole issue is being resolved and, at the same time, directing that no-one other than those listed mates can fish, despite the hardship people may be experiencing and while numerous appeals are being reviewed.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How about stopping reading your speech?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am going to read this material because it is important that I get the message across, and I propose to refer to notes that I have.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Standing Orders prevent you reading your speech. You ought to know that.

Mr. CHAPMAN: It is deeply political and rotten to the core that discrimination such as I have referred to should occur. However, that is how it is at present. The Minister could not at any time since his appointment be described in the industry as a popular Minister, and I can certainly assure the House that, if he did have any popularity at all in the fishing industry in South Australia, he has lost it over this particular issue, or at least his handling of it.

It is my view that there is no need at this stage to continue to cause these genuine participants the torture and distress that they are experiencing, certainly not before the official report on the biological and resource study is completed and considered by that Minister. In the meantime, the reduction of professional effort is steadily but surely being resolved by virtue of the freeze on the issue of new licences in the industry, linked with the natural drop-out factor.

I mention this and will now cite an example that will show that this natural drop-out factor is very real indeed. In 1973 there were 819 B class scale fishermen. By failure to demonstrate interest or activity, failure to furnish regular returns, failure to reapply on time, transfer to other practices within and without the industry, natural retirement, etc., the number of B class licence holders has,

in fact, declined from that figure to 446 on 30 June 1978, a drop of almost half in number over a period of 5 years. What better, fairer and more humane way of reducing the effort! If we are going to talk about humanity in these things, I point out that at the opening of the SAFIC conference on 21 October 1977 the Minister said:

The essential administrative activities associated with licence renewal and other matters of correspondence have speeded up and we are putting a more humane face on the administration of licensing.

The part of this whole issue that concerns me most (and I know it concerns many people who are suffering in the field, about this incident) is that a Minister has adopted his selection criteria on the basis of means and is seeking to cull those who have not only a second full-time job but also those who earn more than the average community income. I understand that he has recently confirmed that figure at \$210 a week.

What hypocrisy for the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries above all people to adopt and dare to implement this type of action. He has a significant investment in primary industry as a cattle and sheep grazier, a cereal grower, as sole owner of part-sections 539 and 549, hundred of Barossa, comprising 32.38 hectares and with an assessed value in 1975-76 of 31 000, and in a joint partnership with R. H. Chatterton in part section 24 and section 557, hundred of Barossa, comprising 1.13 hectares, on which a house and winery are situated, with an assessed value in 1975-76 of \$58 000. Similar material was used in the press release from the Premier when he was promoting this particular Minister to his appointment. It was a big-time promotion for this Minister. The Minister is also part-owner with M. J. Chatterton and M. E. Bagot in part-section 24 and 551, sections 552, 554, 555, part-section 556, part-section 557, 582, 583, 584, 585, and 586, hundred of Barossa, comprising 314.28 hectares with an assessed value in 1975-76 of \$160 000. Collectively, those properties are worth, using those two-year old valuations, \$249 000.

He is also involved in and has a significant interest in secondary industry as a winemaker. He is a full-time Minister of the Crown, we know enjoying a salary, with direct allowances, of \$43 410 per annum. His wife is a full-time employee in the Premier's Department by the Premier's own admission, and, believe it or not, she is advising the Premier on the very subjects for which her husband is the Minister; that is on matters of agriculture policy. I understand that her annual salary brings into that family directly a further \$18 400 per annum.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how the Minister justifies his claim to being humane (and that is his word, not mine) in his application to his job and in his administrative position? How can he reconcile his own financial position with the action he has taken against the hard-working, low-income citizens of my community; in fact, of communities right across the State, including the community of the member for Stuart, where, in fact, some of the special dispensation that I have referred to earlier was extended? He cannot reconcile it, and, if he has any humanity left in him, he will re-issue the fishermen in question with their licences and allow a little more time, thus allowing the issue within the industry to, in my belief, be satisfactorily resolved. The issue will solve itself; there is absolutely no need whatever for Ministerial interference in this instance.

I know that there is concern for a reduction in the resource. I know that when that occurs something has to be done about it, but this is not the way to do it, in my view. The number of B class fishermen is substantially reducing by drop-outs and, indeed, under the current

policy of a total freeze there is no need to be as destructive, inhumane and rotten, as has occurred in this instance, to quite innocent people.

The Minister involved, in his spoonfed, capitalist capacity (call it what you like) has acted quite improperly. Where he has got his advice from, I do not know. In my view, it is the worst demonstration of administration by any Minister since I have been in this place. The Minister, by his actions, is destroying the very livelihood of the little people that his colleagues in this place set out to demonstrate that they represent. To me, Sir, that is quite wrong.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What would you do?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I told you what I would do about it; I would leave these people alone. This matter will resolve itself and the people will drop out steadily and slowly. I am sure that that theme will be backed up again and again by my colleagues on this side. There is no need to help people to get done in six months what can be done in a year or two, and in that time the resource will not be destroyed.

I turn now to the subject of public transport. It is quite clear to me that the South Australian community at large is not aware of the heavy costs involved in providing public transport, particularly urban public transport. It is clear, also, that those who benefit, either directly or indirectly, from public transport should contribute to the costs incurred. Certainly, those who commute should not have to pay all costs through the fare box. I do not believe that the whole cost should be borne by those who are commuting on the public transport system, but spread over business, real estate, and the whole community. Even the private motorist for that matter, benefits from an efficient urban public transport system, particularly when it is well patronised.

Since the establishment of the State Transport Authority in 1974 the cost of providing urban public transport in Adelaide has achieved wide public spread of the financial load. However, the cost of services has risen dramatically during that period. In the meantime, as part of the overall scheme of State-owned and operated services, the private operators have virtually gone to the wall, both in the inner and near metropolitan areas.

An example of costs is extremely difficult to convey, but the net losses incurred, first by the Municipal Tramways Trust as it was then known in the last full year of its operation and subsequently by the State Transport Authority are as follows: in 1972-73, the loss in the Bus and Tram Division was \$1 300 000; in 1974-75, \$5 900 000 was the loss; 1975-76, \$8 800 000; and in 1976-77, \$12 300 000.

The immediate past year 1977-78 report is expected in the next few months to reveal a \$20 000 000 loss and proportionately more in the current 1978-79 period. I assure members there is no joy to be gleaned from either the metropolitan rail or the outer metropolitan rail operations, appreciating that the losses for the latter are picked up by the Commonwealth.

This financially disastrous story surrounding Adelaide's public transport services is with us, and will get worse before it gets better. While public transportation cannot pay for itself out of the fare box, it is a responsibility of the Government to see that its own public transport administration and service run as efficiently as possible at minimal cost to the overall taxpayers. It would be helpful if members opposite stopped chattering.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will decide that matter. I hope the honourable member made his remark in the right vein.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In Adelaide the trend between 1969-70 and 1976-77 indicates a gloomy

picture. In the period referred to in the Adelaide statistical division the population increased by 10.3 per cent, while the number of passengers carried on the South Australian Railways, Municipal Tramways Trust, and licensed services, and later by the State Transport Authority, fell by 2.2 per cent. The number of traffic kilometres operated by that group increased by 18.5 per cent. The number of passengers per head of population fell by 11.5 per cent, while the number of passengers per traffic kilometre fell by 17.9 per cent. The same picture is reflected throughout the statistics. The operating loss per passenger increased by 501.6 per cent.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How many bus drivers would you sack?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I will come to that in a moment. Despite an increase in Adelaide's population of 10.3 per cent and an increase in the level of services of 18.5 per cent, patronage dropped by 2.2 per cent. In terms of the consumer price index, revenue fell by 23.3 per cent; revenue per passenger fell by 21.3 per cent; revenue per traffic kilometre fell by 46.3 per cent; working expenses per passenger rose by 43.4 per cent; and the loss per passenger rose by 195.2 per cent.

Before any consideration of increasing the fare contribution by the patronising community is considered, the ingredients of efficiency of management should be examined. It has become quite clear in the short time that I have been directly involved as Liberal Party spokesman on transport that I can make several observations without reservation. Within the framework of the present Government's rigid State ownership policy, I sincerely recognise and admire the efforts of the State Transport Authority officers. It is also obvious that urban public transport costs in Adelaide have already become a financial burden, and action must be taken urgently to maintain a practical degree of services and prune surplus runs in off-peak periods as soon as they are identified.

No longer can Adelaide afford the luxury of superfluous services unless they are patronised, and bus services (unlike rail) are flexible enough to allow this aspect to be under constant surveillance. The most glaring move, of course, is to reintroduce contract forms of agreement with private operators, so that a balance between free enterprise and Government authority participation is involved in a joint venture on runs that the State Transport Authority cannot operate economically and effectively.

I have a copy of a contract formula which has worked in the past. I have a condensed version of it. It reflects a situation that has been adopted in Australia, including in South Australia, and outside Australia. It is not a statistical table, so I will have to read it. The basic contract is in the form of an agreement between the State Transport Authority and the contractor. This is the answer to pruning costs and maintaining a better level of service. It will reduce the losses of the State Transport Authority Bus and Tram Division dramatically if the Government adopts it. The formula states

The contractor is required to provide services on the routes and on the days and at the times that shall be specified by the authority, and shall use only such buses, and drivers as approved by the authority. The authority shall, after consulting with the contractor, be at liberty to change the times or days of operation or the routes to be travelled. The contractor pays all of the charges involved in the operation and maintenance of the bus service, including registration and insurance, but does not pay any licence fee to the authority, and is required, by the 14th day of every month, to submit a claim for remuneration for the operation of the bus service for the preceding month. The authority determines the fares to be charged, and may vary the fares at any time.

The contractor must ensure that each driver keeps and maintains a current running journal for each trip and to keep and maintain such other records as required by the authority. So, there is a relationship between the private operator and the Government, and there is a fair balance between the two.

The formula continues:

The contractor must collect and account for all fares received from passengers travelling on the service and must pay same to the authority at such intervals as the authority shall require. The authority's inspectors may board the bus at any time to inspect the driver's running journal, and to examine tickets held by passengers.

The contractor must indemnify the authority against all claims for injury, loss or damage which may be caused to passengers using the service, and insure the buses used with an approved insurance company in respect of third party bodily injury and third party property damage and when required by the authority lodge copies of the insurance policies with the authority.

The contractor must fully comply with all industrial awards in respect of drivers employed.

The contract is for a set term, but if the contractor shall be in breach of any of the provisions of the agreement, the authority may forthwith determine the agreement. Payments to the contractors in the past have been made in accordance with an agreed formula. It has worked. It includes the following: market value of bus; depreciation 22½ per cent per annum; interest on capital 10 per cent per annum; profit on investment 10 per cent per annum; comprehensive insurance; and registration and third party insurance.

The operating costs provide for garage and maintenance facilities, mechanics, administration staff, telephone, etc., cleaning, fuel and oil, tyres, repairs and maintenance, drivers time, penalty rates, overtime, etc., workers compensation, and pay-roll tax.

These costs are calculated to provide for payment of a daily rate for the operation of the services to be provided, and are subject to rise and fall. Any of the initial items in the costing formula that alter in cost are reflected in the payment to the contractor.

I can honestly say that I contacted not only the contractors but also the official authority on behalf of the private operators of this State. I made investigations from a wide range of people directly connected with public transport and bus operations, and there is a bundle of evidence to show that people out in the field who are very anxious to become involved in this joint venture with the Government.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo interjecting:

Mr. CHAPMAN: It is not a propped-up system. There are people anxious to do this. It has been tried in Salisbury. There is a contractor, Salisbury Passenger Services—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It's about to be cancelled.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable Minister to order.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Of course it is about to be cancelled, because the Government of the day does not believe within its own philosophical framework, in having anything to do with private enterprise. By not being a partner, it does not believe that private enterprise should make a profit at all. A heap of people want to be involved. There is that assurance. It can be demonstrated in the member for Salisbury's district, amongst his constituents, that the service is very well received, and that the relationship between the operator and the commuter is better than that which exists between the State Transport Authority and its passengers.

It has been further clearly demonstrated, and there is a ton of evidence to show this, that for the period of that contract in Salisbury, and for other contracts entered into by previous Governments of this type, people can operate an efficient service for a lot less money than it takes the Government to operate services. Surely it is our responsibility to provide a top-line service at a price the people can afford, and not to burden the taxpayers of South Australia any further than they have been burdened now.

Members interjecting:

Mr. CHAPMAN: It is all very well for members to interject and carry on, but the service can be provided. There are people willing to be involved. It can be not profitable, because public transport systems are invariably not profitable, but we can substantially cut these massive losses which are becoming an embarrassment to us in South Australia.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo interjecting:

Mr. CHAPMAN: Obviously they are not an embarrassment to the Minister, otherwise he wouldn't carry on like such a damned fool in this case. He should be truly ashamed of himself to carry on as he has in this debate. It is the first time, after all the challenges, that we have had the opportunity to put forward a policy.

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

Mr. Chapman: Can I have another half an hour? I have a heap of material.

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

Mr. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra has already spoken.

Mr. Chapman: So have other members at the same time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will make the decision about that. I have already spoken to the honourable member today. If he does not modify his behaviour, I will take the necessary steps.

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): I support the motion and congratulate the mover (the member for Morphett) and the seconder (the member for Mawson) on their speeches. After the last diatribe, I warn the member for Alexandra. He has had a heart attack and been gored by a bull; why does he not wake up and not give us so much bull? We do not want to have to take up collections for people who may not be in this House.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the Port Adelaide council election you were involved in?

Mr. WHITTEN: I will give you something on that, too. In paragraph 4 of his Speech, the Governor expressed his concern in this manner:

The unacceptably high levels of unemployment which have been caused by this recession in the national economy continue to be a major concern of my Government. No less compelling than the constraints imposed by the conditions of the national economy are the restrictions in funding being imposed by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Chapman: Here we go again.

Mr. WHITTEN: Certainly the honourable member is going to go again on the issue of unemployment. It never ceases to amaze me that not one member opposite is concerned about unemployment in Australia. All that Opposition members talk about is propping up private enterprise. It appeared to me at one stage that the member for Alexandra wished to take away the subsidy from the *Troubridge*. If he was honest he would have said that, but he is not honest.

Let us look at the unemployment situation in Australia and see the real figures. A heading in the *Advertiser* of 15 July 1978, on the front page, states "No sign of jobless figures improving." The C.E.S. figures put the number of unemployed at 393 842 or 6.2 per cent of the labour force, which represents an increase of 1 679 for the month. There was also an increase of 36 in the number of people registered as unemployed in South Australia, bringing the total to 40 491. I want to deal briefly with what is happening in my own electorate.

Mr. Mathwin: Tell us how you went in the Port Adelaide council election?

Mr. WHITTEN: When the member for Glenelg can shut up and listen to a bit of sense, it will be all right with me. I will answer him if he wants to talk about local government. A report in the *Advertiser* on the same day, 15 July, states that the number of vacancies for adults fell by 460 to 12 463 and for juniors by 241 to 4 740. For every vacancy, there are now 23 people seeking employment. Let us look at the real situation in Port Adelaide. The figures for 30 June show that there were 3 110 people registered as unemployed, and there were 57 job vacancies. If honourable members can do simple arithmetic, they will see that there is one vacancy for every 60 people in the Port, whereas the average throughout Australia is one vacancy for every 23 people.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Thanks to the Fraser Government.

Mr. WHITTEN: That is what I intended to say. The Fraser Government has blindly endeavoured to reduce inflation, not caring for the people. Not one member opposite has expressed any concern for the unemployed, except the member for Alexandra. He talked about some soldier settlers unable to get unemployment benefits.

Mr. Keneally: There are 300 Questions on Notice and not one on unemployment.

Mr. WHITTEN: Not one. A *News* report of 19 July, under the heading "Half a million new year dole tip", states:

More than 500 000 people could be out of work by January, according to a report prepared by the Federal employment department . . . The projection that more than 500 000 people will be out of work in January compares with last month's unemployment level of just under 394 000.

But not once has any member opposite, except the member for Alexandra, expressed any concern about unemployment, and what he said was only that some of the cockies were not able to get some sort of rake-off from unemployment benefits.

Earlier the member for Glenelg interjected about the council election in Port Adelaide. Although I do not want to deal with that at the moment, I should like to refer to what Mr. Jim Hullick, Secretary of the Local Government Association, said. This is a nice sort of condemnation of the Fraser Government. Mr. Hullick said:

A squeeze by the Federal Government has cost 500 jobs. A Local Government Association scheme which would have employed 500 young people has been shelved for the lack of funds. The association's General Secretary, Mr. Jim Hullick, said that the scheme was due to start in August but the State Government had decided to cancel it because of the Federal Government's squeeze on specific purpose grants and road funds.

He also said that the next 12 months would be the hardest that he had ever experienced.

I return now to the Port Adelaide scene and the unemployment figures. These have been increased by the actions of the Johns Perry group in closing down Gibb and Miller about two weeks ago. To indicate how many skilled people are unemployed at Port Adelaide I should like to

examine the following figures (and in this respect I am referring to the results of the closure of Gibb and Miller by the Johns Perry group).

It can be seen from the job waiting list at Port Adelaide that 15 boilermakers are out of work and only one job is available. Although 40 fitters and turners are registered for work, only three jobs are available. There are 48 unemployed welders and motor mechanics, with only four jobs available for them. That means that there are 146 vacancies in the metal trades section, with no more than 10 jobs available for those people. In the other trades, there are 82 unemployed trades assistants, with only two jobs available for them. This indicates the serious situation which obtains at Port Adelaide and which is so much worse than the situation anywhere else in Australia.

I should now like to refer to what has happened in relation to the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. Although in the past 12 months \$22 000 000 has been spent on this scheme, we have only \$7 000 000 to spend on it this year. I recall the Leader's saying that this was a wasteful exercise. He should go and tell that to all the people who were able because of that scheme to get some sort of dignity and job instead of living on straight-out dole payments. At least they were able to have some sort of dignity and to earn some sort of respect as a result of working for their money.

It was suggested to Mr. Fraser and Mr. Street that this sort of scheme was useful in South Australia because it allowed people to have some sort of dignity and enabled them to earn money. It was suggested to those gentlemen that, even if the amount that would have been returned to the Government in taxation was given to the States by way of reimbursement, it would have provided many jobs and, indeed, would have saved millions of dollars in social security payments.

While the Leader is in the Chamber, I should like to refer to what he said in the debate. He said that the A.L.P. had 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. I am sure that the Leader knows what is in the Labor Party's platform. However, he does not care to read it out or to express it correctly; he is not being very truthful.

Mr. Mathwin: Read it out.

Mr. WHITTEN: The honourable member has read it many times and misquoted it himself.

Mr. Mathwin: Why don't you read out the bit about—

Mr. WHITTEN: I will read it, and I will do so correctly, too. It is as follows:

The objective of the Labor Party is the democratic socialisation of industry, production, distribution and exchange—

and members opposite should bear this in mind—

to the extent necessary to eliminate exploitation and other anti-social features in those fields.

It is designed to stop the exploitation that the Liberals, their supporters and their controllers want.

Mr. Mathwin: You've changed the words but not the rules.

Mr. WHITTEN: That is no change. This has been in my Party's platform for as many years as I can remember, and I have been a member of the Labor Party for much longer than the member for Glenelg has been in Australia. I assure the honourable member that I know my rule book and my Party's policy. I have not changed Parties, but have maintained my position all the way through. I notice that the member for Hanson is also in the Chamber. I happened to pick up one of his throw-away papers that he puts out.

Mr. Groom: Everyone throws them away.

Mr. WHITTEN: Perhaps so. In one of his newsletters, the honourable member appeals to people to join his Party. The newsletter states that the membership fees were \$15 a year for men and women and \$25 for married couples. However, the member for Hanson also distorts—

Mr. Mathwin: What about the Labor candidate, Reece Jennings? Is he in there?

Mr. WHITTEN: I do not know whom the honourable member is talking about. The member for Hanson talks about socialism and asks, "Where is South Australia heading?" The newsletter states:

Socialism—a political and economic principle that a community as a whole should have the ownership and control of all means of production and distribution.

The honourable member goes on to say that he is quoting from the Oxford dictionary. The *Concise Oxford Dictionary* defines socialism as a political and economic theory (not a principle, as Mr. Becker says) of social organisation that advocates State ownership and control of the means of production, distribution and exchange; it is a policy or practice based on this theory.

The member for Hanson goes on to talk about liberalism. According to him, it is not a collective philosophy. I will get this right so that there is no argument about it. The newsletter, which has a photo at the top of it, is headed, "The Hanson Newsletter of June 1978". Of liberalism, Mr. Becker says:

Liberalism is not a collective philosophy. It looks to the individual, not the State, and sees the State not as the end in itself but as a means of helping people to achieve their own goals. Liberalism rejects the collectiveness and authoritarian dogmas of fascism—

that is a great thing for him to say, too—

socialism and communism as destructive of human liberty and initiative.

Let us see what the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* says. It defines "liberal" as follows

Fit for a gentleman;—

that is a very rare thing in the Liberals—

a general enlargement of mind, not professional or technical; generous; open-handed; not sparing of; ample; abundant; not rigorous or literal; open-minded; candid; unprejudiced; favourable to democratic reforms and abolition of privilege.

Is that what liberalism is supposed to be?

Mr. Groom: They're conservatives.

Mr. WHITTEN: They go back to the real old Tories.

Mr. Tonkin: You're very kind. I've never heard you express the Liberal philosophy so clearly.

Mr. WHITTEN: I am merely trying to show that in some of the things you put out you are not being truthful or correct. In fact, you are a long way from it. I was looking for something else that I had on the Leader, but I have misplaced it for the moment. However, I will pick it up.

Mr. Mathwin: Tell us about council elections.

Mr. WHITTEN: If the honourable member wants me to talk about council elections, I will do so. Elections were held in the Port Adelaide council area on 1 July, and 27 per cent of the electorate entitled to vote voted. It is noteworthy that the Mayor of Port Adelaide, at the declaration of the poll, said, "I now have a mandate," but he did not say that 80 per cent of the people of Port Adelaide did not support him. Is that a mandate?

Mr. Mathwin: They didn't support you, either, did they?

Mr. WHITTEN: I was not up for election.

Mr. Mathwin: But your Party supported—

Mr. WHITTEN: The A.L.P. did not endorse a candidate. My Party never endorses candidates and I hope

that, until we have democratic council elections, it will never endorse candidates. By "democratic elections", I mean full adult franchise with compulsory voting; then, I will support the endorsement of candidates, and we will see then what happens to the Liberals.

Mr. Tonkin: You mean you didn't support any of those candidates?

Mr. WHITTEN: What I do as an individual does not commit the Party. If I vote for a person, that does not commit the A.L.P. Let us look at what the Fraser Government has and has not done. I have talked about how callous the Liberals are in not thinking about the unemployed; let us now see how callous they are to the sick and the aged. Paragraph 10 of the Speech states:

Health is an area which is facing considerable cutbacks in funding from the Commonwealth. The hospital development programme, which last year provided \$5 120 000 to this State, has been abolished completely. Community health programmes have also been reduced from the amount available nationally of \$73 300 000 in 1977-78 to \$52 600 000 in 1978-79. In addition, the Commonwealth has revised the 75/25 sharing formula for recurrent funding to a 50/50 formula.

Let us see what that means. As far as community health is concerned, the Commonwealth's contribution to operating payments has been reduced from 75 per cent to 50 per cent; the cost to the State for 1978-79 is \$1 960 000. That is what the Commonwealth has cut back on community health. The Commonwealth contribution to the domiciliary care programme under the States Grants (Home Care) Act has been reduced from 66½ per cent to 50 per cent; the cost to the State in 1978-79 will be \$335 000. Who needs domiciliary care? In the main, only the aged. Not only are the unemployed penalised but so, too, are the aged and the sick. What about the children? Regarding the school dental programme, the Commonwealth's contribution to these areas was a cost-share on a 75 per cent/25 per cent basis, and that has been reduced to 50 per cent/50 per cent; the cost of that alteration to the State will be \$370 000 in 1978-79. It is not only the unemployed, the aged and the sick who will suffer, but also the children.

The Commonwealth has abandoned the hospital development programme under which \$13 000 000 was received in 1976-77, \$5 120 000 in 1977-78, and a further sum of at least \$5 120 000 was expected in 1978-79. But what did we get? We were cut back to nothing! The programme, which has been slashed, will cost the State an additional \$5 000 000 this financial year. Under the previous programme, \$13 000 000 was received. We do not know what we will get, but the cost will be more than \$5 000 000. More than 200 extra hospital beds in South Australia may have to be closed because of the Federal Government's proposal to slash the occupied bed-days in a recognised hospital by 5 per cent. I cannot understand those Opposition members who subscribe to Liberal policies when they know what they are doing to so many people.

Much has been said recently about indexation and wages paid, particularly by Phillip Lynch. The President of the A.C.T.U. summed up Mr. Lynch the other night in the way in which he had to be summed up. He was referring to the deal done at the behest of the Federal Government in an attempt to settle the Utah dispute. The President was requested to move in and use his influence with the union and the company in an endeavour to call off the dispute. Utah is an American company which last year made \$A160 000 000 profit, of which \$A135 000 000 was transferred to the U.S.A. The Opposition cannot say that there is no capacity to pay or that the Federal Government could not have found some way of retaining some of that

money in Australia for the benefit of Australia. It let it all go away.

Much has also been said about average weekly earnings, now supposedly \$213 in Australia, but what are the award wages? The current award wages in the metal trades award for the first pay period commencing on and after 7 June 1978 for a fitter who has served five years (now four years) apprenticeship are \$146.50—a magnificent sum! For a furnaceman on a cupola, whose job is done in considerable heat, the magnificent wage is \$131.90! In my trade, a boilermaker or structural steel tradesman receives \$146.50, which is the maximum for a skilled tradesman.

At the lower end of the scale, a die-setter, who has some skills, receives \$124.30, and that is not the lowest sum, because employees not elsewhere classified receive the magnificent sum of \$117.10!

We hear a great deal about the A.W.U. and the high wages people are getting in the country, and how those high wages are causing high prices for meat. Quoting from the *Farmer and Grazier*, a station hand receives the magnificent sum of \$126.90! If he is kept by the station owner and given his tucker (and it is not the best tucker), he gets \$27 a week less. He does not get \$100 before Fraser takes his chop. Station cooks, for a 5½-day week, if cooking for 31 shearers or more, get a weekly wage of \$111.30.

Mr. McRae: That's incredible.

Mr. WHITTEN: I am quoting from the *Farmer and Grazier* the wage rates that should be paid on farms. These people get their keep, of course, but certainly the figures I have quoted are not high wages. Let us see how workers have been burgled under indexation. In New South Wales, at 31 December 1977, the award rate under the Metal Industries Association for a process worker was \$122 a week. Over the period of indexation, with the loss of full indexation, that process worker has lost \$780. A fitter who was on the award rate of \$144.10, which is now up to \$146.50, has lost \$920. No wonder the workers are not happy with indexation or partial indexation. They have been burgled right, left and centre. *On Campus*, the Flinders University news sheet, contains the following item:

A Federal Budget which seeks to reduce Australia's deficit by increasing indirect taxes can only intensify the existing recession. This blunt warning is given in the latest issue of the *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, produced by the National Institute of Labour Studies here at Flinders. In a review of the Australian labour market, the bulletin predicts that increasing indirect taxes will also have an adverse effect on profitability, boost the inflation rate and further increase hardship and social distress. What is needed, the bulletin argues, is demand stimulus.

The article concludes as follows:

Rather than adopt the policies which gave the world the Great Depression and the Hungry Thirties, the bulletin says policies which adequately stimulate the economy will lead us into the position whereby as soon as the real up-swing gets underway, natural economic forces will painlessly remove the overhang.

I support the motion.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I support the motion, not so much because of the content of the Speech, but for the manner in which His Excellency presented it when opening the Second Session of the Forty-third Parliament. I believe that His Excellency presented the Opening Speech extremely well, but I sympathise with him on the content of it which he had to present to Parliament.

With other members from this Chamber, I extend my sympathy to Mrs. Potter following the death of Mr. Frank

Potter, the former President of the Legislative Council. His valued services to this Parliament will be missed by many people.

The member for Price expounded for some time on the reasons for unemployment in this country. Before looking at that matter in more detail, I must say that I was pleased that we did not have to listen on this occasion to the member for Napier expounding his lack of knowledge of the wine industry. Perhaps he is saving that contribution for an adjournment debate, but I was pleased that he did not deal with that subject in this debate when we consider the contribution he made to the debate on a motion before the House for a reduction in the excise on Australian produced brandy.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ARNOLD: I am concerned to know where on earth the Government stands in relation to the citrus industry, and precisely where the Minister of Agriculture stands. All sections of the citrus industry, not only in South Australia but also in Victoria and New South Wales, want to know the answer to that question. The sections include the Murray Citrus Growers Association, the growers themselves, C.O.C., and private and co-operative processors in this State. Where does the Government stand in relation to the industry?

The member for Price was rightly concerned about unemployment, but the action of the State Government in the evidence it has given to the Industries Assistance Commission inquiry into the citrus industry indicates that it has only one objective in mind: to see the Australian citrus industry completely annihilated. It is interesting to read the various points of evidence given in the submission which was prepared for the Minister by departmental officers. In my view, it was an academic exercise and, in its preparation, it is probably a fair academic assessment of the situation, but it does not take into account the practical problems of the industry and the people involved, and the overall effect.

We cannot treat the citrus industry in isolation from every other problem we have, and that includes the overall cost of labour, the cost of materials, tractors, insurance, workmen's compensation, and everything else. We cannot have a reducing scale of protection whilst there is still an escalating scale of costs. This is something the submission did not take into account.

Of the 2 500 fruitgrowers in the Riverland about 1 200 are directly involved in citrus production. This, in itself, involves many other persons who will be indirectly employed by the citrus growers and the citrus industry. The action that has been taken in the submission to the I.A.C. from the South Australian Government will have the effect, if it is acted on, of substantially reducing that industry in Australia and, by the same token, markedly reducing the employment opportunities that exist even now.

The submission supports the view of the I.A.C., and we all know that generally, in relation to all industry in Australia, that view is for a considerable reduction and the phasing out of tariff protection. On the other hand, it is a complete and utter impossibility to phase out tariff protection if we are still faced with increasing wage costs and every other cost involved in production in this country when it is at a greater rate than elsewhere in the world. The main objective of the Federal Government is to try to reduce inflation so that eventually we may get to a position where we will once again be competitive on world markets. We in this country, with our cost structure, cannot be competitive merely by becoming more efficient. There is not enough margin in that efficiency area to

overcome our massive problems of costs as compared to many of the countries with a low-cost structure.

In more recent correspondence to the I.A.C. inquiry, it is interesting to note, in a submission made on 4 May headed "Comments on I.A.C. draft report on the Australian Citrus Industry", the following comment:

The South Australian Government is in general agreement with the Industries Assistance Commission draft recommendations for long-term assistance to the citrus industry. The level of tariff protection is comparable with that recommended by the South Australian Government in its submission.

The industry cannot survive on that or on the recommended level of assistance made by the I.A.C., yet the State Government supports that recommendation. Not one organisation in South Australia involved in the citrus growing industry agrees with the Government. In fact, even the Victorian Government, when preparing its case to present to the I.A.C., sought the advice of and worked closely with the citrus industry in that State. However, in South Australia the Government prepared its submission without reference to or discussion with the growers or allied industries involved in the citrus industry here. What on earth is the Government trying to do with the citrus industry? What are its objectives? Does it want to see it wound up and the people employed in the industry also thrown on to the unemployment market? These are the questions that everyone in the citrus industry wants answered.

There is unanimous agreement throughout the citrus industry for a tariff quota system, yet it is clear that we do not have the support of the South Australian Government on that subject: it recommends that a level of assistance to the orange sector be a tariff of either 6c on a single-strength litre of orange juice, or 25 per cent *ad valorem*, whichever is the higher. That is so low that the industry would be on its knees within 12 months.

It was only about 18 months ago that the industry was in complete chaos. At that time the Industries Assistance Commission recommended a tariff protection level of 45 per cent. The Federal Government, in its wisdom, came out with a 65 per cent tariff protection, which had the effect of stabilising the citrus growing industry and those employed in it. It is not only those who grow citrus who have benefited from that: every person involved in this highly labour-intensive industry has benefited. Many people have benefited as a result of Federal Government intervention at that time.

That protection was to be reviewed on 30 June this year, but the Federal Government has extended the tariff protection period at the rate of 65 per cent for a further three months and that is now due for further consideration on 30 September. I trust that the Federal Government will not be influenced by the submission that has been made by the South Australian Government on this subject, because if it is, and there is a substantial reduction as recommended by the South Australian Government, the citrus industry will again be back in chaos and many more South Australians will be unemployed.

As I have said earlier, there are fixed costs over which we have absolutely no control and, as long as those costs continue to escalate, there is no way on earth that we can reduce tariff protection. I sincerely trust that the Federal Government will have the wisdom to see that and will not be influenced by the State Government and the South Australian Minister of Agriculture because, if we see a reduction, we will immediately go back to where we were about two years ago, and everyone in South Australia was aware of the critical situation and the plight of the industry then.

I wish now to refer to decentralisation. Over many years all Governments have given lip service to decentralisation but few have really come to grips with it. For a long time I have brought to the notice of this House the method of refunding pay-roll tax in Victoria as an example that should be followed in South Australia as a genuine incentive to decentralisation, but that has not been taken up in South Australia on the same scale. It has been taken up in a selective manner, in a way in which the Government retains control over the funds, but by and large there has been no effective decentralisation in South Australia.

A reason for raising this matter now is that, if there had been effective decentralisation, we would not have the problems in the north-eastern metropolitan area of Adelaide that we now have. The expansion of that area has caused real transport problems. The Government is considering the North-East Area Public Transport Review, with a view to spending about \$50 000 000 to \$60 000 000 to try to relieve the transport problem in that area.

If there had been effective decentralisation in South Australia we would not be looking at this problem now. By effective decentralisation, I mean the provision of some of the services provided in the metropolitan area.

There is little encouragement given to people in this State to live anywhere other than in the metropolitan area. There are three natural growth areas: the northern Spencer Gulf area, the South-East, and the Riverland. With some encouragement, those areas would go ahead and, instead of having the transportation problems that are developing week by week in the metropolitan area, we would be able to place many of the people who would live in the rural areas of South Australia if they had equal opportunity and equal consideration to that given to those living elsewhere.

There is usually a grave shortage of housing allotments, and once people do go to live in country areas they are faced with transportation problems and costs that they can ill-afford. It is high time that consideration was given to those people living in rural towns and to their transportation needs. Elderly retired people and those in lower-income groups who do not have their own transport are totally at the mercy of the good graces of friends and people in the community to take them in and out of town and even from their homes in the town to the shopping area.

I have received numerous representations from people without transport whose only source of transport is, in the main, by taxi. On their level of income, that is just not a possibility, and they are virtually tied to their homes. I think the Minister of Community Welfare would be the first to acknowledge that nothing could be worse than people being bound to their houses, unable to get out and mix publicly. Socially, this is one of the worst possible things that can happen in any community. This is happening, particularly in country areas, because there is absolutely no transport available to people.

I have suggested that this is one area where the Minister of Transport's mini-bus or dial-a-bus concept could work effectively. If a small dial-a-bus was available in each town on the basis of some subsidy from the State Government, in the same manner as the metropolitan transport system is subsidised (and it is subsidised very heavily in the metropolitan area), we would probably find that in the towns that have a taxi service the taxi operator would be interested in operating the dial-a-bus in conjunction with his taxi service. In this way, it would not affect his overall business, but it would provide a much greater service to the community. This could be an effective way of

overcoming the transportation problem in those communities, but there would have to be a measure of Government support for it to work.

I think that the people in country areas are entitled to the same sort of consideration as that received by people in the metropolitan area. There is no way that we will ever stop the growth of Adelaide if we are not prepared to provide the same incentives and services for people who are prepared to live in rural areas as those provided in the city. Every incentive one can think of is provided for people who live in the metropolitan area. This is precisely what we should be striving not to do.

South Australia is recognised as being one of the most urbanised areas in the world, with the bulk of the State's population living in metropolitan Adelaide, which is not a city ideally suited to an ever-expanding situation. Hemmed in on one side by the sea and by the Mount Lofty Range on the other, Adelaide is developing into a city stretching from Gawler right down the coast to the south. Such development is not in the interests of Adelaide or its residents.

We could do much for the rural community and the decentralised areas of South Australia if we were to provide in country areas facilities similar to those existing in Adelaide. I see no reason why there should be any difference between consideration given by the Government to the transportation needs of people living in rural areas and that given to people living in the metropolitan area. As I have said, many of the country people with a transportation problem are elderly or people on low incomes who have no transport of their own and who, without assistance from the State Government for a public transport system, are virtually housebound. We all know of the social problems that arise from that situation.

A short time ago I referred to the NEAPTR studies that have been undertaken, concerning which the Government is prepared to fund a transport corridor to the north-eastern suburbs costing between \$50 000 000 and \$60 000 000. Yet when considering the need for a bridge over the Murray River, the Minister of Transport regularly states that, unless the Federal Government comes to the party with funds, the State cannot afford such a project, which would cost \$4 000 000 or \$5 000 000. However, this Government has clearly stated that, if the Federal Government does not come to the party, the State itself will fund the north-east transport corridor. How can the State Government fund such a project costing some \$50 000 000 or \$60 000 000, on the one hand, and yet, on the other, find it totally impossible to fund a necessary bridge over the Murray River at Berri, costing \$4 000 000 or \$5 000 000? Obviously, if the Government can fund one project it can fund another. It is a matter of priorities, and obviously the priority for a bridge over the Murray River at Berri is low, according to the Government.

It was interesting to note that, just prior to the previous State election, the Government candidate promoted a petition in the Riverland for the building of a bridge over the Murray River. This petition was signed by a great percentage of the people in the Riverland, including me, and I was pleased to sign and support that petition. It was presented to the Minister of Transport, from whom we have never heard a word on the subject since. I doubt whether the Labor Party candidate has heard what happened to that petition. Just what was its fate, I do not know, the people of the Riverland do not know and, to my knowledge, the Labor Party candidate does not know. However, we would certainly like to know precisely where the Government stands in relation to that important project.

If the Government can fund a \$50 000 000 or

\$60 000 000 transport corridor in the metropolitan area, there is no basis on which it can claim that it cannot fund a \$4 000 000 or \$5 000 000 bridge over the Murray River at Berri.

Mrs. BYRNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MESSAGE PARLOURS

The Legislative Council transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

That in the opinion of this Council a Joint Select Committee be immediately appointed to inquire into:

1. The activities of massage parlours in this State and in particular the following matters:

- (a) To what extent are massage parlours in fact brothels;
- (b) Whether a licensing system of operating health studios should be set up;
 - (i) to ensure that proper standards of competence in massage and in hygiene are observed; and
 - (ii) to prevent massage parlours from operating as brothels;
- (c) To determine the extent of criminal involvement in the operation of massage parlours;
- (d) All facets of the operation of massage parlours in South Australia;
- (e) The location, owners and occupiers of all premises used as massage parlours;
- (f) Whether a definition apt to the activities can be established so that criteria for the registration of premises and persons can be defined;
- (g) Whether the State Planning Act and Regulations and Local Government Act and Regulations and any other Act are satisfactory for the control of such parlours;
- (h) Any other matters pertaining to the procurement earnings soliciting and employment of persons associated with massage parlours.

2. That all hearings of the Joint Select Committee be open to the public and media and where deemed necessary the Committee may at its discretion protect the identity of witnesses; and

3. That the Select Committee recommend necessary legislative action.

MINORS (CONSENT TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL TREATMENT) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I refer to the Opposition's efforts to denigrate South Australia. Opposition members stand in this place and at every opportunity knock South Australia. The Opposition is aided and abetted by the press. The Leader of the Opposition, who evidently finds humour in that remark, is affectionately known throughout the community as "Ocker the Knocker". He leads the band, and most of his members join in the chorus.

We had two classic examples yesterday. The member

for Davenport provided an example in his Address in Reply speech, which was one of his most pathetic efforts. Secondly, the member for Coles, in the adjournment debate, told us of the so-called mass exodus of people from South Australia to sunny Queensland. She told us that people were leaving South Australia because of the activities of the South Australian Labor Government. If this exodus is occurring and if the flow of capital is to other States, what is happening to the properties that the people owned in South Australia? Are they being sold to people in other States or to people in this State?

I challenge the member for Coles to give facts, names, and figures in respect of the claimed exodus of South Australians to other States, particularly Queensland. Are those people just investing further money in Queensland in property to avoid paying duties? Are they joining another infamous Liberal, Phillip Lynch, in a penthouse at Surfers Paradise to avoid tax? I take issue with the Opposition's claim that South Australia alone is suffering from an economic downturn. Unfortunately, it is happening in every State. The real blame lies with the Fraser Government's economic policies.

Mr. Tonkin: How many other States—

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

Mr. Tonkin: How many—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have already ruled that the honourable Leader of the Opposition is out of order. I do not want to go any further.

Mr. Tonkin: You are not going to answer.

Mr. SLATER: No. Regarding the claim by the member for Coles that people are leaving South Australia to live in Queensland, I point out that the people who do so are not leaving for the reason given by the honourable member. Such people have the same kinds of motive as lie behind the Liberal Party's philosophy. Those motives are to retain and perpetuate their wealth, often at the expense of the rest of the community. If there are people such as those in Queensland, that State is welcome to them. No doubt they will fit in well with the attitude espoused by the Queensland Government. They may be able to join Bjelke-Petersen in the Ku-Klux-Klan in the Deep North.

The member for Coles quoted two letters in her speech, one being from a young man who wrote to her and said, amongst other things:

With no confidence in the future of South Australia, I am off to Queensland, where the sun shines on the willing worker.

I might mention for the sake of the member for Coles, and also her correspondent, that the latest unemployment figures show that at June 1978 the percentage of unemployment in Queensland was 7.2 per cent, which is higher than in South Australia, so the sun is not shining on the willing worker, as the member for Coles might imagine.

Mr. Tonkin: There are quite a lot of unemployed South Australians up there now, you see.

Mr. SLATER: I wonder how long it is since the Leader of the Opposition or the member for Coles has visited Brisbane.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: If the Leader does not lift his performance, he may be retiring there.

Mr. SLATER: That is right, he may be one of those joining the mass exodus to Queensland, and may join Phillip Lynch in the penthouse at Surfers Paradise.

I wonder how long it is since they have been to Brisbane and looked at the conditions of various State services there, such as the dilapidated public transport system, the antiquated schools, and hospital services. All this, of course, is at the price of the community in Queensland,

who may not pay death duties, but they are also suffering the consequences of not having adequate public services.

Mr. Tonkin: Are they happy?

Mr. SLATER: That is a question I cannot answer on behalf of the individual who lives in Queensland. I have lived in South Australia all my life and I am proud of it. I do not go around the countryside knocking South Australia like the Leader of the Opposition does.

Mr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The honourable member is imputing to me activities which I emphatically deny, and I ask for a withdrawal. I want to make quite clear that I am prepared to knock the Government of this State for what it is doing to South Australia. I am doing that because I love South Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. SLATER: It is not my view, but it has been expressed to me by members of the community in this State, that that is the attitude portrayed to them by the Leader of the Opposition through his antics in this House and outside, on the media. As I said, I am proud to be a South Australian. I know that the overwhelming majority of people in this State are also proud to be South Australians, and the sort of political bally-hoo that the Opposition goes on with in this place and outside to gain what I consider to be some sort of petty Party-political advantage does not assist them or the State.

I recognise that it is the Opposition's duty to oppose, but it is not its right or duty to continually knock the efforts of the Government in this State. If it does so, it should do it in a constructive way. It has not provided any constructive criticism, as far as I am concerned, in the past seven or eight years, since I have been a member of this House. I do not suppose I should be too critical of this, because it means that in my political career I will probably be on this side of the House, whereas the Opposition will be continuously on the other side of the House because of the attitude Opposition members portray to the community in knocking their own State. As I said it is the duty of the Opposition to oppose. It is not the duty of an Opposition to denigrate its own State. I think Opposition members should look closely at their attitudes to the political situation in South Australia and endeavour to be more constructive in their attitude towards the State.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I have one of my officers finding out the number of times that the Federal Government has been blamed during this session, beginning with His Excellency's excellent Speech, with which he was pleased to open Parliament. I do not know how many times in this session the Federal Government has been blamed for this State's ills by the State Government, but I will very soon find out. It is difficult to keep pace, because it seems to me that the Federal Government is blamed for every single ill which occurs in this State. Indeed, we have got to the stage now where the propaganda machine, which is financed by the taxpayers of this State at considerable expense, is continually churning out material telling everyone in South Australia what a wonderful Government it has, how well off it is, and how absolutely tremendous everything is.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You are not knocking the State by saying this are you?

Mr. TONKIN: Do not worry. We are used to these inane bleatings from opposite. The reason for my speaking this evening is simply to say that I have never heard such a perfect example of proving that what I said in my Address in Reply speech is entirely true and accurate, because if there is any criticism made of this Government for any mismanagement, for any extravagance, for any wasteful spending, then the propaganda machine, spearheaded by

one or two Ministers, or, when they cannot find Ministers to do it, by some poor unfortunate backbencher who has to read out what has been written for him, tells us that we are knocking South Australia. If one criticises anything that the Government does in this State, one is knocking South Australia. Not only that, if one dares to criticise the Premier of this State, one is a traitor to South Australia. We have heard it said (it is in print, and is a matter of record) that, if one criticises the Premier of this State now, one is a traitor to South Australia. I have never heard such a ridiculous sort of argument.

Mr. Allison: It's twaddle.

Mr. TONKIN: As the member for Mount Gambier says, it is twaddle, except that it is not all that funny. Once this sort of thing starts to happen, and once the Government believes that it is totally infallible and above criticism, and so arrogant that it can afford to ignore Parliament, it is the time when a government is moving towards a totalitarian State. Whether or not it likes it, if the Government does not accept criticism or listen to criticism by the people, it is on its last legs, and that is where I believe the present Government is.

Sir Winston Churchill made a comment that has been widely quoted many times. He said that criticism was necessary. It is like pain in any organism. It draws attention to an unhealthy state of affairs and, if things in South Australia are not unhealthy now, I do not know when they will be. They are disgustingly and dangerously unhealthy, and this State's Government does not care.

I still cannot understand why the Government is not able to understand that it is in serious difficulties and that the course it is following is leading this State deeper and deeper into the mire. I repeat what I said previously: if this Government had spent as much time and effort in determining the problems that face this State and finding solutions to those problems as it spent trying to persuade the people, through its propoganda machines, that everything was all right with South Australia, we would not have the problems that currently face us.

We in this State (and this involves a question that the member for Gilles was not willing to answer when challenged three times) have a record deficit for South Australia of \$25 000 000. Every other State (except Tasmania, which budgeted for a small deficit of \$2 000 000) has finished its financial year with a balanced Budget. Indeed, South Australia's deficit is greater than the total of all deficits for the past 10 years.

Mr. Slater: How's the Federal deficit? What's that?

Mr. TONKIN: I am pleased that the honourable member has finally said something. Let us now talk about the Federal deficit. I thank the honourable member for that Dorothy Dixier. The Federal deficit arose from a period of extravagant and unprecedented spending by the Whitlam regime, spending that was greater than that during any other period. The deficit incurred by the Whitlam Government was also a record.

We in this State have a Government which wants to repeat the same activity and which, we are told, is committed to raising State taxation in order to increase State spending. It is a Government that is not willing in any way to modify its own wasteful expenditure. The Federal deficit is the real reason why the allocations to every State have been cut back. We are still trying to pay off and service the record overdraft that the Whitlam Government incurred. Honourable members opposite and you, Sir, can laugh as much as you like.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is reflecting on the Chair.

Mr. TONKIN: Oh!

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member does

not continue in that vein.

Mr. TONKIN: I would not dream of continuing in that vein, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I hope that in future the Leader will not do so.

Mr. TONKIN: No, Sir. What has happened to this South Australia of ours that we all dearly love? I have also lived here all my life, and I love it, and I do not like what is happening to it. I predict that, because this Government is prepared to throw the taxpayers' money away, because it is taking space for its departments that are not using it (\$200 000-worth we heard about last week), because we hear of the frozen-food factory, which is becoming a disaster, and because of waste and neglect at every hand, and, what is more to the point, because the State Government appears not to be concerned about it, there is only one way in which we can continue to maintain our essential services, namely, in line with the Labor Party policy, and we will see an increase in State taxes and charges within the next few months.

There is a tax revolt which has been given some prominence in the media over the past few weeks and which follows on the tax revolt that occurred recently in California. South Australians have had a guts full of increased taxes. They are getting to have a guts full of Governments which propose further increases in State taxes, but I give clear warning now that, unless the State Government starts to look at its wasteful and extravagant expenditure and unless it shows some indication of that, the people can look forward to increased State taxation within the next six months. I believe that, when those State taxes and charges are increased, it will be one of the final nails in the coffin of the Dunstan Government.

I love this State of ours. I like what happened to it under Tom Playford and as it developed under the private enterprise system, but I detest and abhor what is being done to it by this Labor Government.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: I will fight what is being done to it and, if it means that I have to criticise—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: I will . . . will continue to do it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I called the honourable Leader to order, but he continued in a loud vein. I hope that he does not continue in that vein again, and I assure him that I will remember the occasion.

Mr. OLSON (Semaphore): It is clearly apparent that the Leader has demonstrated this evening that he is the wearer of two hats because, apart from being the Leader of the Liberal Party in this Chamber, I think that he has been to another party, and that probably explains his behaviour in the Chamber this evening.

Mr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Government members, if they wish to provoke a hard-hitting speech about something in which I believe very strongly, have no right to impute the sort of thing which has been imputed by the member for Semaphore and which I was surprised to hear from him. I demand that his comments be withdrawn and that an apology be made.

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the Leader's point of order. The honourable member for Semaphore.

Mr. Tonkin: Withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to apologise.

Mr. OLSON: I apologise, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Semaphore.

Mr. OLSON: We have already seen, during the early part of the Second Session of this Parliament, members

opposite trying to shift the Federal Government's responsibility in relation to funding cut-backs that have been occurring in relation to various projects in this State. However, as hard as they try, they cannot deny the harsh injustices being levelled at pensioners, brought about by the viciousness of the Fraser Administration, especially affecting fringe benefits for pensioners 75 years or over.

At the request of the Port Adelaide Navalmen's Association and other exservicemen's groups, as well as individuals throughout the electorate, I intend to relate the injustices that have been meted out by this uncharitable Federal Government, the direct aim of which is to create harsh restrictions on those older members of the community who are least able to fight and support themselves. I refer to the adjustments made to the T.P.I. benefit and the 90 per cent war pension as from November last, when they were increased by 43c a week. This means, of course, that they have been denied the fringe benefits they previously enjoyed.

War pensions were first introduced by the late William Morris Hughes, when he was Prime Minister. Billy Hughes was known as the "little big man". When pensions were made available through the Repatriation Department, they were granted on the basis that they would become an exserviceman's right and privilege, not to be interfered with, irrespective of the Government of the day. This practice has continued over the years until the past few months. We find now that, because of these adjustments, hardship is being created for those exservicemen, who, at the time, were prepared to give their lives in defence of this country.

It is a great regret that the Fraser Government, by its recent actions, has violated that promise. War pensions, unlike other pensions which are controlled by cost of living and consumer price indexation, were granted as an expression of appreciation and gratitude. Now we are finding that they are actually bringing about pain and suffering, as well as the disability that many of these people will have for the rest of their lives.

War pensions were to remain free of income tax and any form of income or means test. We find this is not the case, because the T.P.I. pensioner is now required to pay income tax, in the same way as are pensioners throughout the community. As a result of this small increase of 43c a week, in addition to the concessions on council and water rates having been withdrawn, the concessions to obtain free medical and health benefits have been withdrawn. It must be remembered that no longer is the T.P.I. pensioner treated for all his ailments. He is considered only if ailments are actually attributed to his war-caused disability.

He finds that he must make a contribution now for his normal medical benefits. He has had withdrawn the concession card that permitted him in the past to receive concessions in relation to motor cars and so on. In addition he has had his pass withdrawn to travel on public transport, as well as being denied the concession that applied to sporting fixtures. The message should be conveyed to the Federal Government of the inconvenience and hardship that these decisions are causing, and steps should be taken to again make these concessions sacred, as it was envisaged when they were first introduced. Moreover, the concessions that have been withdrawn should be placed back at the pensioners' disposal.

Probably, in November 1978, further consideration will be given to upgrading pensions and we could possibly find that pensioners who are receiving less than the T.P.I. pension and the 90 per cent war pension, those on a 60 per cent pension or less, could find that they will cease to enjoy the benefits that they have been able to get because of their disabilities. I make the appeal that everything should be done to reimburse these people for some of the hardships that have been brought about by their disabilities.

Motion carried.

At 9.53 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 3 August at 2 p.m.