

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 16 August 1978

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

## PETITION: VOLUNTARY WORKERS

Mr. **TONKIN** presented a petition signed by 203 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to take action to protect and preserve the status of voluntary workers in the community.

Petition received.

## QUESTION

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

## BREATHALYSERS

In reply to Mr. **OLSON** (20 July).

The **Hon. D. W. SIMMONS**: I am satisfied that the readings of breathalyser tests are accurate. The breathalyser does not over-read by as much as 0.027 per cent. In his article, Mr. Hodgman was no doubt referring to scientific experiments which detected a difference in blood alcohol concentrations from different sites of the body, namely, venous blood and arterial blood. The breathalyser gives accurate blood alcohol concentration readings from arterial blood, and there is ample scientific support for the view that the concentration of alcohol in the arterial blood is an accurate indication of the concentration of alcohol being delivered to the brain. It is this concentration which affects the behavioural pattern of the individual.

The breathalyser is a scientific instrument specifically designed for the purpose of measuring the blood alcohol content of arterial blood. It is certainly being used for that purpose in South Australia, and I have no doubt the same applies in other States. The matters raised by Mr. Hodgman in the recent newspaper article are not new. The medico-legal professions have been aware of the issues raised as far back as 1962. Numerous challenges, on similar bases to Mr. Hodgman's contention, have been made in courts throughout Australia about the accuracy of the breathalyser. To date, nothing has been proved that would raise any serious doubts as to the validity of the readings obtained by that instrument, provided it has been operated correctly. In the face of this, it would be difficult to sustain the claim that people have been unfairly convicted as a result of the instrument's use.

## QUESTION TIME

## MALAYSIA

Mr. **TONKIN**: Will the Premier say whether the level of activity and present financial situation of the joint Malaysian and South Australian companies is such that their winding up is currently under consideration, and what has been the cause of what appears to be a further financial disaster for the South Australian Government?

Although the Premier has given periodic reports about activities in Malaysia (usually after his return from that country) little information is available about the actual operations of the companies in which the South Australian Government has an interest. Household componentry,

rice straw, and other interesting proposals have been mentioned, but no evidence of any economically viable activity has actually come forward. Reports that have come from Malaysia indicate that the entire operation is regarded in some circles in Malaysia as something of a joke. What evidence is there to show that the continued operation of these companies is worthwhile, and not a total failure as many people seem to regard it?

The **Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN**: The honourable member does not cite any person by name in suggesting that his allegation is founded in fact. As to the attitude of the Malaysian people, I can only say that the South Australian Government has received the highest commendation from the Prime Minister of Malaysia and he has indicated to the South Australian Government that, in relation to its operations, I may speak to him directly at any time and that so highly is the South Australian operation regarded that, whenever the Federal Investment Development Agency of the Malaysian Government (FIDA) seeks an Australian partner, it goes not to the Australian Government but to South Australia. I do not know what the honourable member is talking about when he talks of "financial disaster". He does not cite any evidence for that, nor is there any.

Mr. **Venning**: You've got it covered up.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I call the honourable member for Rocky River to order.

The **Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN**: If the Leader is going to go on with his usual persiflage, I suppose we must expect this, as it is normal for him. However, if he is going on to say anything of any moment in this House, he had better produce his evidence.

## FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. **BANNON**: Can the Premier, who is also Treasurer of the State, tell the House some of the broad implications for the people of this State of the Federal Budget introduced last evening? Will he comment on the Federal Treasurer's statement that the Australian economy is now responding positively to the policies directed to its basic problems and on his claim that the Federal Government is pursuing higher levels of economic activity and greater job opportunities?

The **Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN**: Those claims by the Federal Treasurer, of course, would be laughable if they were not so serious. The Federal Treasurer's own Budget papers show that the appreciation of the Federal Treasury is that there will be greater unemployment in Australia. That is perfectly correct. There can be no doubt at all that at the end of this year unemployment will exceed 500 000. Every indication from the Federal Budget is that there will be a depressed level of economic activity; certainly, consumer ability to spend will be reduced markedly. About \$5 a week will be taken from the average family's income, apart from the depredations upon the lower income groups caused by the abolition of Medibank standard.

Directly inflationary, and of severe effect upon this State, will be the increase in the prices of all petroleum products. This State relies heavily on the transport of its goods to the Eastern States, and much of that transport is by road. Undoubtedly, the prices of our goods to the market through increased transport costs will be severely affected.

Mr. **Chapman**: Drop the road maintenance tax.

The **Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN**: I would love to drop the road maintenance tax if the Federal Government would do the appropriate thing and introduce a fuel tax in its place. The South Australian Government has constantly

proposed this. In the meantime, we simply cannot do that if the honourable member believes that we should (and I should have thought he did) maintain the roads in South Australia for these transports to run on.

Additionally, South Australia is faced with the fact that there have been severe deprecations upon this State. The brandy industry will be virtually closed up by the increase in excise on potable spirits. Previously, the brandy industry had suffered severely from increases in excise, and I have constantly made submissions to the Federal Government for a reduction in that excise. Brandy sales have fallen severely because of the previous excise. Brandy prices increasing to more than \$11 a bottle puts the industry in a hopeless position.

I notice that the Leader of the Opposition has said today that there are some signs of hope for the wine industry. I can only say that he does not know very much about the wine industry, because the brandy industry (and we have nearly 90 per cent of Australia's brandy production in this State) is integrated with the wine industry. A great deal of the economics of the wine industry depends upon its being able to convert a certain amount of its crush to brandy. Particularly are the co-operative wineries, supported by the State as they are heavily through the loans to producers scheme, hit by this system, and particularly are the people in the Riverland hit. It will be difficult for many growers to quit their wine grapes.

In addition, there has been a reduction overall of 3.7 per cent in the spending on State schools, but in South Australia it is 5 per cent. Our schools, in consequence, have been especially badly hit. Honourable members opposite have approached me about the need to extend the school dental programme in country areas, but the programme in South Australia has been cut by \$2 000 000.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** In South Australia?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Yes. The general effect of this Budget on the people of South Australia is that every family with an income of less than \$238 a week has been disadvantaged by the tax measures which have taken place during the past year and which will be finally reached on 1 November this year.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Why do you think they have done it?

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

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The attitude of the Federal Government comes out clearly right through the Budget papers. The Federal Government believes (and it has stated this again and again) that real incomes in Australia must be reduced, but the real incomes to be reduced are those of the lower 70 per cent of the population. In fact, the top 30 per cent have been advantaged, and the destruction of Medibank is to the advantage of the best-off people in Australia. They will have their premiums for the high tables in private insurances reduced.

The people who most need help from a national health scheme are those who now will get less. It is quite clear what the Prime Minister is about. He is about reducing the real income of the average citizen and redistributing that income upwards. I believe that that is a disastrous proposal for Australia. It will reduce markedly consumer incomes and it will reduce the level of business. It will attack the Australian economy. As Kenneth Davidson has said today in the *Age*, it is a Budget one could expect in an extreme boom period.

It is heavily deflationary. The effect of that in the present circumstances is to reduce economic activity, and an analysis of the Budget papers shows quite clearly that the deficit figures have been padded and that there is no way that a growth in economic activity as forecast will occur. There will, in fact, be a reduction in Federal

revenues from a further depression of activity within Australia. The deficit will not be reduced, it will simply be moved down the scale and there will be a redistribution of income from the poor to the rich. That is the effect of the Budget, and it is absolutely disastrous to the average citizen in this country.

### LONG SERVICE LEAVE

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to continue its pace-setting legislation, such as the long service leave provisions for Government employees, which, as the Government promised at the election, will be the most generous in Australia? This legislation has been criticised by Mr. H. D. Krantz, the State Secretary of the Federated Clerks Union, for reducing employment opportunities in South Australia.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The Government will carry out its election programme.

### REYNELLA EAST SCHOOL

**Mr. DRURY:** Is the Minister of Education able to say whether portion of the new primary school at Reynella East will be available for use by the Kindergarten Union and playgroups? This new primary school is to be ready for use in February 1979. There is a lack of kindergarten facilities in the area, and it seems, after last evening, that there will be even less likelihood of kindergarten facilities becoming available.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Capacity would certainly be available in the early stages of the primary school for a pre-school to be set up, and I would imagine possibly also a playgroup. The problem with the pre-school as opposed to playgroups is that salaries have to be generated. As a result of the disastrous document to which the honourable member referred, it seems most unlikely that the Childhood Services Council in the coming year will be able to generate additional salaries.

I have previously rehearsed this matter in the House, and the Budget last evening did nothing to give the lie to my assertions about the way in which childhood services would be treated by the Commonwealth in the coming 12 months. Playgroups tend to be less formally organised affairs, relying on the enthusiasm on the mothers of the children concerned, and I think there is a good possibility that, in the initial stages of the school at least, there would be rooms available for this type of activity. If I provide the honourable member with the name of the Principal of Reynella East Primary School, who I understand has already been appointed necessarily ahead of the time for the acceptance of enrolments, he could liaise with that person to see what might be possible in this respect.

### POWER INDUSTRY

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** My question to the Minister of Labour and Industry concerns the 37½-hour week in the power industry. As a result of the decision handed down by the High Court this morning, will the South Australian Government now ensure that the "sweetheart" agreement between ETSA and the Municipal Officers Association over the 37½-hour week is tested before the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission for its compliance with wage indexation guidelines? In addition, if the agreement is found to be outside the guidelines, will

it be withdrawn?

This morning the High Court handed down a decision stating that the Victorian State Electricity Commission could not intervene in the case before the Australian Industrial Commission. Therefore, the case before the commission, in which the 37½-hour week in the power industry in South Australia is being tested for compliance with the guidelines of wage indexation, can now proceed.

That case came before the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission earlier this year. Since then the South Australian Government, by a decree of both the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister of Labour and Industry, issued an instruction that the 37½-hour week would be adopted, irrespective of the decision of the High Court or of the Industrial Commission. Last week, the State Industrial Commission severely criticised the State Government, in effect by criticising the Public Service Board, for its "sweetheart" agreement reached on another matter. Therefore, I think it only fair to say that we should ensure that—

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

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** The agreement between ETSA and the M.O.A. must now go before the Commonwealth commission to ascertain whether it agrees with the wage indexation guidelines and, if it does not, obviously it should be withdrawn.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** First, certain corrections should be made to the honourable member's remarks and explanation. The agreement is an agreement between ETSA, on the one hand, and the Municipal Officers Association and the Trades and Labor Council, on the other hand, and involves all members of the staff of ETSA and all employees who were previously working a 40-hour week. It is not a "sweetheart" agreement but a productivity agreement.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** It's a "sweetheart" agreement.

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

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The honourable member may say that it is a "sweetheart" agreement, but it is not: it was negotiated on the initiative of the board of ETSA, and not on the initiative of the M.O.A. or of the Trades and Labor Council or any of the unions involved in the power-generating industry. It was a proposition developed within ETSA, and was negotiated with the unions for 15 to 18 months. One condition that the ETSA management and board wanted included was that the agreement should be ratified at arbitration. It is important to get the history correct on this matter. The application to arbitration was made, I think, in about July or August 1977, and immediately the State Electricity Commission of Victoria, acting on instructions of the Victorian Government, applied not just to intervene in the case but also to be cited as a party to the case.

The commission granted the S.E.C. the right to intervene, but refused the right for it to be cited as a party. For the benefit of the member for Davenport, who has a propensity to distort history, it was on the issue of not being cited as a party that the S.E.C., on instruction from the Victorian Government, went to the High Court. The High Court case was initiated last November, and it has taken nine months for the High Court to give its decision, even though the High Court had finished hearing the case in February. It is that sort of delay that is designed to make industrial relations worse.

To make clear the role of the Victorian Government, it took this action, even though it knew (because it was informed by the Minister of Labour and Industry that this was the case) that the S.E.C. was introducing a 38-hour

week in the Latrobe Valley for large groups of workers.

The State Electricity Commission of Victoria had the gall (and it probably had no alternative, I suppose, because it was instructed by the Victorian Government) to take this delaying action through the High Court in order to try to foul up industrial relations in South Australia, even though it was doing that very thing in the Latrobe Valley that it was going to try to stop in South Australia. In those circumstances, back in March this year an agreement was reached whereby we decided that, if the High Court had not handed down its decision by the middle of May, South Australia would introduce administratively the 37½-hour week.

It is a change in South Australia that the unions have had to agree to a whole series of changes so that there is no significant impact on costs. Several productivity agreements have been made previously that would have gone to the Arbitration Commission. The first was from Telecom and the second from Australia Post for a 37½-hour week. Those agreements have been approved by the Arbitration Commission as falling within the wage indexation guidelines.

This productivity agreement was a better agreement than that which applied through Australia Post and Telecom. There were some minor increases in cost in Australia Post and Telecom but, in the case of ETSA, the change was insignificant. What the member for Davenport is really trying to do in relation to this matter is say that the Government of South Australia should have connived with his colleagues in Victoria to promote rotten industrial relations in the power industry in South Australia and to reduce the power industry here to the kind of conditions that prevail in Victoria.

That is the kind of proposition that the member for Davenport wants to argue. Let me conclude on this point. This Government has been an advocate of good industrial relations. We have never had in the history of this State a more effective Minister of Labour and Industry in securing good industrial relations. The number of days lost through industrial disputes in this State has never been lower; they now represent about 2 per cent of the number of days lost in Australia, even though we have 9½ per cent of the Australian work force.

The Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues know that to be a fact, yet the Leader is unwilling to control a member like the member for Davenport and stop him from trying to foul up industrial relations, produce strikes in the power industry, and industrial trouble of the kind that occurs continually in Victoria.

The 37½-hour week in ETSA is a productivity agreement that virtually involves no change in costs. It was initiated by the management and board of ETSA. To my knowledge Sir Thomas Playford, a member of the board, supported the proposition. He may not have agreed that we should introduce the proposition administratively rather than wait for arbitration, but he supported the initiation of these discussions with the trade union movement.

Those discussions took place and produced an agreement, with the unions conceding all the changes that ETSA wanted in order to make the whole thing feasible and an effective productivity agreement. ETSA has had a tremendous record in industrial relations. It was promoting that record further with this arrangement. The member for Davenport is really saying, "Why don't you chuck it all away and indulge in the kind of union bashing that the Federal Government indulges in and the Liberal State Government in Victoria indulges in," and we will indulge in if we are ever put in that position. Thank God the Opposition will not be the Government in this State.

### RAILWAY SERVICES

**Mr. KENEALLY:** Can the Minister of Transport say whether any evidence came out of the Federal Budget that would substantiate the claim made by the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon) that the Federal Government has no plans to extensively reduce services on the Australian National Railways? My question is supplementary to one I asked yesterday. Subsequent to that question the Leader of the Opposition claimed that the reason the railways are under threat is because of the railways transfer agreement. When that agreement was entered into with the Whitlam Government, there was no reason to believe that a Liberal and National Country Party Government would seek to emasculate the railways and that South Australian railway workers would need to be protected from such a Government.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** There is no evidence to support the view that Mr. Nixon has attempted to convey to the public of South Australia by his article in yesterday's *Advertiser*; rather, to the contrary. A brief statement was made by Mr. Howard, when he delivered the Budget last evening, that the Commonwealth Government has instructed A.N.R. to reduce its deficit to \$60 000 000 and that it is working in that direction.

The only way that A.N.R. can reduce its deficit to \$60 000 000 is to reduce services, withdraw services, and increase freight and livestock rates that I referred to at the weekend. The member for Rocky River can shake his head all he likes, but he should not shake it too hard, he might get a headache.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** The plain facts are that, despite two requests to the Federal Minister for Transport to give the people an assurance that those services will not be reduced, withdrawn, or freight and livestock charges increased with a consequential dismissal of railway employees, Nixon has twice refused to give such an assurance.

I was also told that, following delivery of the Budget, I would be provided with a plan: I have not got it. Mr. Nixon, in one of his telexes yesterday, revealed for the first time publicly that there is now a 10-year corporate plan to wipe out the deficit altogether. I suggest that some Opposition country members do a little thinking on what that means, because there will be no trains running in South Australia if Nixon has his way.

### PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

**Mr. VENNING:** Will the Minister of Works give further consideration to having the Public Buildings Department remain at Kadina? The Minister will recall the deputation that came from Kadina, Wallaroo, and Moonta areas to give its support to the retention of the Public Buildings Department offices at Kadina. The case was further supported by letters from the Yorke Peninsula District Council and the Port Broughton District Council. Because of the need to spend our State's resources wisely, and as surplus office space will become available at Kadina now that the Commonwealth offices are about to be commissioned, will the Minister reconsider the matter?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I should like to be able to say "Yes" to the honourable member, but I think he appreciates that much consideration has already been given to his representations and representations made by the people of Kadina who came to see the Minister

assisting me (Hon. D. H. L. Banfield). I have received letters asking that the Public Buildings Department remain at Kadina. The honourable member would be aware (and it has been explained to him and his constituents who made up the deputation) that regionalisation of some Government departments is taking place. A decision has been made by the Government on that matter and, indeed, this move is part of that regionalisation that is taking place.

Whilst the honourable member has said that Kadina is a more suitable place than is Clare for the Public Buildings Department to be located, that is not the opinion either of the department or of the people who made the decision in relation to regionalisation. The department's service to those facilities requiring it in Kadina will not be reduced in any way. However, the officers who previously were located in Kadina will no longer be there. I regret that I cannot say that I shall give further consideration to it. I believe that it has had sufficient consideration. I can see no area or ground in which I can move, so I have to say to the honourable member that I will not give further consideration to the request.

### PROSTITUTION COMMITTEE

**Mr. SLATER:** Does the Chief Secretary believe that the Select Committee of Inquiry into Prostitution will be able to carry out its work effectively in view of the lack of experience of its members, as alleged by the member for Mitcham? The member for Mitcham has alleged in the press that he doubts whether any member of the committee of inquiry has ever been in a brothel. We can see, therefore, that the committee would be relying heavily on the member for Mitcham and his wealth of practical experience in that regard.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I was surprised to read that the member for Mitcham had said that he was alarmed, because he doubted whether most of his colleagues on the committee had ever been inside a brothel.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I wasn't speaking for you.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham.

**Mr. Millhouse:** But—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will have an opportunity during Question Time to ask a question.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** As the honourable member has raised the subject, I shall put the matter beyond doubt and say that I have never been inside a brothel.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** I am pleased to hear it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I am glad that the Deputy Premier is pleased to hear that.

**Mr. Chapman:** He won't be in a position to pimp on you.

**The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:** I do not really believe that that disqualifies me from taking part in this inquiry. I am sure that the members who have been appointed to the committee are quite capable of assessing the evidence put before them. However, if we feel a lack of experience in this area, we will be pleased to have the benefit of the experiences of the member for Mitcham.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** Inspector-General of Brothels!

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

### EDUCATION GRANTS

**Mr. ALLISON:** Since technical and further education grants to South Australia from the Federal Government have been greatly increased for the second successive year, will the Minister of Education use some of this funding and take immediate action to integrate some further education and secondary school courses to provide a much greater measure of practical and theoretical career experience than at present exists and, in doing so, thereby help to lessen the problem experienced by unskilled youngsters trying to enter the work force on leaving school? The Minister no doubt will realise that I refer specifically to the Link courses which have been under investigation for the past two or three years.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The honourable member has made clear that the Government and the Education Department have been looking at this proposition for some time, but the problem in relation to the specific area of financing to which he refers is that usually Commonwealth finance in this area is allocated for specific purposes. It would be necessary for there to be extensive negotiations with the Technical and Further Education Council of the Tertiary Education Commission before any finance which is coming to us in this present Budget could be diverted to that purpose.

We are talking about capital grants, which would come only as a result of their having been approved for a specific project, such as the Gilles Plains project, or something of that sort (and during the last session, the honourable member criticised me extensively in relation to certain aspects of those projects), or else they are in relation to certain specific curriculum areas. Our aim has been to endeavour to define specific curriculum areas which could be capable of funding from Commonwealth sources. Clearly it is in our interests to do this because of the severe cutbacks in funds to Government secondary schools. These have yet to be defined. When they have been defined, there will still be the battle about whether or not the Commonwealth Government would see this as a priority area of funding, but in that case I am strengthened by the fact that any applications we may make would have the support of the honourable member.

### PROSTITUTION COMMITTEE

**Mr. GROOM:** Can the Minister of Works say what method was used yesterday to select members of the Liberal Party for service on the Select Committee of Inquiry into Prostitution? In today's *Advertiser* appeared the following report:

Mr. Becker (Liberal Hanson) said later he was insulted and "very cross" that he had not been appointed to the committee.

I know the honourable member has shown an interest in this matter, and it was commonly expected that he would be a member of the committee. My concern is that the remarks of the honourable member could be construed as a suggestion that the Government had excluded him.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The procedures were perfectly normal in that the Government indicated to the Leader of the Opposition that there would be seven members on this committee. That was unusual, because the usual membership of Select Committees is five people, three being Government members and two being Opposition members. The Leader of the Opposition expressed some concern that the Government might attempt to set up a committee of five (three Government members and two Opposition members), and insist that

one of the latter would be Mr. Millhouse, because of his obvious expertise in this area. They were quite correct in assuming that initially, because Mr. Millhouse has had much to say, as we know, and from the utterances he had made we thought he could serve a real purpose on the committee.

Following the Leader's approach, it was decided that we should not depart from the practice of appointing two members of the Opposition, and we indicated to the Leader that the membership of the committee would be increased to seven so that the normal situation relating to the proportion of Government members on a Select Committee would obtain. I was surprised to learn that the member for Hanson was not appointed. As he had given notice that he intended to move a motion for such a Select Committee and, as he had a personal interest in the subject, I assumed that he would be involved in it. I was surprised he was not selected by his Party to be a member of the committee. I do not know whether or not that shows that there is a split in the Party.

We on this side share the disappointment of the member for Hanson, and I think bitterness, that he was not considered by his colleagues fit to represent them on the committee. In other words, he had better qualifications and I think he had more concern than the people who were put on the committee. Let us say that he has our sympathy.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** They put on a couple of worn out old men.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Oh, no, they are not worn out, but he is one of the younger and more vigorous members on that side, and I think those attributes might have been put to good use during the course of the inquiry. Be that as it may, we feel sorry for him to think that his abilities in this regard are not recognised.

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

**The SPEAKER:** Before the honourable Leader speaks, I remind him that he may explain matters of a personal nature, but he may not debate the matter.

**Mr. TONKIN:** Although this matter has been raised in a somewhat facetious manner, it is important to make one matter particularly clear to the Government: in my opinion, the member for Hanson has been making an extremely valuable contribution to the Public Accounts Committee, and the Opposition considers that nothing should be allowed to detract him from that course.

### CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION

**Mr. GROTH:** Will the Attorney-General inform the House what is the maximum payment allowable under this State's Criminal Injuries Compensation Act? It was reported in today's *Australian* that a judge of the Darlinghurst Criminal Court, in Sydney, had complained that the Criminal Compensation Act in that State allowed for a maximum of only \$4 000 compensation to be paid to a victim of serious crime. In his judgment, the judge said:

If this child was being awarded damages in a civil jurisdiction, it would be a very large amount. She has suffered a shocking ordeal; experienced both physically, organically and psychologically.

The case in question concerned a seven-year-old girl who was repeatedly raped by a youth, and suffered, as the judge pointed out, serious physical and psychological damage.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I am glad that this matter has been raised in the House today, because I think it is an

important matter. The fact that it was reported in the national press this morning that a judge in New South Wales had been critical of the level of criminal injuries compensation available in another State underscores the fact that, in South Australia, we as a Government have a good record of providing compensation to people who have been injured. Members will be aware that this Government some years ago introduced a Criminal Injuries Compensation Bill, which was subsequently passed and became law, and that legislation was recently upgraded regarding the maximum compensation to provide for a total sum of \$10 000 per claim.

On that basis, the child who was injured in New South Wales as a result of being raped would have been able to claim a sum totalling \$30 000, and I imagine that that would have been much more satisfactory compensation than was the total maximum available in New South Wales, which was only \$12 000. In saying "more satisfactory", I do not want it to be thought that in any way am I suggesting that monetary compensation is a satisfactory compensation to a victim of rape. I believe that rape is one of the most heinous crimes in the criminal law, and I do not believe people could seriously suggest that one could be compensated for the damage caused by rape simply by monetary compensation. Nevertheless, a number of matters associated with the suffering and injury can be compensated by financial means.

This Government has been concerned about the number of rapes that have been occurring in this and other States, and we have been most concerned to ensure that police in this State are properly equipped to meet the challenge of the increases that have occurred. By and large, I believe that the police in this State have been successful when it comes to meeting the challenge regarding rape. Any decent member of the community would roundly condemn rape as a most heinous crime. We have in this State, as against the other States, an adequate Criminal Injuries Compensation Act that to some extent tempers the trauma suffered by rape victims. I point out that some jurisdictions elsewhere do not have criminal injuries compensation legislation. This is just another area where South Australia has provided the community with much better protection than is available in other States.

#### MOTOR VEHICLE NOISE

**Mr. WOTTON:** Can the Minister for the Environment say whether the Government now has any plans to introduce legislation that would control excessive noise emitted by motor vehicles? I quote from a letter, which was signed in May this year by the Minister of Transport, as follows:

Regulation 9.07 of the Road Traffic Act requires all new motor vehicles to comply with Australian Design Rule No. 28—Motor Vehicle Noise. In addition, section 101 of the Act states that a person shall not drive a motor vehicle while that vehicle emits an undue amount of noise. It is realised that difficulties are sometimes encountered in enforcing section 101 of the Act because of the problems associated with determining what is an acceptable level of noise. However, investigations are currently in hand . . . to introduce noise regulations for all "in-service" vehicles. It is anticipated that such legislation will be formulated in the not too distant future so that there is an effective control over vehicles emitting excessive noise by setting specific limits for noise levels.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** If the honourable member cares to look at the list of matters now before the Subordinate Legislation Committee he will see that

regulations under the Road Traffic Act for that very purpose are being considered. They were drawn up and introduced at the same time as regulations were drawn up under the Noise Control Act. The regulations under the Road Traffic Act deal with in-service vehicles, which are catered for under that Act rather than under the Noise Control Act. The regulations are designed to control the sorts of problem that were raised by the honourable member. We have fulfilled what the Minister of Transport in his letter said that we would be considering.

#### WATER FILTRATION

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Can the Minister of Works say what overall effect the savage decrease of nearly \$2 000 000 for the water filtration programme for this State as announced in last evening's Federal Budget will have on the Government's water filtration programme?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** It will have the effect of causing the State Government to produce more funds in order to maintain an economic programme. As the honourable member would appreciate, it should not be possible, other than at an economic level—

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** Tonkin is pleased about that.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Of course he is. He is grinning about our difficulties in this area; he thinks that it is rather funny. I go back to the undertaking that was given by the Whitlam Government to finance this programme: that was the basis on which this Government mounted the programme. There was no other reason. We knew the funds were available and we commenced the programme on the undertaking that the Federal Government would finance it over 10 years to the tune of \$100 000 000, 70 per cent of which was to be a long-term loan and 30 per cent a grant. That basis no longer exists. We were told by the present Government, when it entered Government, that that undertaking would no longer be honoured.

The Federal Government did not care that the State had mounted a programme that will now cost about \$150 000 000; it did not care that we had mounted that programme because of the undertaking given by the Whitlam Government. Obviously, it does not care now, either, because this year it has reduced the sum made available by \$2 000 000 compared to last year. We have a sum of \$4 400 000 for this purpose this year. As I have stated previously, that means that the programme will have to be extended over a much longer period than is desirable, because of the financial restriction placed on the programme by the present Federal Government.

As Minister of Works, I am looking forward to the day when the present Government in Canberra is thrown out on its ear for the things it has done, particularly in financial areas, and for the hardship it has imposed on hundreds of thousands of Australians through its heartless approach to its fiscal policies. I am looking forward to the day when it is thrown out on its ear and we will have a Government that will be sympathetic to the pleas of this Government in relation to this most important programme.

We undertook the programme not only because the Federal Whitlam Government made these funds available to us but also because it was necessary on a health basis. That necessity still exists. Whether or not the Opposition likes it, or whether it thinks that, if ever it does happen to get on to the Treasury benches in this State, it can cancel the programme, it is wrong. The programme will have to be carried on, and that will have to be done at the expense of other essential works in this State.

I am bitterly disappointed by the fraud that has been perpetrated by the Government in Canberra in relation to

this programme. The people of South Australia ought to be aware of that. I hope that they are aware and I hope that, at the appropriate time, they will register their disgust at the actions of the present Federal Government.

### SPORTS LOTTERY

**Mr. EVANS:** Can the Premier say what action, if any, the State Government will take regarding the recommendations of the Confederation of Sports that a lottery to finance sport be established?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I have sought a report from the Lotteries Commission concerning this matter. The market for lottery clients is not elastic, and any large-scale lottery that intrudes on the large-scale lottery market of South Australia is likely to reduce that market, which at the moment is providing valuable provision to the Hospitals Fund in this State. The Lotteries Commission has reported previously against attempts by other bodies to get into the large-scale lottery market in this State. I have not had a report from the Lotteries Commission, but I will give a reply when I have it.

### LOWER NORTH-EAST ROAD

**Mrs. BYRNE:** In accordance with previous indications, work on the reconstruction and widening of the first section of the Lower North-East Road from the Torrens River at Dernancourt has commenced. I am pleased about this, and I am sure that my constituents, too, are pleased. I therefore ask the Minister of Transport to state the time scale for the completion of this section of the road, presumably to Lyons Road, and give any other relevant information.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** I will obtain a full report for the honourable member.

### PUBLIC SERVICE APPOINTMENTS

**Mr. RUSSACK:** In view of the criticism of the Government for making appointments from outside South Australia, can the Premier say whether there were no suitable applicants in South Australia to succeed the late A. M. Ramsay as General Manager of the South Australian Housing Trust?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Criticism has been made of the Government for making appointments from outside the service. I do not accept that criticism. I believe that it is vital that we bring people in from elsewhere, either from the private sector or the public sector, because that means we are getting the best expertise in senior positions. I do not believe that the Government should be confined to the promotion of people within the Public Service alone, any more than private industry is in its course of seeing to it that it gets the best quality.

In the case of the appointment of the General Manager of the Housing Trust, some well-qualified South Australians were interviewed, and I believe that all of those people had capabilities for the post. However, the unanimous recommendation of those members of the board who formed the interviewing panel, and the unanimous recommendation of the board, I believe, was for the appointment of Mr. Edwards, because of his outstanding qualifications in all the areas that the board sought.

The Government naturally, with a unanimous recommendation of that kind, had to accept the opinion of the board. It was not something that the Government in those circumstances believed that it should take any action whatever to over-rule. I believe that the trust's board is extremely effective and responsible, and that its recommendation in those circumstances was unexceptionable and one that the Government was necessarily bound to accept.

### STRAW COMPANIES

**Mr. OLSON:** Can the Minister of Transport say whether the reported support for legislation to outlaw straw companies, contained in the explanation of the member for Alexandra on Tuesday 10 August, is advisable? I understand that, contrary to the belief of the member for Alexandra, if such legislation were introduced, it would mean that legitimate companies would be advantaged.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** When the member for Alexandra raised this matter, he asked two questions. Following the second question I thought it was time for me to check the official journal of the organisation to which he referred, the Professional Truck Drivers Association.

**Mr. Chapman:** Are they the editors of that journal?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** This journal is, *Truckin Life*, the voice of the Australian truckie. In the latest issue, volume II, No. 4 of 1978, an open letter to transport politicians makes the position clear. The abolition of straw companies will strike a body blow to thousands of independent small business men who provide that service. The whole of this article is along the same lines as they expressed to me at their convention at the Challa Gardens Hotel, at which the member for Alexandra was present. I find it difficult to understand the line that the honourable member is following when, in fact, he is saying that this organisation has a policy, which, in fact, it does not have. I do not support cheating by straw companies.

**Mr. Chapman:** That's a good admission from you.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Alexandra.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I rise on a point of order, Sir. A question was asked by a Government member of the Minister of Transport, and throughout the answering of that question the Minister has reflected on previous remarks of mine relating to this subject. He has directed his remarks in my direction, and has ignored the Chair when replying to a question asked by his own colleague.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair will decide these matters. The honourable member has interjected several times this afternoon, and I have warned him. He has the opportunity, as has anyone else in this House, to ask questions. I do not uphold the point of order.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** I am sorry if this is upsetting the honourable member, but the record must be put straight: there is no risk about that at all. While we are putting the record straight, I can say that, while considering this matter, I came across the report of the speech made by the member for Alexandra at the convention, to which I referred, after I had left that meeting. I do not know whether he made the statement with or without the consent of his Leader, but he has virtually committed a Liberal Government to a reduction of more than \$5 000 000 a year in road funds. He said he believed that it was possible to drop the road maintenance tax altogether and not replace it. I think we ought to start by giving effect to what he has put forward by withdrawing the *Troubridge* from service and saving \$1 000 000.

*At 3.7 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

### PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION

**Mr. KLUNDER (Newland):** I move:

That this House condemns the Fraser Liberal Government for its callous attitude toward pre-school education as evidenced by its retreat from financial responsibility in this area. It notes that while, on the one hand, the Prime Minister seeks to justify present Commonwealth Government policy by stating that pre-school education is a State responsibility, his heavy-handed treatment of the States at the recent Premiers' Conference and Loan Council meetings denies them the resources to adequately compensate for the decline in direct Federal funding. It calls upon the Prime Minister to restore Federal funding for pre-schools to the block-grant equivalent of the 75 per cent salary subsidies which were initiated by the Whitlam Labor Government.

The saga of pre-school education is a sad indication of the way in which the Australian people are being conditioned from the age of four years to accept and be satisfied with second-rate services and experiences. Last evening's Budget was but the latest chapter in this saga, albeit an exceptionally brutal one.

In Australia in 1978 (and this the lucky country) pre-school education is still not available to every child, and we have the sorry spectacle of a Federal Liberal Government desperately trying to welch on its promises to four-year-olds. An amount of \$6 000 000 was cut from the pre-school and child-care budget only last evening. I give the House an outline of the recent history of pre-school education in this country. I start with two quotes from the year 1972. The first is from a report of the special committee of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, which was reported in the *Advertiser* on 29 November 1972, and part of which reads as follows:

Children with the greatest need are suffering from the lack of pre-school education in South Australia, according to a special committee of the South Australian Institute of Teachers . . . The committee found that for children with working mothers, only one parent, poor parents, or migrants settling into a new community, there was only a remote opportunity for pre-school education. In many areas there is no pre-school to feed in five-year-olds to the infants grades. The work of kindergartens has reached the stage of effectiveness where there is an obvious difference in development and maturity between those who have attended one and those who have not.

It is our strongest recommendation that adequate finance be provided to enable this work to be extended so that every child can receive the benefits of this early education, irrespective of economic background.

The second quote is from the 1972 election speech of the then Leader of the Labor Party, Mr. Gough Whitlam. In his policy speech, he made the following statement:

The area of greatest inequality in education is pre-school, and it is precisely here that inequality is riveted on a child for a lifetime. The greatest single aid in removing or modifying the inequalities of background, environment, family income or family nationality or race will be in the provision of pre-school education. In Canberra, where the Commonwealth cannot escape responsibility, every child enjoys a year at properly equipped and properly staffed centres. In the States, fewer than 20 per cent of the children do.

I still find that quote fascinating: where the Federal Liberal Government had a direct responsibility, every child was catered for; where it did not, it was content to leave the figure at a measly 20 per cent. Fortunately, all of

this was to change with the advent of a Federal Labor Government. The pre-election speech of the Leader promised that pre-school education would be made available to all children within six years. In February 1973, after its election, the Australian Pre-Schools Committee was set up by the Australian Government to make recommendations as to how that policy should be implemented.

The South Australian response, I am glad to say, was immediate. Three days after Mr. Beazley announced that the Australian Pre-Schools Committee had been told to develop the programme, the then South Australian Minister of Education, Mr. Hudson, announced that Education Department officers would be requested to start work on the design of pre-school centres immediately, so that South Australia would be ready to take advantage of Federal funding when it became available early in 1974.

What was generally thought of all this probably was best expressed by the editorial of the *News* on 15 November 1973, from which I shall quote only a couple of sentences, as follows:

The pre-schooler, long neglected in the split-up of the education dollar, may at last be facing a better deal.

The editorial concluded as follows:

It sounds fine. The Government must now provide enough money to give the project every chance of success.

In December of that year the Australian Pre-Schools Committee published its report. Pre-school education in Australia at that time was so incredibly poor that it recommended the establishment of 3 330 pre-schools, as well as day-care centres and family day-care centres. South Australia was recommended to receive \$30 000 000 in capital grants and \$7 135 000 in annual recurrent grants until 1985. The report called for the establishment of 320 pre-school centres in South Australia alone, at a cost in land of \$3 960 000, building costs \$11 250 000, equipment costs \$620 000, and recurrent costs \$3 685 000.

Next, the Whitlam Government asked the Social Welfare Commission and the Priorities Review staff to look at the development of the pre-school and day-care situation from the point of view of community welfare. In February 1974, the Whitlam Labor Government announced that South Australia would receive \$1 250 000 Federal funding for pre-school education in that financial year. It was the first programme in Australia to receive Federal funding.

Mr. Bennett, the then Administrator of the Kindergarten Union of South Australia, welcomed the grant as giving a badly needed boost to pre-school education in South Australia, as planning for 20 new kindergartens had been held up and 15 kindergartens which were existing without subsidies at the time were in dire need of assistance.

In April, the interim programme announced approval of \$10 000 000, relating mainly to pre-schools, and in May the Prime Minister promised that pre-school education would be free of charge for all children. There was some hiatus from July to September of that year with the advent of the mini-Budget, but by September the full programme was restored, and the Prime Minister announced that by 1980 all children in Australia would have access to services designed to take care of their educational, emotional, physical, social, and recreational needs.

On 16 September 1974, the first pre-school set up by the Education Department in South Australia opened at Mansfield Park. That was a milestone in South Australian education. Mr. Hudson, in opening it, estimated that half of South Australia's four-year-olds would be able to attend pre-school by the end of 1975, and that, in three years, was



a jump of 30 per cent.

In December 1974 the Interim Committee of the Children's Commission announced its first approvals: that all the projects to be approved were funded for all their capital and recurrent costs. On 2 February 1975 there occurred another milestone. It gained about three column centimetres in the *Advertiser*, and announced that kindergartens in the Kindergarten Union of South Australia were to be free of tuition fees. In April 1975 the Interim Committee of the Children's Commission announced its second group of approvals. They were to be funded for 100 per cent to the end of 1975 and at 75 per cent levels thereafter with approved staff. On 24 June 1975 the policy speech given by the Premier of South Australia at the Norwood Town Hall stated:

S.A. leads all States in pre-school education provisions. We will now eliminate all fees in kindergartens affiliated with the Kindergarten Union and proceed with the development of a universal pre-school system for four-year-olds by the end of the decade.

I will recall the applause given to that section of his speech on that night. In other words, pre-school education had been established and was rapidly becoming available throughout Australia, not just to the privileged few but to all.

Unfortunately, that picture soon changed. For the time being, however, all was well as the incoming Liberal Government went to great pains to assure everyone that the social commitments of the Labor Party would continue under the Fraser Government. The Liberal and Country Party election policy statement indicated that they believed that pre-school education had important social and educational functions. After the coup and the subsequent elections, Senator Guilfoyle issued a press statement in February 1976, and it is interesting to read what she had to say.

**Mr. Groom:** Was she Minister for Education?

**Mr. KLUNDER:** I think she might have been. They gave it to all sorts of people at all sorts of times. She stated:

I would like to point out the former Government's policy of providing 75 per cent cost of salaries of agreed staff in pre-schools, provided they confirm that they extend and integrate their activities to cover other areas of family need, will continue.

I should like it noted that this promise differed qualitatively from all the other promises made by the Liberal Party at about that time. It differed from its promises to maintain aid to Aborigines, to maintain Medibank, and from the implied statement that we would now have a Prime Minister who was not going to be a tourist. This promise was qualitatively different because it happened to be made after the election, and not before it. It was even backed by a letter from Senator Guilfoyle to the South Australian Minister of Education, Dr. Hopgood, which contained the following sentence:

There has been no change in this Government's policy in relation to pre-schools.

In May 1976 the Prime Minister announced a cut of \$5 800 000 in child-care programmes, and in typical style announced that priority would be given to day-care programmes as opposed to pre-school education. It is relevant to note that day-care programmes are considerably cheaper than are pre-school education programmes.

He also announced that the Government was reviewing the present basis of the Commonwealth's recurrent assistance for pre-school education and that he would renegotiate with the States the funding formula for pre-schools. It was perhaps a sign of the times, and an accurate indication of the understanding that the electorate already

had of Mr. Fraser, that not even his apologists in this State Parliament were prepared to argue that renegotiation might mean an increase in funds rather than a decrease in funds. The May indication of cuts in pre-school education was followed in June by the announcement of the formation of the Office of Child Care. The correspondence to the States which accompanied this indicated that, since greater provision was to be made for the children of needy families, pre-school funding would have to be renegotiated. In an article on 26 July 1976 the *Age* read this particular situation accurately indeed when it very succinctly said:

The Federal Government next year will cut its subsidy for pre-school staff salaries.

Mrs. Molly Byrne in this House on 18 August 1976 moved:

That this House express its satisfaction with the present Commonwealth 75 per cent funding arrangements for pre-school teachers' salaries and approved support expenditure; note with concern recent statements attributed to spokesmen for the Commonwealth Government to the effect that this arrangement will be renegotiated, and call upon the Commonwealth Government to adhere to the existing system, or, if it finds this proposition unattractive, to at least make funds for childhood services available to the States on a block grant basis, which would be consistent with its much vaunted federalism policy.

She then spoke eloquently in defence of the existing 75 per cent of salaries support system. In response, the member for Fisher said that we should not do anything about it until it was too late to do anything about it. Fortunately, better counsel prevailed within the Liberal Party, and the then shadow Minister of Education, the member for Mallee, indicated Liberal Party support for Mrs. Byrne's proposition.

Rather fortunately, many other people also did not share the attitude of the member for Fisher. In a letter written to the *Advertiser* on 17 August 1976 the President (Elizabeth K. Richards) and the Secretary (Joan Clark) of the Pre-school Teachers Association had some pertinent things to say about the Fraser Government. The letter states:

It will be remembered that, at the time of the last Federal election, the present Government promised that it would not interfere with the then proposed funding formula now in operation. On the basis of that level of support the State Government provided complementary funding which has permitted all pre-schools to abolish fees.

It seems obvious that if the Federal Government is permitted to dishonour its undertakings in this manner, not only will it become necessary to reintroduce fees for attendance at pre-school but it is most unlikely that the State Government will, at least in the short term, be able to continue with its pre-election promise to develop universal childhood facilities throughout South Australia.

Mr. Bowen, the shadow Attorney-General, was reported in the *Advertiser* of 3 August 1976 as saying that he had given an undertaking to all State Ministers that the Federal Government would bear 75 per cent of the recurrent cost of the programme, and the States would not have entered into this scheme if this commitment had not been made. To show my lack of bias in this matter I am even prepared to quote Stewart Cockburn. On 19 August 1976 in an article in the *Advertiser*, he said:

Fears are mounting that the Federal Government is about to deal a serious blow at pre-school education services in South Australia. This, the sources say, would have the effect of recreating a divisive and elitist system of kindergartens for those who could afford to pay, and a more basic, "second-class" child-care and play-centre service for those who couldn't. Inevitably, those forced to fall back on the "second-

class" service would tend to be children from deprived and under-privileged homes who most needed the best help available . . . Five years ago, only about one in 10 kindergarten staff was professionally qualified. Today, more than six in 10 are professionals.

The then chairman of the Childhood Services Council of South Australia, Judge Olsson, in the same article, said that he feared that the Government was, in fact, in the process of redeploying funds which should be allocated for fully professional services, and channelling them instead into pure child-care facilities. The article continues:

Another of the judge's fears is that South Australia is going to be made to suffer unduly. The State has so far been well in the forefront of efforts to provide integrated childhood services. Under rumoured new Commonwealth provisions, all States would get the same per capita assistance. That could involve bigger relative cut-backs in funds for South Australia than in those received by States which haven't so far organised their services as well.

The same article later states:

In the words of the director of the South Australian Kindergarten Union (Dr. F. N. Ebbeck), it would be "spanking us for being good".

On 18 October 1976 came an extraordinary statement by Senator Guilfoyle which was reported in the *Advertiser* as follows:

The Federal Government had no intention of withdrawing support from pre-school education, the Minister for Social Security (Senator Guilfoyle) said in Adelaide last night. She said a formal announcement about pre-school education funding would be made in the next few weeks.

She was right, because in November, the promised few weeks later, the Prime Minister telexed the Premier, as follows:

In general terms my Government favours providing pre-school recurrent funds in the form of a lump sum, rather than on the basis of staff salaries as at present. It has consequently been decided to make available for the six-monthly period ending 30 June 1977 a fixed sum payable quarterly.

The fascinating aspect of this seemingly innocuous change of policy is the State Opposition's attitude towards it. The then shadow Minister (the member for Mallee) was quoted in the *Advertiser* on 4 November 1976, as follows:

Mr. Nankivell said the Liberal Party in South Australia had been pressing for child-care funds to be provided in the form of a block grant. He was delighted the Federal Government had agreed to adopt this principle. "The provision of block funds equivalent to that which would be provided under the existing percentage scheme will enable the State Childhood Services Council to provide the type of child-care and pre-school services best suited to meet the needs of the South Australian community," he said.

Two interesting points arose in that article. The first is that, although the State Opposition claimed to have been pressing the Federal Government for a change to a block grant and had been delighted to have this point of view accepted, no mention of this was made during the debate engendered in this House by Mrs. Byrne's motion only a few months earlier. Perhaps the kindest thing we can say about that was the State Liberal Party made a very late change of heart very rapidly.

The second aspect is that I will accept that the State Opposition did not want to decrease the availability of funds for pre-school education, and in fact in that article the shadow Minister said so. If that was the case, the Liberal Party in this House was as fooled as was everyone else by the deliberate misleading of the Australian people by the Australian Government. I do not make that accusation lightly, and I will provide proof of that. The Federal Liberal Government deliberately set out to

mislead the Australian public over the funding of pre-schools, and in that process it misled its State Liberal Party colleagues. In fact, it was not until January 1977 that the Prime Minister lowered the boom. In response to a request for indexation of the block grant, in a letter to the Premier he said:

. . . I have yet to be persuaded for the need for such a general arrangement as distinct from specially argued cases relating to unavoidable and justifiable increases in costs. That is what my Federal colleague, Dr. Neal Blewett, calls the Prime Minister's brilliant ability to mislead without telling an untruth. I will come back to that later.

In the meantime, rather belatedly, Senator Guilfoyle did her handspring and joined the rest of the line. In July 1977, a press release in her name stated:

The amount of the block grant provided for each State in the 1977-78 financial year is the same amount as was provided by the Government in its 1976-77 Budget.

In other words, there was no increase in real terms, but a decrease in real terms by the amount of inflation for that year. Unfortunately, she was not even accurate in that, because in 1976-77 South Australia had been given a certain amount allocated to it in its Budget. It had then received \$552 000 more during that financial year, and the 1977-78 Budget then again gave it an equivalent amount of money to that in the previous year's Budget, but not for the previous year's spending, so the State lost \$552 000 on that. Even the *Advertiser* was not impressed, because on 30 July it reported that the allocation represented an effective cut of about 13 per cent. On 30 September, Senator Guilfoyle made it official. In a letter to the Minister of Education in this State, she wrote:

The Commonwealth had not agreed to the general and automatic application of a cost supplementation procedure. Then, last month, Senator Guilfoyle made an incredible error: she told the truth. With that error, she made two things clear: first, that the Federal Government intended to deceive, and succeeded in deceiving, not only the Australian people but also the Liberal Party in South Australia. Secondly, she made perfectly clear that the letter from the Prime Minister to the Premier in January 1977 was, and was intended to be, nothing but double speak in the best 1984 tradition. She said:

As a consequence of the rapidly escalating subsidies that were being paid under this funding arrangement, the present Government decided that, as of 1 January 1977, recurrent assistance would be paid in the form of block grants to the States.

That is an incredible statement. She says, "As a consequence of the rapidly escalating subsidies"; in other words, the Federal Government knew that it would cut back on its real spending for pre-school education when it made its change to a block grant. The State Opposition did not know that but, by its own admission, it inadvertently helped to create the situation where it could occur. It was played for a bunch of suckers by the Federal Liberal Government.

There is no escaping the fact that the Federal Government acted scurrilously and deliberately to reduce the sum that was made available to pre-schools by pretending, first, that it did not intend to do so. Moreover, it did so in an underhand fashion, little caring that it would leave this State's Opposition hanging high and dry in the breeze or that it would leave pre-school education in a somewhat precarious position. I think that it is high time for the Liberals in this House to start repudiating some of these Federal actions if they do not want to be tarred with the same brush.

The Federal and State contributions to pre-school education can best be summed up by looking at the

decrease in funding by the Federal Government over the past few years. In 1976-77, the Federal Government provided 71 per cent of pre-school salaries. In 1977-78, it provided 52 per cent and, in view of that rather disgusting little statement in the Budget last night that \$6 000 000 was being cut from the pre-school and day-care budget, I estimate that we would be lucky to get up to 30 per cent of the pre-school funding for 1978-79. That is nearly the reversal of the situation that applied three years ago.

During this period in South Australia, the number of children who attended pre-schools rose from 52 per cent of those aged four years in 1974 to 92 per cent of those in that age group in 1977. Those are A.B.S. figures, and one needs to take into account that a number of three-year-olds also attended pre-school. So, those figures probably need to be depressed somewhat. Nonetheless, it is obvious that in South Australia a valiant effort was made to place four-year-olds in pre-school education where required.

The problem is that the supply is not always where the demand exists. In the Newland District, for example, the number of youngsters in the zero to four-years-of-age group, that is, those who will want pre-school education within the next few years, has risen from 2 087 in 1971 to 3 249 in 1976, or an increase of 56 per cent in five years.

The requirement for pre-school education in that area is therefore urgent. It is gradually being met as a result of the energetic action being taken by the State Government, but there are still long waiting lists at several centres. Also, as my question to the Minister of Education a week or so ago showed, the Surrey Downs area lacks a pre-school centre to service the suburbs of Surrey Downs, Wynn Vale and the northern part of Redwood Park. The construction of a centre there is considered by the Education Department to be a high priority, but the Childhood Services Council has no money to provide it. I hope that the parents of pre-schoolers in that area are aware that the reason a centre cannot be built there yet is that the Federal Liberal Government has decided, in the most surreptitious and underhand method imaginable, to stop footing the bill.

One of the things that people do not apparently realise is that education tends to suffer a double penalty in the current squeeze on money by the Federal Liberal Government. Education takes up a considerable percentage of the money in the State Budget, and it is inevitable that some of the money that is made available to the States from the Federal Government has to be used for education purposes. Some of this money also comes indirectly from the Federal Government through the Education Commission.

Both of these sources are decreasing in real value. The *Advertiser* indicated on 23 June and it was repeated in the Budget speech last night that the States would get 5.1 per cent more money in the 1978-79 financial year from the Commonwealth at a time when inflation is about 7 per cent—a decrease in real terms of between 1 per cent and 2 per cent. The fact that the States ended up with about \$7 000 000 less from the Schools Commission this year than they did last year I have already outlined in my Address in Reply speech. In South Australia, following the Budget, the situation is even worse. As the Premier indicated earlier this afternoon, South Australia has had its funds for State schools reduced by 5 per cent, and education therefore is being squeezed in two ways. In this context, I must admit to being less than pleased at the way in which the member for Torrens tried to obfuscate the issue in his report in the *News* on 10 August.

**Mr. Wilson:** I'm glad you read it.

**Mr. KLUNDER:** I had to read it two or three times, because the figures were confusing. In it he uses the argument, borrowed from the Federal Minister for Education and already used in this House by the shadow

Minister, that, since 88 per cent of the education budget is provided by the State, education is mainly a State matter. He implied that it was therefore not important that the Federal Government decreased its commitment.

**Mr. Wilson:** I said no such thing.

**Mr. KLUNDER:** It has been implied time and time again in this House. We have the perfect argument for him in the pre-school situation. As I have outlined, the Federal Government, in early 1976, contributed over 70 per cent of the cash. I wonder whether the member for Torrens and the shadow Minister will now agree that it is mainly a Federal concern, that the States can now be excused for not honouring their commitment, and that they can expect the Commonwealth Government to pick up the tab. That is the argument they have used in general education spending altogether. I think that we have the right to expect better than that from one of the few Opposition back-benchers with some degree of potential.

I can imagine that the Opposition finds itself in some degree of difficulty over this motion. After all, it supported Mrs. Byrne's motion in 1976 to retain the 75 per cent level of support for staff salaries. On 20 July 1978 the shadow Minister of Education indicated in his Address in Reply speech on page 139 of *Hansard* that he had already approached the Federal Minister to ask that some consideration be given to maintaining the Federal level of spending of pre-school education. He did not state whether he wanted that maintained at 52 per cent or at the 71 per cent level, but I give him credit for trying to keep the Federal Government up to the mark. I suggest that the Opposition cavil at the wording of this motion, but supports the principle. There is, after all, very little else it could do.

In conclusion, I make several comments. Last evening's Budget can best be described as a "reverse Robin Hood Budget"—it stole from the poor to give to the rich. The Federal Government has reduced its credibility to the point where it is even finding it necessary to steal from four-year-old children in order to maintain its particularly peculiar programme.

I am aware that we have been told that life isn't meant to be easy by a millionaire farmer who is doing his best to become a tourist Prime Minister; a man who can spend \$80 000 of other people's money on crockery (by the way, \$80 000 would just about establish a pre-school centre at Surrey Downs); a man who can spend \$40 000 000 of other people's money on aeroplanes; and untold thousands of dollars of other people's money on taxi fares and hotel suites.

I know that the working people of this country are paying for all this, but I did not, even in my most pessimistic moments, think that four-year-old children of this country would have to learn that life wasn't meant to be easy before they even had a chance to attend school.

**Mr. DRURY (Mawson):** I second the motion so ably moved by my colleague. He has said practically everything about this matter that one could think of saying. Nevertheless, because I represent a district in which there are eight kindergartens and several playgroups, I believe that it is my duty to add my condemnation to the actions of the Fraser Government. Quite properly this motion condemns the Federal Government, because it has contradicted what the Minister for Social Security said in February 1976:

... I would like to point out that the former Government's policy of providing 75 per cent cost of salaries of agreed staff in pre-schools, provided they confirm that they extend and integrate their activities to cover other areas of family need, will continue.

Only two months before that, the caretaker Prime Minister said in his election speech that there would be vast Federal Government cut-backs. It is hard to reconcile those two statements. As one comes down the chronology of this road to deception, one finds, as he moves closer and closer to last evening the possibility of further and further cut-backs becoming more and more real. Even as late as September last year it was stated that the Federal Government would slash the real value of its grants for pre-school teacher salaries in its Budget. That statement was reported in the *Advertiser* on 30 July last year, and it so happened that that is exactly what came to pass.

We are fortunate in this State that the State Government, led by the Premier, in 1975 committed itself to guaranteeing pre-school education for all children between the ages of four and five. As my colleague said this goal was to be reached in 1980, whereas it has already been reached. This brings into question the recent publicity given to pre-school education for children under the age of four years. It so happened that, with the rationalisation occurring at that time, the variation of staff to kindergartens enabled some children under the age of four years to receive this necessary form of education.

As well as having eight kindergartens in my district, I also have an increasing number of playgroups. That is why today I asked the Minister of Education whether Reynella East school, which is now being constructed, could be put to some use for pre-school education. In his reply, the Minister said that the problem would be that of salaries.

As I have said previously, salaries have been cut back consistently since this Federal Government came into office in December 1975. In the South Australian Institute of Teachers *Journal* on 3 May this year the Secretary, Mr. Gregory, pointed out that there would be retrenchments in teachers and teacher aides, there would be reductions in kindergarten hours, and there would be cuts in funds, the first two resulting from the third.

Pre-school education is necessary for a child, because it gives him the ability to socialise with other children, it enables him to learn by imitation from teachers other than his parents, and it enables him to strike up friendships and, frankly, to give his mother a bit of a rest. Anyone in this House who has a family or who has young children would well know that pre-school children can be extremely trying on parents, particularly mothers, because in our society they have the care of children during the day. The balance of the number of mothers at home to those at work has been altered to such an extent that a larger number than usual must put their children into day-care centres.

Nevertheless, this motion has brought into the limelight again the shoddy treatment by the Fraser Government of young parents in this State and in Australia. In a statement published in the press today, the Premier said, we in South Australia have been hit the hardest. The outer suburban areas, such as those in the District of Mawson and the District of Newlands, which have the highest proportion of young marrieds and pre-school children, will not have the facilities available to them to cater for those children. I cannot honestly understand how, after last evening, anyone who is a supporter of the Federal Government can say that that Government is a Government for the people of this country. Obviously, it is not. It is just as obvious, in the intervening 2½ years, that the Federal Government has made it more and more apparent that it does not intend to be a Government for the people.

As I said earlier, we are fortunate in having a State Government that has taken on the responsibility to a large extent to provide for pre-school education. It is obvious that this form of support, particularly in my district, is in the form of shared facilities in several schools.

For instance, as I said earlier, the school at Reynella East can be used on a share basis for some time for playgroups and kindergarten activities. The school at Morphett Vale West (the much maligned school that has been brought to the attention of the House several times by the member for Mount Gambier) is being used for playgroup activities, and will continue to be used until the facilities are no longer available, which will be several years hence, I believe.

In addition, at the Stanvac Pre-School Kindergarten in Highway Drive, Morphett Vale, on the same property as is the primary school, children there learn that they have a natural progression from kindergarten to primary school. It is not the traumatic experience it used to be when the kindergarten was a mile or so away from the primary school, causing a complete change of environment for children when they progressed from one to the other. At the Stanvac school children have a continuation from pre-school to primary school education. I believe that the actions of the Federal Government are to be deplored, and I fully support the last sentence of the motion, which states:

It calls upon the Prime Minister to restore Federal funding for pre-schools to the block-grant equivalent of 75 per cent salary subsidies which were initiated by the Whitlam Labor Government.

That promise was made in April 1974, and was to include family day care, day centres, pre-schools, playgroups, out-of-school care, emergency and occasional care, toddlers groups, and baby-sitting pools.

In December of that year the interim committee of the Children's Commission announced its first approvals: all projects were approved for 100 per cent of their capital and recurrent costs, they were not reduced or savagely cut back, because the Whitlam Government kept its word. In January 1976 the Government grant was reduced to 75 per cent of staff salary costs. In the 1976 press statement of Senator Guilfoyle, she believed that the providing of 75 per cent cost of salaries would continue. Now, it will no longer continue, to the grief of many young families in outlying areas which are faced with the effects of rapid urbanisation, and in areas where the growth of housing has outstripped facilities such as transport and pre-school institutions, and, until recently, playgroups, shops, and the other ordinary, every-day services that are considered normal. In some cases those facilities are not available as quickly as we would like them to be. Once again, the Federal Government last evening set out in what I can only describe as a "blood thirsty manner" (for want of better words) to come down hard on the very young.

In addition, it came down hard on many other groups, but that does not matter to the Prime Minister. It is all very well for him; he has 28 000 sheep, plus another 90 sitting behind him in Federal Parliament who all baah when he tells them to. I cannot add to what the member for Newland has said in his excellent condemnation of Fraser's assault on pre-school education for the young, and I second the motion.

**Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** As I cannot support the motion, I move the following amendment:

Leave out all words after "House" and insert "commends the Federal Government for the manner in which under its federalism policy it has very substantially increased untied grants to South Australia from \$365 000 000 dollars in 1975-76 to \$560 000 000 dollars in 1978-79, thereby permitting the State Government to exercise its own discretion in setting priorities for the funding of pre-school education."

The amendment keeps the debate within the bounds of

pre-school education, but widens the responsibility of the State Government.

It was patently obvious that this motion was set down as a post-Budget day issue, among others that are on the Notice Paper. I do not think it is any accident that we have something relevant to the Budget to debate. Points that were made by the previous two speakers will have to be dealt with before referring to the main argument. The first is that the member for Newland apparently believes that the State can quite effectively get rid of any responsibility for pre-school education, if the Federal Government of the day simply declines to fund all or part of it.

I make quite clear that, in the Liberal Party education policy, we were quite prepared to accept responsibility for pre-school education. In fact, we acknowledge the paramount importance of educating youngsters at as early an age as possible. Therefore, there was no suggestion that we as a Party would reduce pre-school education in any way, in case that red herring should be thrown before the public of South Australia.

We notice that the issue of pre-school has been dealt with today in splendid isolation, and is an attempt to blow up the issue out of all proportion to the general education issue. The education Bill is a substantial one for the whole of Australia, and certainly for South Australia where it represents nearly 30 per cent of the total amount spent each year. Can it successfully be blown up out of all proportion? Of course it cannot. This issue is obviously an important one: pre-schooling has to be, and I acknowledge that first and foremost. The fact that it has been taken on as an emotional issue in an attempt to divide members of the public is not to the Government's credit, when the whole of Australia for the past two or three Budgets has been asked to be responsible, not with a long-term stringency in view but mainly to overcome the difficult situation that the present Federal Government inherited from the Whitlam Government in 1975.

The way in which the Federal Government was returned, not once, but twice, is a reflection of the general population's attitude to responsible Government and the adequate control of expenditure. To say that young, pre-school children have been singled out for a vicious attack is, in itself, a vicious attack on the Federal Government, and is quite unwarranted.

I contacted Senator Guilfoyle, the Minister responsible for pre-school funding (which I acknowledged previously in this House), but at no time did I say that Senator Guilfoyle had made any commitments. I undertook to approach Senator Guilfoyle on behalf of Judge Olsson, Chairman of the Childhood Services Council. The Senator, in her reply, gave no promises but simply said that the matter would be considered in the usual way in the Budget, which was introduced last evening, and that the comments of the Chairman of the Childhood Services Council and mine would be borne in mind.

There were certainly no leaks from that Minister regarding what would happen in the Federal Budget. However, it has been pointed out to me repeatedly by responsible Federal Government officers that considerable additional money has been made available to the South Australian and other State Governments during the past few years since the Liberal Government took office in Canberra. The funds that I shall quote are the total funding in South Australia from Federal sources: in 1975-76, the total was \$975 000 000, increasing progressively to \$1 033 000 000, \$1 163 000 000, and this year \$1 189 000 000. The amount which is not tied, which South Australia can allocate to its own priorities, and therefore the responsibility is at the doorstep of each Minister to establish his priorities within Caucus—

*At 4 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae):** Order! Call on the Orders of the Day.

### MINORS (CONSENT TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL TREATMENT) BILL

Second reading.

**Mr. BANNON (Ross Smith):** I move:  
*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

First, I say what the Bill is not: it is not a Bill to reduce the age of consent in relation to medical and dental treatment of minors. It is a Bill to define at what age and in what circumstances broadly such consent shall be given. It was introduced by the Hon. Anne Levy in another place on 23 November 1977, and, in the course of explaining the purposes of the Bill, the Hon. Anne Levy referred to uncertainties in the law regarding the ability of minors to consent to medical and dental procedures.

It is quite clear, concerning adults, that consent eliminates the possibility of the medical or dental practitioner being sued for the tort of assault. Consent provides a clear authorisation in such cases where it is given by adults, but the common law situation in relation to minors is extremely murky, and authorities differ as to whether or not they are able to give consent, or, having given such consent, whether that consent has effect.

The free and informed consent of a responsible minor should be possible in such situations, and this Bill seeks to provide the statutory authority, and protection for the medical and dental practitioner in receipt of such consent. Some examples of problems that can arise in a situation if this law is not enacted are, for instance, the general situation where the parents of a minor are of a particular religious or ethical belief and are thereby opposed to either any kind of treatment being undertaken by a medical or dental practitioner and would withhold consent on behalf of the minor, or, alternatively, are opposed to some of the procedures.

An example of that, perhaps, is the commonly cited case of that religious body of belief that opposes blood transfusions. The situation at present is that minors cannot consent and thereby eliminate the possibility of the practitioner being sued for the tort of assault. Perhaps there may be other problems in relation to parental attitudes or in relation to the attitude of the minor to his or her parents.

Under that second heading, we could perhaps consider a minor seeking advice on contraception from a qualified practitioner who is prepared to give it and to recommend and prescribe certain contraceptive remedies. In the situation in which the practitioner, one would hope, was fully cognisant, the parents would object, and that objection would be unreasonable. In the present state of the law, the practitioner could persist and run the risk of the parents suing him under this tort of assault. In certain situations, that is quite inequitable and it is unreasonable that the practitioner should be open to such a risk.

The third situation relates to dental procedures. For example, a dentist might take certain surgical procedures, such as removing a tooth, when the parents think that a simple filling would have done the job adequately. They might sue him, not for negligence, but for assault in that

consent was not obtained for removal of the tooth. That example highlights that this Bill does not affect a case of negligence or malpractice. It is aimed purely at the tort of assault.

The model for the Bill is the New South Wales Act of 1970. The provisions contained in this Bill follow closely indeed, in their original form, that of the New South Wales Act, which was introduced in that State with no opposition whatever.

When the Bill was introduced by the Hon. Anne Levy, the main controversy centred on the age of consent provided in the Bill. It was stipulated in the original Bill as 14 years. Following the debate in another place, the Bill was referred to a Select Committee. This Bill has been passed unanimously by members in another place, and takes into account the unanimous recommendations of the Select Committee appointed there.

It is important, in relation to the controversial question of the age of consent, to note that an amendment has been made to the Bill as originally presented, changing the age from 14 years to 16 years. A perusal of the evidence before the Select Committee does not lend strong support for any kind of public disquiet about the age being 14 years; in fact, to the contrary. Most of the witnesses who appeared before the committee were older persons. Only two witnesses were close to the median age of persons living in Australia, which is 28 years. Interestingly enough, both were in favour of the Bill as it stood, including the 14 years age of consent.

The fourth report of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee of South Australia, known as the Mitchell Committee, has been published, and in matters concerned with the criminal law it has recommended the age of 16 years as being an appropriate age of consent for minors. As this age is already recognised as the age when a person assumes a certain measure of responsibility in some areas, and as the Mitchell Committee has recommended it as being appropriate in a criminal law situation, it was thought by members in another place, and of the committee, that this was appropriate for the Bill, which comes to us in that form.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 differs from the Bill as originally presented in another place by the insertion of a definition of "consent", which I think considerably clarifies the meaning of that word for the purposes of the Bill. Clause 3 is the substantive clause. Subclause (1) refers to consent being required of parents or guardians of a minor under the age of 16 years, and, where such consent has been given by the parent or guardian, the protection is extended to the practitioner concerned. Subclause (2) refers to the consent of a minor aged 16 years or over and, on giving that consent, this will have the same effect as consent given by an adult. Subclause (3) is important in that it covers the situation where emergency procedures are necessary, whether medical or dental. It is most likely that medical treatment would be the subject of this subclause.

In that situation, even though consent has not been given, if the absence of consent can be justified then statutory protection is given by the Bill. I commend Miss Anne Levy for her initiative in promoting this Bill in another place. It has gone through a thorough investigation in another place, particularly by a Select Committee. It gained the unanimous support of members there, some of whom were originally sceptical of it. I urge all members to support this progressive measure.

**Mr. EVANS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Klunder (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 575.)

**Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** More significantly, the amount available to South Australia in untied grants over the past few years has been \$365 000 000 in 1975-76, increasing to \$433 000 000, then to \$507 000 000, and for the year 1978-79 there has been an increase of \$53 000 000 to a total of \$560 000 000. This, when coupled with the increase from \$1 163 000 000 to \$1 189 000 000, indicates the extent to which the Government has additional funding completely untied that it could commit to educational and other projects at its own discretion, without resorting to the usual ploy of simply blaming the Federal Government for everything that happens adversely in South Australia and not giving any credit for amounts that are increased.

There have been some increases to offset these figures; for example, the technical and further education field has received an increase this year of about 20 per cent. That \$3 526 000 follows hard on the heels of a similar 20 per cent increase for South Australia last year about which the Minister did not complain, despite the fact that the rest of Australia received only a 9 per cent increase. There seems to be no attempt on the part of the Government to balance the books in some way and give credit where credit is due. The Federal Government has increased the Tertiary Education Scholarship allocations to students by \$20 300 000 across Australia, and the South Australian Education for Unemployed Youth programme receives an extra \$500 000 this year.

The best way to place the whole of this argument in perspective is to take note of the total amount involved. We have a deficit of \$6 000 000 quoted by the member for Newland, and yet at one fell swoop that responsible body, the South Australian Institute of Teachers (which has already also been jumping up and down on the spot on this issue having changed its mind in a matter of two or three hours on one particular occasion recently blaming first the State and then the Federal Government for problems in education) placed before the Teachers Salaries Tribunal 18 months ago an ambit claim for a 20 per cent increase in salaries, which claim was recently rejected by the commissioner. That claim would have added to the State's salaries burden about \$50 000 000. When we are arguing responsibility, perhaps we should take that into account.

The major burden for South Australia in education is that 85 per cent of all expenditure is in teachers' salaries. The Federal Government has indexed salaries. It has given cost supplementation, and it has been criticised for removing cost supplementation for the capital costs in education. Supplementation is to cover the amount spent over and above what would normally have been committed at the beginning of the year. It is supplementation for inflation. I am informed by the Federal Government and people in the building industry that tendering, whether for pre-school buildings or any other buildings, is now at an all-time low and that, in fact, builders are accepting fixed price bases when tendering, and therefore the amount of cost supplementation would probably be minimal in any case. The essential factor, the salaries indexation, in the rest of education is being met.

I believe that the motion was essentially criticism of the Federal Government, which has taken the following positive steps. It has shown what the public has been asking for during the past several years; that is, a responsible attitude to financing. Print money and you print inflation. Education has certainly not been hit more than any port-

folio at State or Federal level. There is a 6 per cent increase at the Federal level for inflation. It is my personal regret that Senator Carrick does not have personal responsibility for this four to five-year-old pre-school area, because I believe that it belongs in the education portfolio. There is confusion between State and Federal Governments and between the Social Security and Education Departments. I believe we have our priorities right in placing it in the education portfolio in the State.

The Federal Government has accepted a need for Australia-wide restraint, and I believe so has most of the public. Indexation of salaries has saved the Education Department a vast amount of funding. The reduction from 18 per cent to less than 8 per cent is obviously a major contribution towards educational funding that has been completely ignored by Government members. Deflation generally is the way of life in Australia and that, too, has been ignored. Interest rates are falling across Australia, and that is ignored. The spending power of the Education Department and every other Government department has therefore increased commensurately, 10 per cent over and above what Whitlam was allowing for in 1975. We should bear in mind that the pattern for education cuts was set by the Federal Labor Government in 1975 with a \$115 000 000 predicted reduction from that year's Budget.

Is it the massive problem we have been told it is? I maintain that the State Government, doing an excellent job as it already is, with its record of pre-school provision, should be encouraged to carry on irrespective of whether it obtains money from Federal funds (and it is certainly obtaining some), or whether the Minister manages to convince Caucus that his priorities are correct and that he utilises some of that \$53 000 000 in untied grants allocated to South Australia this year.

The Minister, while complaining about the cuts in pre-school education, also tended to put back on the shelf comments which he made personally when I believe the St. Peters teachers pre-school matter was being raised in the House 12 to 15 months ago. At that time we had a declining patronage for pre-schools. People were having to be educated into using them; a good thing.

We have several pre-schools I know of that are having to be used as community centres in order to educate the parents into bringing their children to them. The terrible argument we are trading off the poor for the rich, that we are ignoring the poor in favour of the rich, cannot be supported in the pre-school field, because I am quite sure if you went around pre-schools in South Australia you would find many of them are being attended by the so-called wealthier groups and that probably the Minister should have established the right priorities in South Australia some years ago while these schools were being constructed.

This Government cannot blame the Federal Government for having constructed pre-schools in the wrong places, and not in areas of need. I cannot support the motion, and I urge honourable members to accept the amendment I have moved. I urge this State's Minister of Education to support my amendment, to fight for all he is worth to establish priorities for pre-school education in this State, and to stop setting pre-school and primary school teachers against one another, all in the name of persecuting the Federal Government.

**The SPEAKER:** Is the amendment seconded?

**Mr. EVANS:** Yes, Sir.

**The SPEAKER:** If the honourable member for Newland speaks, he closes the debate.

**Mr. KLUNDER (Newland):** I oppose the amendment, and I am disappointed that the mover should have chosen

to hang his hat on such a ridiculous piece of nonsense. He accused me of speaking in splendid isolation from the rest of education. I could have fixed that for him by taking up all of private members' time this afternoon and speaking for four hours about all the education matters relating to the motion. I chose not to do so, so as to allow other members to speak. In my Address in Reply speech, I spoke about the general field of education, and I am sure that the honourable member would not like to hear a rehash of that. He accused me of isolating a particular strand of education, but he himself has done just that.

Unfortunately, the money from the Commonwealth Government comes to the State in a number of bins. He is saying that, because one of those bins has increased in size, we ought to be grateful and say how terrific the Federal Government is, when, at the same time, the total overall sum from the Federal Government has decreased. He did not say that in his speech, and neither did any Opposition members. All that they did was pick on a particular bin, which had been increased somewhat in size, and hang their hats on that. The amendment is fatuous nonsense. I oppose it, and I hope that all members will vote for my motion.

The House divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (25)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder (teller), McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Venning. No—Mr. Wells.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (25)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder (teller), McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Whitten, and Wright.

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Wells. No—Mr. Venning.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

## UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla):** I move.

That this House condemns the Federal Government for its continuing policy of creating massive unemployment throughout Australia. The House further condemns the current attitude of the Federal Government in accepting ever-increasing figures of unemployment with complete disregard for the plight of the people that unemployment has seriously affected, and calls on the Federal Government to immediately instigate as a matter of extreme urgency a "Get Australia working programme."

Having moved the motion I wonder whether, after the presentation of the Federal Budget by Mr. Howard, the Federal Treasurer, my motion is completely in vain. Last night's Budget could be described only as an appalling document. In its own right it shows, if anything, a

contempt by the Federal Government for the unemployment position. The so-called interest by members opposite in private enterprise would be, after last night and in my humble opinion, a complete sham. How the Federal Government can contemplate that private investors will invest in the economy of this country surpasses my understanding of economics.

I suggest to the Federal Government and to members opposite that last night's Federal Budget will probably drive private enterprise further into its shell of despair and gloom. Before the Federal Budget was brought down, I was rather interested in the campaign that was being carried out by the newspapers of this State, particularly the Murdoch press, on the question of a tax revolt. I wonder what part the newspapers will play after last night's Budget?

It has been pointed out to me that the Murdoch press today reports that we will pay \$4 a week more in tax. I suggest that that is probably about 50 per cent correct. We can only describe the efforts of the Murdoch press as a complete failure. I wonder whether we can describe it as being a complete sham.

We should remind ourselves about what the Liberal and National Country Party coalition Government had to say in its policy speech at the last election on the question of unemployment. This is what it said:

Only under a Liberal and National Country Party Government will there be jobs for all who want to work. It is rather ironical that I should read that statement at this time, because, if anyone in the Commonwealth could say that there will be jobs for all who want to work, under the present economic basis of the Federal Government, it would be absolutely laughable.

Let us now turn to a part of the Budget, that dealing with unemployment. Under the heading "Assistance to unemployed and sick, unemployment and sickness benefits, unemployment relief grants, relocation assistance schemes and others" we see that in 1976-77 the sum spent was \$747 700 000, in 1977-78 it was \$951 500 000, and the 1978-79 estimate is \$965 300 000, an increase of \$13 800 000. I question that figure because, if unemployment figures rise to the numbers that have been forecast, how far will the sum of \$13 800 000 go?

I turn now to the question of the effects of unemployment in my area, because, with the downturn of the shipbuilding industry we must all know by now that my district is showing exactly double the overall Australian figures for unemployment. From my personal point of view, to say the least, that is a shocking situation. Unfortunately, from any point of view, the downturn in the shipbuilding industry has caused this massive unemployment figure.

I turn now to the remarks made by the member for Mallee in this House last week. For once, I thought there was a member opposite who had a heart, some guts, determination and sympathy for the plight of the unemployed. I thought the member for Mallee's speech was a good one. I believe that he had some sympathy to express towards the unemployed of this country, and I agree with his sentiments. He said during that speech that there was a need for an overall, down-to-earth conference between the Opposition parties as a matter of urgency to see what could be done about unemployment: I could not agree more. If the member for Mallee is as serious and concerned as he said last week, I invite him to support my motion.

I turn now to the endeavours to overcome unemployment, particularly in my district. Before doing so, I again stress to the House that there are, currently, 390 000 unemployed, and it has been forecast that that figure will

increase to 500 000. I point out that in my district there are 1 100 to 1 200 unemployed: on a pro rata basis, that is twice the figure found anywhere else in Australia.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** That is the forecast for two years.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I suggest that the member for Davenport take the matter more seriously and be more genuine in his attitude towards unemployment. I can assure the honourable member that if he goes into my district he will find that unemployment has created wide social implications. It has created a degrading and inhuman situation where highly skilled people, who were recruited to come to this country, are walking the streets unemployed. In addition, there has been an overall business slump in the city of Whyalla.

I turn now to an article that appeared in a news sheet published by the trade union movement. There are problems flowing from the closing of the shipyard at Whyalla, and the steel industry is not exactly in what one would call a rosy position. A report appeared in the *News* on Wednesday 2 August that I mention because it is an important matter which has come under attack by the conservative elements in Whyalla. The article, which is headed "Steel works may be next to go", states:

The Whyalla Combined Unions Council has warned that loss of the steelworks could follow the shipyards closure. The council's monthly publication *Newsheet* says that Whyalla would not be the first city to lose both shipyard and steelworks. "It has happened before in the United Kingdom. We are now seeing the last act of a drama that a couple of years ago most people did not believe possible. The last ships have been built and the last men are on the way out. But we have not by any means seen the last of the spin-off from the loss of the shipyard. Local conservatives true to form continue to bury their heads deeper into the sand and try to convince people that if we pretend everything is all right the bogeys will go away."

I wonder whether they can still pretend that after last night's Budget. The article continues:

The report says things are far from all right at Whyalla and could get very much worse. World trends tell us unmistakably that steel is already following the downward path set by shipbuilding. The report on the steel industry from the March conference in Wollongong gives a chilling sense of having seen it before. The report tells us that steelmaking capacity increased seven-fold in Japan in the 60's to 148 million tonnes and doubled in Western Europe to 222 million tonnes. In 1974 the bubble burst and the world was left with a vastly increased capacity to produce steel for a steadily decreasing market.

It is obvious that over the years the tendency has been to over-produce steel. There is no question of that, and the current dispute between Telecom and the Telecom union is another classic example of what I am talking about regarding unemployment. The article continued:

*Newsheet* says the Australian steel industry is now in the demoralising situation shipbuilding drifted into a few years ago. If our steel workers were paid the same as in South Korea—\$7 to \$50 for a six-day week or even worked for nothing—

those people work for nothing at all—

Australia would still be unable to compete in the open world market with the modern mills in Taiwan and South Korea.

Despite that, we hear from the Opposition that we have to have a continuing decrease in wage standards and acceptance of depreciation of wage indexation; yet we are faced with a situation in which, even if we worked for nothing, we could still not compete with Taiwan and Japan. The Federal Government ought to be looking at that matter in a real way.

The Whyalla city councillors, for example, have



criticised that article. I believe, contrary to what the Whyalla city council believes, that the problems in this area are real, and it is no good burying our heads in the sand and saying that it will not happen, because it is happening. The business houses and the conservative elements in Whyalla generally have been saying (and are still saying) regarding the shipbuilding industry that all that will happen in the shipbuilding industry is that we will get rid of rabble rousers, the bludgers, red ragers and so on. I say, in all seriousness, that we must have had 1 700 of them, because they have all gone. Now is the time, in my humble opinion, when we ought to be sitting down, as the member for Mallee suggested, and talking to one another to see how we can overcome this problem.

Prior to the closure of the shipbuilding yard, which as I said has brought about a massive unemployment situation, an interim report was brought down by the Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence which dealt largely with shipbuilding. That report contained a recommendation, as follows:

It is concerned that, if there were no existing shipyards, time would not permit sufficient construction of new vessels to take place should it be necessary to create and man new shipyards before any ship construction could commence. It considers, therefore, that steps should be taken urgently to ensure the retention of large shipbuilding facilities in Australia which in the normal course would appear to be almost certain to cease operating in the near future.

In other words, now that the yard is entirely run down it would take a number of years to restart it. I believe the Federal Government, before the decision was made and before it created all the unemployment in my district, should have sat down with the trade union movement and management of the yard to look at the problem positively.

The report continues:

The industry to be rationalised;

The existing ship construction facilities at Whyalla and Newcastle be retained;

There be an injection of capital at both yards on a shared basis, sharing being between the Commonwealth and New South Wales Governments in the case of Newcastle, and between the Commonwealth and South Australian Governments and Broken Hill Proprietary in the case of Whyalla . . .

That was part of the recommendations. The South Australian Government did everything possible to improve the employment situation in the shipbuilding industry. In that context, I refer honourable members to a press statement appearing in the *Whyalla News* on Wednesday 1 September 1976, showing what the South Australian Government tried to do for one industry. Other industries, of course, are not looking very bright. The situation in the motor car industry is not rosy at present, and perhaps there ought to be times when the trade union movement, General Motors-Holden's, the Federal Government, and the State Government should talk about these things. I invite the Federal Government to take part in such talks. I would also include the white goods industry. Under the heading, "Shipyard proposals offer a glimmer of hope", the report in the *Whyalla News* states:

Delegates on the joint shipyard trade unions committee will meet tomorrow to hear plans put forward by the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, for survival of shipbuilding at Whyalla. Recommendations from the committee will be put before a mass meeting of unionists from the yard, probably next week.

A meeting was called, to which the management of the industry in Whyalla sent its top representatives. The ball was then at the feet of the present Federal Government, but nothing was done. The report continues, quoting a

shipyard spokesman, as follows:

"The Premier has put forward a proposition which I think will be acceptable to shipyard unions," he said. "And there is also a set of propositions for BHP which we think are very generous."

The Government was prepared to make a grant equal to payroll tax if the company would spend four times that amount on capital re-equipment and modernisation. The Premier had also undertaken to match the New South Wales Government's offer of a \$1 for \$1 subsidy to cover the difference between the local price for an A.N.L. ship after Federal subsidy, and the price offered by Mitsubishi.

The A.N.L. ship referred to was shown on television two nights ago making its maiden voyage to Port Adelaide. The article states that B.H.P. had been offered loan guarantees and capital development loans for the shipyard. That was not a bad offer. The Premier was fully behind the proposal, but at the date of the article Mr. Fraser had not seen fit to mention the Whyalla shipyard in the terms he had offered for the A.N.L. ship orders. That shows the lack of interest on the part of the Federal Government.

The trade union movement, the South Australian Government, and B.H.P. showed a great interest in the situation, and it was decided to send the proposals in the submission to Canberra. The offer was genuine, something the parties involved were prepared to take up with the Federal Government, and on that basis it was decided to take up the matter with Canberra. An article in the *Whyalla News* on Friday, 8 October 1976 states:

Seven proposals designed to provide a workable solution to the problem of the Australian shipbuilding industry have been submitted to Canberra by the South Australian Government. Details of the submission were released this morning by the Trade and Development Division of the Premier's Department in a 21-page statement which rejects the validity of the arguments presented by the Industries Assistance Commission in its recent report.

Not only did the South Australian Government's submission reject the validity of the arguments of the commission, but so did the interim report of the Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence. The article continues:

It states that acceptance of the South Australian proposals would have many benefits and clearly assist the Commonwealth in its economic policies by preventing the needless creation of approximately 8 000 unemployed, with the associated social and economic problems; save a potential outflow of from \$60 000 000 to \$100 000 000 each year on overseas ship purchases—a significant factor given present pressures for devaluation; and assist decentralised industries to become viable.

The South Australian Government's attempt to get the Federal Government to do anything was quite useless. No reply was forthcoming. The Federal member for Grey (Mr. Wallis) tried to get some discussions going and finally, in 1977, Liberal and Labor Senators, with Mr. Wallis and myself, had discussions with the Whyalla City Council. Earlier, the Liberal Senators had refused to come to Whyalla, and if the meeting were to go ahead, the Labor Senators would have had to meet the city council and endeavour to do something while on the Opposition benches. Finally, the Liberal Senators saw the light and came to Whyalla. The results of the discussions appeared in the press on 24 June 1977, as follows:

The Senators' meeting with the Whyalla City Council yesterday resulted in an urgent bid to keep the shipyard going. The Deputy Prime Minister and four other Ministers will be urged to help carry out the meeting's plan. The plan is

contained in the Interim Report from the Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence. It calls for the Government to set up an expert group to make a thorough study of all factors governing retention of the shipyards at Whyalla and Newcastle.

The expert group would include representatives of the Federal, South Australian and New South Wales Governments, managements of shipyards, and the A.C.T.U. It would "examine proposals as a matter of urgency and report on the cost and the practicability of their implementations as an integrated package and whether the industry could then be reasonably expected to be economically acceptable".

Nothing could have been fairer. At that meeting, the Liberal Senators unanimously agreed with the proposal. They were prepared to advocate in the Senate that the interim report should be adopted, and they were prepared to vote for it. However, when the report came up, Senator Jessop, Senator Messner, Senator Young, Senator Davidson, and the other Liberal Senators voted *en bloc* against it.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** They should all be called on to resign.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** I agree. That is the only answer I can come up with. It did not stop there. Senator Cotton, who was then the Minister for industrial matters, was invited to come and examine the problem. Despite many attempts to get Senator Cotton to Whyalla, to my knowledge he has not done so. However, this year Phillip Lynch decided to come to Whyalla.

**Dr. Eastick:** After Senator Cotton resigned, was it?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Probably. The last I heard of Senator Cotton he was in America.

**Dr. Eastick:** He couldn't go to Whyalla if he was in America, could he?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** It was ironic to me that he found time to go to America, but could not visit Whyalla. I give Phillip Lynch credit for two things. First, he had enough guts to come to that city and, secondly he publicly admitted that the Federal Government shipbuilding was out and the only real salvation he could present to the people of Whyalla was that they had better put their thoughts towards establishing Redcliff. That situation shows glaringly the attitude of the Liberals to this question of unemployment. They could not care less. In relation to the problem of unemployment that is facing this country at present I believe we are not paying enough attention to the troubles in manufacturing industries.

There is no doubt at all that countries such as West Germany, Japan, South Korea (to a lesser degree), and Sweden have all concentrated on their manufacturing industries. I suggest, as I have suggested in other places many times, that all those countries in some way have to subsidise their manufacturing industries. The problem facing the manufacturing industries is the question of labour intensification. If we took the motor car industry out of South Australia, we would be in real trouble. It could be argued that the Federal Budget presented last evening could do something for the motor car industry.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** Do you agree with that?

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Yes, I agree that the reduction in sales tax for motor cars is welcome. However, by agreeing to that we could not possibly say that the increase in the price of petrol will assist the motor industry.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** The Minister of Mines and Energy agrees with world parity for fuel oil; it is on record.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Interjections are out of order. The House knows the standard set by the Speaker, and I intend to follow it.

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** That is the point I am trying to make. If the Opposition believes something is constructive

in relation to our unemployment situation, I believe that my Party should support that. I do not think that is a crime. I have yet to find any aspects about which the Opposition in this State or the Federal Government is willing to sit down with this Government, the trades unions, or management to discuss the problem. Some time ago I received a letter from the Leader of the Opposition in which he stated:

I am sure you were concerned as I was to hear from the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Hudson) yesterday that the Electricity Trust of South Australia favoured the importing of turbo-generators for the new Port Augusta power station from Japan, instead of having them built in Whyalla.

This is particularly disturbing in view of the tremendous need for jobs in Whyalla, and we consider that about 50 jobs would be created if the generators were built there.

I am worried about it, too. The Leader of the Opposition is worried about 50 jobs, but he did not seem to be too worried about 1 700 jobs. The letter continues:

The firm of Reyrolle Parsons has already provided turbo-generators for South Australian power stations from overseas, and with appropriate State Government assistance—

there is no mention of Federal Government assistance—could well undertake a considerable portion of the work for the new project at Whyalla. It might be cheaper to import the generators from Japan, but I think you will agree that the South Australian Government must consider helping the people of Whyalla by providing the necessary assistance so they can be built here.

I replied as follows:

Dear David,

Thank you for your correspondence of 7 December 1977 of which I personally became aware by an article appearing on the front page of the local newspaper circulating in this city. In reply to your correspondence, first, let me say that your statement to the effect that the State Government through the Electricity Trust favoured the importing of turbo-generators for the new Port Augusta power station from Japan is not completely true.

The Minister of Mines and Energy stated in his reply to the member for Torrens that "obviously, the Government has a policy of preference for local industry as against interstate competition and a further degree of preference for local industry as against overseas competition".

I certainly am concerned as to the possibilities of obtaining employment in Whyalla for, as you would be aware, the unemployment position in Whyalla has obtained the heights of real proportions.

My second point on this matter is that the manufacture of turbo-generators in Whyalla would be a first within this country and, although the firm of Reyrolle Parsons have tendered for the overall project at Port Augusta, the fact is that the firm tenders from their parent body in the United Kingdom and usually subtenders certain aspects of their overall tender to their factory in Whyalla.

As I understand the current situation, Japan has substantially entered into the field of quoting for this type of product within power house concepts and, although I personally cannot quote from any authority, my personal experience, particularly in the shipbuilding industry, is that the Japanese Government would be involved in subsidies and, I would be of the opinion, substantial subsidies.

Thirdly, I point out to you, and particularly your Federal colleagues, that this is the very thing that Japan has done in the ship-building industry and is currently doing in the motor car industry.

There is no question about that. The letter continues:

I certainly will take this matter up with the Minister, but I wonder whether I could be rude enough to suggest that I could be equally supported in the shipbuilding industry, laying off some 50 employees a week currently, and the motor car industry, by yourself and your Federal colleagues.

I conclude by saying that I now look forward to your personal interest in these matters with bated breath in early 1978.

My breath is still bated. I have not received a reply, nor is there the likelihood of a reply or assistance. I believe that the unemployment situation is real. Although it is of mammoth proportions now, God knows what it will be by 1979. In my opening remarks, I invited the Opposition, and I openly invite the Federal Government, at least to discuss problems in the manufacturing industries. That is something that no-one has been willing to do. I draw members' attention to a report in a recent *Australian*, in which the Federal Opposition, quite seriously, invited the trade union movement and others to sit down with it and examine a similar project. The report states:

The A.C.T.U. and the Federal Opposition are examining a proposed scheme to provide financial support for struggling industries in an attempt to boost technological development in Australia. The plan put to the A.C.T.U. by the Deputy Opposition Leader, Mr. Bowen, could involve the use of A.C.T.U. funds with the unions receiving a share of the profits from industries aided.

I see nothing wrong with that. That is at least a practical demonstration by the Federal Opposition to try to do something collectively with the people who work in the industry to see whether something positive can be done. The report continues:

Under the scheme, special committees representing specific industries would be set up by senior union leaders in those areas and Federal Opposition M.P's. They would draw on support of employers and employees.

We are planning to create our own team efforts to assess how industries exist, what changes will be necessary and plan for the sort of technology we should be adopting if we want to preserve an industry and not just rely on tariffs. Mr. Bowen said development of this concept and the formulation of a policy for an effective manufacturing basis as well as a manpower policy could play an important part in Australia's growing role with South-East Asian countries.

I could not agree more, but I suggest that the plan does not go far enough. I believe that it is not a question of the Labor Party and the trade union movement only: it is a question of the Labor Party, the trade union movement, employers, and the Federal Government all joining in the discussion. I believe that, if something along these lines is not pursued soon, we can look forward in 1979-80 to a very real human problem with regard to unemployment.

There was no sign before last evening (certainly not after last evening) of any positive sign of recovery in the economy. There was nothing in the Budget to indicate that unemployment would not worsen. No-one can argue today on the question of dole-bludgers and people not wanting to work if work is available. Members should come to my district, and I will show them hundreds of people who have worked all their life, who still want to work, but who cannot find jobs. They are not dole-bludgers or people who do not want to work.

**The SPEAKER:** Is the motion seconded?

**Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I take pleasure in seconding it. I think that the motion is so true, especially the following passage:

... with complete disregard for the plight of the people that unemployment has seriously affected.

That is only one aspect. I have spoken in the House before about the problems of unemployment that people

continue to suffer. The Howard Budget will do nothing for the unemployed in Australia. Unemployment will rise dramatically, even more than the projected figure of 600 000 forecast by the Federal Government department. The deflationary Budget will do nothing for the unemployed. It will reduce direct spending, rather than add to it, and it will do little to let private spending come into play.

Let us examine what other people around Australia have been saying during the past few hours concerning the Budget and its effect on unemployment. First, I will read part of the editorial in today's *News*, as follows:

It is the kind of Budget produced by Treasury mandarins.

It has nothing to do with restoring incentives or creating new opportunities.

The comments of the Federal Leader of the Opposition in Canberra were reported as follows:

The Budget was the most brutal since the notorious Fadden Budget of 1951 . . . this Budget strikes at everyone, but most savagely at the poor, the sick and the elderly and the great majority of families. Mr. Hayden said one of the Budget's most appalling aspects was its effect on employment and he predicted that more than 500 000 people would be jobless by early next year.

The A.C.T.U. President (Mr. Bob Hawke) said that the Budget was a huge confidence trick. I now read what other Liberal leaders have said elsewhere in the country. The Western Australian Premier (Sir Charles Court), apart from admiring the Commonwealth Government's political courage, said:

But I must say I find it hard to accept the strategy of the Budget, even allowing for the paramount importance of continuing to win the battle against inflation.

The Victorian Premier (Mr. Hamer) said:

The Budget was "very severe". It would not help the unemployment situation or the depressed building and construction industry.

The New South Wales Premier (Mr. Wran) said:

The Budget was more horrendous than all the leaks in the past few weeks had suggested. It was spiteful, went too far, and would take away incentive.

The Royal Automobile Association's General Manager said:

The cost of practically every service and commodity could "sky-rocket".

The Federal President of the Australian Council of Salaried and Professional Associations (Mr. P. W. Reilly) said:

Low income earners could not have been hit harder than they were.

What has the Leader of the Opposition here been saying? A report in the *Sunday Mail* stated that despite the fact that he was receiving complaints from members of his own Party that he persistently refused to condemn Mr. Fraser, he insisted on kow towing to the Fraser Government. This is what the Leader is reported to have said about the Budget:

Although the Budget has been a tough one it was far more favourable to South Australia than any other State. Mr. Tonkin was bitterly disappointed that no consideration had been given to the Australian brandy industry, but he was also pleased that low income earners and the socially disadvantaged would be the people affected least by the Budget changes.

He said on radio this morning that if it was a good Budget South Australia would benefit. If the Leader has any credibility in this House or in this State after having made that remark, he has lost it completely. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### GRAPEGROWING INDUSTRY

**Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** I move:

That this House express grave concern at the Federal Government's failure to relieve hardship in the wine-grape growing industry by not reducing the rate of excise payable on Australian produced brandy, and calls on the Federal Government to reassess its attitude which, if left unaltered, will have a disastrous result for many communities dependent on the wine-grape growing industry.

I trust that Government members will unanimously support this motion and that, in so doing, they will support not only the brandy industry and the wine-grape growing industry of South Australia but will also show themselves in a good light as not trying to play politics in this vital matter. I pay a tribute to members of the Opposition who have stood aside during private members' time today to enable me to proceed forthwith with this motion.

In March of this year the Leader of the Opposition and I travelled to Sydney and met the Federal Treasurer to present to him a carefully documented submission calling for a reduction of about 30 per cent in excise payable on Australian produced brandy. In that submission we clearly indicated to the Federal Treasurer that since 1970 producers have had to contend with a 50c a gallon excise on wine, the loss of Section 31A of the Commonwealth Income Tax Assessment Act exemption, the loss of the differential on Australian brandy, and an increase of about 231 per cent in brandy excise (until the Federal Budget last evening).

The urgency of this motion is such that the Leader of the Opposition is trying now to arrange a meeting of him and me with the Federal Treasurer for tomorrow morning. We trust that he will be successful in making that arrangement so that we can make representations to the Federal Treasurer at the earliest opportunity.

The Leader has already sent a telegram to the Federal Treasurer indicating and setting out clearly to him the problem that we are facing in South Australia. I refer to the following Australian brandy production figures:

Year	000's litre alcohol Australian production	Amount cleared from bond in litres
1971-72	4 240	—
1972-73	—	3 700 000
1974-75	—	2 900 000
1976-77	—	2 700 000
1977-78	—	2 800 000
1978-79	—	1 540 000

The expected clearance from bond for 1978-79 as a result of the increase in excise last evening will be only about 45 per cent on last year's clearances. While beer and all spirits have been increased in price, that increase will result in increased sales of wines in Australia. However, while only 8.8 per cent of that 467 000 tonnes of grapes delivered to wineries last year was processed into brandy, that 8 per cent across the board is not a clear indication of the effect the increase in excise will have in South Australia on the Riverland.

The Riverland produces between 80 per cent and 90 per cent of Australia's total brandy production. Therefore, the 8 per cent is no indication of the effect this increase in excise will have on the Riverland growers and wineries. It must be realised that, as we produce between 80 per cent and 90 per cent of Australia's brandy in the Riverland, about 25 per cent to 30 per cent of grapes produced in that area go into brandy production.

It is important for members to realise that the Riverland co-operatives are wine and brandy producers and not merchants. Many private wine companies in Australia are

wine and brandy producers, but a considerable percentage of their business involves their being merchants in the wine, brandy and whisky industries. The co-operatives are purely involved in processing growers' fruit.

As such, this increase in excise will have an enormous effect on the co-operative and producers in the Riverland. I hope that the Government will support this motion unanimously, without trying to amend it. It will be a pity if it is amended and it will be seen by growers, by the wine industry, and the South Australian public that once again the Government is putting political advantage before the realities and problems facing South Australia. I thank the House for allowing me to move this motion this afternoon at short notice, and I commend it to the House.

**Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier):** First, I agree with the member for Chaffey that this matter should not be subject to a political point-scoring exercise. All members appreciate the problems that brandy producers, especially those in the Riverland, are facing. I hope that the member for Chaffey realises that, when members from this side speak in this debate, they will be supporting brandy producers in this State.

Although I support the motion, in the circumstances surrounding the savage increase in excise (the increase can be described only as "savage"), the motion should be amended to read in stronger terms. I move:

To leave out "express grave concern at" and insert "bitterly condemns", and leave out "reassesses its attitude" and insert "reverse its decision".

The motion would then read:

That this House bitterly condemns the Federal Government's failure to relieve hardship in the wine-grape growing industry by not reducing the rate of excise payable on Australian produced brandy, and calls on the Federal Government to reverse its decision which if left unaltered will have a disastrous result for many communities dependent on the wine-grape growing industry.

In support of my amendments, I cannot believe that people operating the Riverland co-operatives, after being given the news that the Federal Budget was increasing the excise on brandy, would be "expressing grave concern." I should imagine that they, and every other brandy producer in South Australia, will be bitterly condemning the Liberal Government for what it has done to the industry in this State.

If we do not force the Federal Government to reverse its decision, the only result will be the death of the brandy industry in South Australia. One could assume that the increase in excise on brandy and spirits could be taken as a deliberate attack by the Fraser Liberal Government on South Australia, especially as it was fully aware that more than 85 per cent of Australian brandy is produced in South Australia, and most of that from the Riverland.

What the State Government has done in the past in regard to the problems of the ailing wine industry has been well documented in this House. When the previous Federal Labor Government increased the excise on wine and brandy, the Premier attacked the Prime Minister and then made strong representations in Canberra on behalf of the industry. The Federal Liberal Opposition was then vocal on that matter, too, claiming that it was a cruel blow to brandy producers and that when it got into power it would relieve the situation.

What did the Liberal Government do: it did nothing. It further increased the excise, and has brought about the death of the brandy industry in South Australia. Through the Minister of Agriculture the State Government made a further attempt to relieve the situation and created a surplus pool to help growers. That pool was continued for

two harvests but, as a result of the 1977 harvest, there was nothing more that the Government could do.

Earlier this year this House passed a motion urging the Federal Government to reduce excise. What did it do? Again, it did nothing. It said that after the Industries Assistance Commission carried out an inquiry into the brandy producing industry it would then reconsider that matter. That inquiry is currently proceeding, yet the Federal Government increased excise in the Budget. One wonders what notice the Federal Government will take of any inquiry that the Industries Assistance Commission makes into any industry in the future.

The member for Chaffey said that perhaps the increased excise on beer and brandy would relieve the wine industry because people find that they could not afford to buy beer or brandy and would return to buying red and white wine, port, and so on. I cannot see that happening. The average working man has been slugged in the Budget; he will pay, on average, an extra \$4 a week in tax; he has to pay increased Medibank charges if he is on Medibank standard, and, with the struggle he will have to survive, the last thing he will be doing is going to the hotel to buy a couple of bottles of red or white wine.

I quote from today's *Advertiser* a report in which the Chairman of the brandy section of the Australian Wine and Brandy Producers Association described the rise in excise as "a disaster" and then said:

The Riverland of S.A. would be "massively" affected, he said.

The report continued:

The production director of Tolley Scott & Tolley, Mr. M. J. McNeil, said the industry would come to a "dead stop" for the next three months and remain in a slump for at least six months. Some of the worst-hit producers would be the co-operatives of the Riverland which produced bulk brandy.

The report also stated:

Two major industry groups said last night some of the 12 big South Australian producers could be put out of business because of the increase.

I urge members opposite to support my amendment. I do not think this is a political, point-scoring exercise. I think we need to put to the Federal Government in strong terms that, unless the Government reverses its decision immediately, there is no hope for the brandy producers in the Riverland. I urge all members not to support the motion, which refers to reassessing the situation. If what the member for Chaffey has said—that the Leader and he have already been to see the Federal Government and that the Federal Government has received a submission from this Government, which went to the Senate Select Committee—is correct if the Federal Government is not aware of the problem now it never will be.

**Mr. DRURY:** I second the motion.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** I support the motion and reject the amendments for what they are. The member who has just sat down cannot help trying to play Party politics in these questions. We have seen it happen before, and we have just seen it happen again. He is the spokesman for the Labor Party on the wine industry. He has a couple of wineries at the tail-end of his district (neither of them makes brandy), so the honourable member is suddenly an authority on what the people in Chaffey are thinking.

I put my faith in the judgment of the member for Chaffey, who is a producer. The member for Chaffey can properly put the case to the Federal Government without trying to bash it over the head with a big political stick and without turning this matter into a political exercise: he can keep it a rational exercise. The member for Napier is

bitterly resentful. Probably, under his crocodile tears, he is rubbing his hands together because he thinks there is a possibility of increased wine sales in his district. Enough of this false and phoney alleged concern for the district of Chaffey.

I support the member for Chaffey, who has given an authoritative outline of the history of excise in this matter. Let the member for Napier remember that it was the Whitlam Government that imposed the 230 per cent increase in excise on brandy. Let us not forget that in this false show of bitter resentment: that is the sort of thing we get from the Premier. I do not think that the member for Napier thought up "bitterly condemns"; I will bet that that came from higher up.

In support of the member for Chaffey, whose record in relation to battling for the brandy industry in this State is second to none, let me point out that the effect on the industry at this time, particularly in the Riverland, will be most adverse. There are several distilleries in my district, which is second only to the Riverland in this field. The effect there, too, will be adverse. As has been pointed out, it is probable that there will be an increase in some other products of the wine industry as a result of this exercise. That is small comfort to people in the Riverland, from which the bulk of Australia's production comes.

I do not for a minute subscribe to the Labor Party's view that the Budget is all bad, but this is one item in the Federal Budget with which the Opposition disagrees. The general Budget strategy is acceptable, we believe to the vast majority of South Australians.

**Mr. Whitten:** Shame!

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** You can "shame" yourself if you like, and wear sack-cloth and ashes; I am not going into phoney politics. This is one area in which we share a considerable amount of concern, which was outlined in the motion moved by the member for Chaffey. I reject the politicking we have seen under the crocodile tears of the member for Napier. I second the motion.

**Mr. DRURY (Mawson):** I second the amendments. It makes me smile to hear the remark that the Budget strategy is for the good of Australia. Quite frankly, the Deputy Leader knows that the Budget strategy will bludgeon an already punch-drunk Australian public further down. That is as plain as I can put it to a very plain speaking person, the Deputy Leader. What this excise will do is make it harder, as the member for Napier has said, for an ordinary person to buy brandy, because he will have to pay extra petrol charges and more tax, and he will get less in other payments from the Federal Government, so there will be less money to go around and therefore less money to spend on beer, wine and spirits.

When one considers that the price of a bottle of brandy will rise from \$7.10 to \$11.10, one sees that that is quite a hefty price hike. The Deputy Leader said that we should not forget that it was the Whitlam Government that imposed a 230 per cent increase in the excise on brandy, but let us not forget that the Fraser Government has the most bloated majority in the history of the Australian Parliament, so there is no reason on earth why it cannot remove that excise. I can hear the stunned silence from the Opposition when that challenge is put. Why will the Federal Government not remove it?

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** The country is broke, due to Whitlam.

**Mr. DRURY:** Wind it up again! Why don't you try plugging it in next time: you'll keep going all the time. I have a few vineyards at the tail end of my electorate, as the Deputy Leader says, like my colleague, the member for Napier. But fortunately, or unfortunately, I do not have

any distilleries from which to sample the goods as the Deputy Leader does. Therefore, I am thinking in terms of the burden placed on grapegrowers and on the Australian public. There is already a grape glut; there are problems in selling wine and brandy because of this glut. Now we have the Federal Government turning around and adding another impost to an already severely strained price. It is beyond me how an increase of 86 per cent in excise on brandy will help the brandy producers. If the Federal Government can see fit to reduce sales tax on motor cars by \$530 for a \$7 000 car, why can it not see fit to drop the excise a little on brandy? The Federal Government does not seem to want to answer that question; it does not seem to want to face realities.

When I read in the local paper of the Federal member for Chrysler (who used to be called the Federal member for Kingston) commenting on how he was having meetings with the grapegrowers, how he was very sympathetic, and that sort of thing, why does not the Federal Government do something about this excise? If I may quote from our esteemed local press, he said on these visits he had found many growers who had been able to sell only a fraction of their crop. That was on 14 June. Less than two months later the Federal Government turned around and king-hit the industry by placing an extra 86 per cent excise on to brandy. Would it not be logical to assist the industry by at least leaving the excise at what it was before the Budget?

**Mr. Max Brown:** They haven't got a hostile Senate.

**Mr. DRURY:** No. At the rate the Government is losing Senators, it will not have any members in the Senate. Although the Whitlam Government increased the excise by 230 per cent, it has been conveniently forgotten by members opposite that the Premier of this State criticised the then Prime Minister, who was a Labor Prime Minister. At that time the then Liberal Party Opposition went in boots and all with its pious platitudes about how difficult it would be for the brandy producers and all this hoo-ha, and now they go in boots and all, with fists included. I second the amendment.

**Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** On balance, the Federal Budget will considerably help the wine industry. This motion largely revolves around the effect that it will have on the Riverland grapegrowers and the wineries in that area. I refer briefly to the report in this morning's *Advertiser* by Keith Martyn, headed "Increases to help ailing wine industry". In the case of the member for Kingston, most of his wineries would be advantaged by this Federal Budget, because there will be substantial increases in wine sales, but, when it is offset against the drop in brandy sales, it is uncertain at this stage whether there will be a net gain or a net loss. Outside of the Riverland, I have no doubt that there will be a substantial net gain for the wine industry, but there would appear to be a substantial loss, since between 80 per cent and 90 per cent of Australia's brandy is produced in the Riverland. The article states:

The big increases in beer and spirits prices will provide a welcome boost to the struggling wine industry.

I am quite sure that a number of wineries outside the Riverland will readily agree with that. The article continues:

It will also provide relief of the grape surplus problem of the past three years.

I believe that it will probably go a long way to resolving the grape surplus problem outside the Riverland, but we in the Riverland could well be left with a similar surplus because of our involvement in the brandy industry last year. To me, that is very regrettable, and that is why the Leader of the Opposition and I intend to seek discussions on this

subject with the Federal Treasurer tomorrow.

Amendments carried; motion as amended carried.

## PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

**Dr. EASTICK (Light):** I move:

That the regulations under the Planning and Development Act, 1929-1976, relating to rural land, made on 6 April 1978 and laid on the table of this House on 13 July 1978, be disallowed.

In speaking to this motion, I acknowledge that this regulation has had a rather chequered career since it was first introduced by the Government. It has previously been disallowed in another place and has previously been debated in this place. It has religiously, a day or two after the prorogation of the Parliamentary session, been restored as a regulation.

It has had an even more significant history than that. When it was originally entered and gazetted by the Government, it was withdrawn by the Government a matter of days afterwards because it was found that the word "not" had been missed out. The original regulation without that one single word "not" put an interpretation upon the regulation which was rather contrary to the intention of the Government; indeed, it destroyed the interpretation which the Government hoped to place on this issue.

I seek to have the House disallow the regulation because I believe it is discriminatory. I accept that the Government, in planning and development, must start at some point. The subdivision of land into small blocks creates a great deal of difficulty. In many areas adjacent to provincial towns, and in areas within an approximate 50 miles radius of Adelaide, there has been a considerable number of subdivisions to provide what might be described as week-enders, small hobby farm blocks, or (I prefer that this interpretation be inserted) a living area on which a family with children who desire to have immediate or direct access to a horse may run a horse or horses and enjoy that recreation.

The intention of the regulation that the Minister has brought down time and again is to require that, before sanction is given for subdivision or resubdivision, the area must be deemed to have economic viability; that is, that there is an opportunity agriculturally to obtain a return from the area. Evidence has been taken over a period of time from the Agriculture and Fisheries Department in relation to what constitutes an economically viable block of land in an agricultural setting which would allow either for a sanction or for refusal of a sanction.

Many agricultural, horticultural, or viticultural pursuits are viable or non-viable, depending on the industry of the person who manages the property. A 10-acre block or a 20-acre block could be non-viable in the hands of one person, but completely viable in the hands of another. Some intensive industries are viable on small areas of land, subject to the industry of the owner. I refer not only to poultry raising and piggeries, but to the cultivation of mushrooms, vegetables, specialised viticulture, specialised gardening, and floriculture.

In the longer view, I understand the Government has adopted the attitude that the block of land should be viable in all circumstances, regardless of the ability of an individual to obtain the total economic return to make the proposition viable. I say that this regulation is discriminatory. Many small properties, which have been in the hands of some families for many years, are economically non-viable, but the families wish to retain them, because they want a certain way of life, and they

want to continue with what is claimed to be their heritage and their right to enjoy the lifestyle of their forebears.

Because of the attitude of the Government, and because there is no provision for the creation of small areas which may give these families capital and allow them to improve the viability of their operation, they are being forced to sell to developers. In some cases in the Barossa Valley, and in the area around Gawler River, Wasleys, Roseworthy, and elsewhere, this is happening. No doubt my colleagues representing areas south of Adelaide and in the Hills could relate similar instances.

Because they are being denied subdivisional rights which would provide them with funds to become more viable, people are being forced to put their properties in the hands of developers, who, in turn, are amalgamating blocks and dividing them on a far less reasonable basis than that which exists at present, thus allowing an opportunity to completely destroy an existing lifestyle. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

### SUPPLY BILL (No. 2) 1978

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### AUSTRALIAN MINERAL DEVELOPMENT LABORATORIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories Act, 1959-1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

This Bill provides for certain changes to the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories Act. Members will recall that the laboratories originated out of the research and development section of the then State Department of Mines, which played a significant part in the successful treatment of Radium Hill ores for recovery of uranium and which, as a result of the technical competence displayed, was called upon to provide major assistance to other sections of the mining and mineral industry.

As a result of this activity, consultations were held with the Commonwealth Government and representatives of the mining industry in 1959, and it was agreed that the laboratories and staff could perform a valuable function for the community and that the staff and facilities built up should be retained and, if warranted, expanded. The laboratories were initially set up for a trial period of five years, commencing in 1960.

This initial period proved so successful that amending legislation was passed in 1963 to provide for the continuing life of the organisation. With financial support guaranteed by the three sponsors, the Commonwealth, the State, and the mining industry, the latter represented by the Australian Mineral Industries Research Association Limited (AMIRA). Since that time the organisation has

continued to grow in terms of staff employed and the range of services offered. This growth, however, has not been without its problems.

In the first instance, the functions of the laboratories as set out in the original Acts have tied their operations closely to the fluctuating fortunes of the mineral industry; secondly, the range of expertise now available has not been capable of being fully exploited in areas closely allied to or arising from the activities of the mineral industry.

Arising from the sharp decline in activity in the mineral industry after 1971, the viability of the organisation suffered a severe set-back over a period of three to four years, and negotiations were entered into with the Commonwealth Government and AMIRA to review the individual work levels guaranteed by each of the parties, which had remained unchanged since 1964.

As a consequence of these negotiations, a consultant was engaged to review the operations of the laboratories and to make recommendations as to their organisational structure and future activities, with the object of making their operations viable. The consultant's recommendations contained in the report issued in July 1976 were accepted in principle by the guarantors, and the council of the laboratories was requested to implement them.

The recommendations included recommendations that the laboratories be developed as a market-oriented corporation with the required flexibility and capacity to adapt to changes in demands for their services, not limited to the mining or minerals-related areas, and that a clear definition and delineation be made of the powers and responsibilities between the sponsors and management of the organisation. This definition of areas of interest is to be effected by the appointment of a council representing the interests of the sponsors appointed by council and responsible for the overall operations of the organisation and responsible for broad policy guidelines, and a board of management. A chief executive officer, appointed by council, will be responsible for the control of management functions, including marketing.

Many of the recommendations aimed at more efficient and viable operations have already been implemented. Some changes in internal arrangements, together with a reduction of some 15 per cent of staff was effected in July 1977, and I am pleased to report that preliminary figures for the financial year ending 30 June 1978 show a significant return to profitability.

This Bill has been prepared to give effect to the changes arising out of the recommendations of the consultant, which will enable the organisation to maintain its present viability and permit it to operate in those allied areas of activity which derive from the diversity of skills now available. It is important that the necessary changes be formalised and implemented as soon as possible, because the present financial guarantee arrangements by the Commonwealth and AMIRA are certain only up to 1981.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 removes an obsolete provision. Clause 4 provides for the deletion, amendment, and insertion of definitions which reflect the proposed changes in latter parts of the Act. It should be noted that the definition of "relevant industries" has been inserted to provide not only for the principal activity of the organisation but also for those other activities which derive from the employment of scientists with diverse technical skills.

Clause 5 is formal and provides for changes which occur later in the Bill, particularly in respect of the creation of a board of management. Clause 6 (1a) provides for the use of the name "Amdel", which has been and is widely promoted as the shortened version of the rather unwieldy full title of the organisation. Subclauses (4), (5), (6) and

(7) provide for the manner in which the board of management has the necessary constitutional powers to effect the business of the organisation.

Clause 7 provides for the repeal of the original statement of the functions of the organisation and the insertion of new functions which will provide scope for the laboratories to provide the range of services and enter into activities which will enable them to meet the best interests and needs of the community, and at the same time provide sufficient diversification to enable it to cushion the effects of any downturn in economic activity, particularly in the mineral industry.

New section 6 (2) has been inserted to overcome uncertainties raised by third parties, with which the organisation has entered into negotiations, as to whether the organisations has legal capacity to act in a number of the areas stated. The powers will also enable the organisation to provide those services which industry now seeks from it. Clause 8 repeals section 7 of the principal Act, which provided for the initial five-year period and the arrangements subsequently entered into in 1963, has been repealed.

Clauses 9, 10, and 11 provide a new basis for the composition of the council. Under the new provision, the council shall consist of six members, two each from the Commonwealth, the mining industry (through the Australian Mineral Industries Research Association Limited), and the State, in place of the old council, which consisted of seven members nominated by the guarantors with the power to nominate an additional three members.

Clause 12 provides for the repeal of section 13, which related to the payment of members of council, and the insertion of a section relating to the conduct of meetings of the council. New section 13a provides for the payment of allowances and expenses to members of council. Clause 13 provides for the repeal of section 15 and the insertion of an amending clause 15 defining the functions of the council. The council, representing the guarantors, will determine and set out the broad policy guidelines for the operations of the organisation. Clause 14 introduces a new Part IIIA into the principal Act. This new Part establishes a board of management which will, within the policy decisions of the council, provide a decision-making body closely attuned to the operations of the laboratories.

Clause 15 makes a consequential amendment to a heading in the principal Act. Clause 16 repeals the old section 16 dealing with the Director and staff of the organisation and establishes the position and role of the chief executive officer responsible for the day-by-day operations of the laboratories. As the chief executive officer will be a member of the board of management, provision is made for his appointment by the council.

Clause 17 refers to amendments to section 17 of the original Act, vests powers to appoint the staff in the board of management, and deals with the provision of superannuation benefits to the staff. Clause 18 provides for the repeal of section 17a of the principal Act, which dealt with the position of those members of the Public Service seconded to the organisation when it commenced operations in 1960. Clause 19 provides for the repeal of section 18 of the original Act and the insertion of powers concerning financial matters which are relevant to the current operations of the laboratories.

Clauses 20 and 21 repeal sections 19 and 20, which related to expenditure and provision of funds to cover such expenditure when the laboratories were set up. The new section 20 provides for the keeping of financial records and the audit of these records by the Auditor-General. Clause 22 repeals Part VA, which made provision for adjustment of the respective interests of the Commonwealth and the

Australian Mineral Industries Research Association Limited in the event of arrangements being made to wind up the activities of the laboratories.

Clauses 23 and 24 relate to formal matters covered by Part VI of the Act, concerning the reporting of the activities of the organisation to the governing body of the laboratories and the guarantors.

In conclusion, the Bill is designed to serve two purposes: first, to amend those sections of the principal Act which had application when the laboratories were originally set up and which are no longer relevant; and, secondly, to provide a vehicle that reflects the current range of activities and demands being made on the laboratories and will permit them to recognise their full potential as a valuable service to the community and to industry.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### OLD ANGASTON CEMETERY (VESTING) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 3 August. Page 319.)

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Drury, Dunstan, Goldsworthy, Hemmings, and Venning; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on 14 September.

#### LEVI PARK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 3 August. Page 323.)

**Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder):** I do not intend to allow this Bill to be dealt with as quickly as was the last Bill with which the House dealt, as there are certain matters relating to this legislation to which I should like to refer. The Minister said in his second reading explanation that the Levi Park Trust would go out of existence and that a new trust would be appointed. The old trust consisted of a Chairman and one member both of whom were appointed by the Government, two members appointed by the Walkerville council and one member appointed by the Enfield council. When the trust was created in 1948, certain circumstances then prevailed that do not prevail now.

I should like now to refer to one of the major alterations. The property in question was then situated in the Enfield council area; hence the appointment to the trust of a representative from that council. In the early 1970's, local government boundaries were changed, as a result of which the property is now wholly and solely situated within the Walkerville council area.

In his second reading explanation, the Minister briefly outlined what had happened in 1948. The Levi Park Trust was set up in that year to administer the newly created public park from which it took its name. The Minister of Local Government continued, as follows:

This park was established at Vale Park on land which Adelaide Constance Belt, a member of the Levi family, had offered to the Walkerville council for that purpose. In fact, the council did not accept Mrs. Belt's proposal, which is the reason why the trust came into existence.

I have just related to the House why the council at that



stage considered that, because the land was not in its area but in that of another council, it would be wrong for rates raised in the Walkerville council area to be spent on this land. The Minister, in his second reading explanation, continued as follows:

Nonetheless, the Walkerville council has played an active role in the administration of Levi Park since 1948.

The Opposition is concerned about what is proposed in this Bill, and wants to stress two major factors to which it indicates its opposition. First, this land is being taken from the aegis of local government and, secondly, financial aspects associated with the trust could, the Opposition considers, be questionable. I now refer to the principal Act, the preamble of which states:

Whereas Adelaide Constance Belt, of Walkerville, has given to the Corporation of the Town of Walkerville approximately 10 acres of land situated at Vale Park in the hundred of Yatala, county of Adelaide, and the sum of £5 000, and has expressed her desire that the said land shall be used in perpetuity as a public park, and that the said sum shall be applied to the improvement and maintenance of the said land as a public park . . .

The Act definitely states that the land was given to the Corporation of the Town of Walkerville and, if this Bill is passed, it will take the land from the Walkerville council and place it under the Government's control. The Minister also said in his second reading explanation:

Administrative matters associated with these projects make it desirable to bring the trust more directly under the control of the Minister. A complement of five members will be retained all of whom will be appointed by the Governor . . .

Then, as a consideration, the Minister said that two members would be appointed on the nomination of the Walkerville council. I take it from this that the Government will immediately appoint three trust members. It will then consider the two nominations from Walkerville and, if they are unsatisfactory, it is possible that the Government will ask for more nominations until it finds the required people whom it wishes to be on the trust.

In other words, the responsibility for and the complete oversight of this land, left in perpetuity as a public park by Adelaide Constance Belt for the purposes of Walkerville, will be taken over by the Government. I am sure that I am voicing the Opposition's opinion when I say that this is indeed a high-handed attitude by the Government, which pays lip service to the three levels of Government. However, when it comes to the point, after saying that local government should stand on its own two feet, the Government takes away a responsibility that should be left with local government, in this case with the Walkerville council.

The second thing I wish to say is that the trust will have power to raise money. Clause 8 provides:

Sections 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22 of the principal Act are repealed and the following sections are enacted and inserted in their place:

Clause 8 also provides:

(3) The Treasurer may upon such terms and conditions as he thinks fit guarantee the repayment on any moneys (together with interest thereon) borrowed by the trust under this section.

(4) Any moneys required to be paid in satisfaction of a guarantee given pursuant to subsection (3) of this section shall be paid out of the general revenue of the State which is hereby to the necessary extent appropriated accordingly.

17. (1) All moneys received by the trust shall be paid into a fund and applied by the trust for the purposes of this Act.

(2) Such of the moneys of the trust as are not immediately

required by the trust may be lodged on deposit with the Treasurer or invested in any other manner approved of by the Treasurer.

I understand that trusts of a similar nature to this one have the power to borrow up to \$1 000 000. That being the case, the Treasurer has the ability to take any of that money and use it as he sees fit.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** You don't know what you're talking about.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** That's what it says: such of the moneys of the trust as are not immediately required by the trust.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** It says, "by the trust", and the trust has to say that it is not immediately required. That's merely to facilitate investment. What are you trying to read into that?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister will have the right to reply.

**Mr. RUSSACK:** The money would still be in the Government's hands. The members of the trust will be appointed by the Government; that is the point I am bringing forward. It is being taken from local government and placed in a trust, whose members will be wholly and solely appointed by the Government, and the Treasurer will have the absolute power to do whatever he likes with the money.

Regarding the land, many councils are responsible for caravan parks, and they act responsibly. I am sure that the Levi Park Caravan Park is also being administered correctly. Although the Opposition will not hinder the progress of this Bill, which must go to a Select Committee, I considered it most appropriate to bring these matters before the House now.

In summarising my points, the Bill provides that the land shall be given to the Corporation of the Town of Walkerville. Secondly, the Government is taking the opportunity to appoint a trust, all of whose members will be appointed by the Government, with the exception of two nominees of the Walkerville corporation (not people appointed by the corporation), and moneys will be raised by the trust which, even if given approval by the trust, can be used by the Treasurer for any purpose whatsoever.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. RUSSACK:** If the Deputy Premier thinks that what I have said is not correct, I look forward to his reply so that he can explain the position. The Opposition supports the Bill through the second reading stage so that it may be referred to a Select Committee.

**Mr. WILSON (Torrens):** I support the referral of the Bill to a Select Committee and I support the remarks of the member for Goyder. I wish to bring one important point to members' attention. On the 10 acres that has been bequeathed to the town of Walkerville, known as Levi Park, is an historic homestead known as Vale House, which was the homestead of the Levi family and which is of considerable historic value. As the member for Goyder has said, part of the park is used as a caravan park, and is of importance to our tourist industry. Therefore, understandably, the park has a greater ramification than just being applied for the use and enjoyment of the citizens of Walkerville. Also the NEAPTR tramline is proposed to go through the edge of the park.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** It goes through the edge, does it?

**Mr. WILSON:** It goes along the edge. Is that better? The Minister seems to be upset tonight. It would be an advantage if the Select Committee recommended that an environmentalist be placed on the trust. Undoubtedly, it would be possible to place one on the trust, because the Government will appoint three nominees, other than

those of the Walkerville corporation. I think it would be better, and the citizens of Walkerville would feel much safer if an environmentalist was mentioned as a specific appointee.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works):** The Bill will be referred to a Select Committee, and all the points the honourable member has raised so ardently on behalf of people who have contacted him will no doubt be raised before the committee. Such people will have the opportunity to appear before the committee and to place their evidence and most convincing argument before it in order to be heard fully, and their evidence, whatever it may be, will be evaluated by the committee. I do not want members to get the impression that, once the Bill is dealt with tonight, it is finished with. This is only a preliminary stage. Regarding the trust being able to borrow money, with the permission of the trust, the Treasurer will be able to invest that money on behalf of the trust, but not on behalf of the Government. I have had enough experience with trusts and with the Treasury to know that that is the case. The money that investment earns accrues to the trust, not to the Government. The inference the honourable member has tried to draw from what has been said this evening is incorrect, and I make that clear to the House.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Chapman, Russack, Slater, Virgo, and Whitten; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on 14 September.

**SPICER COTTAGES TRUST BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 3 August. Page 326.)

**Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg):** As this Bill is to be referred to a Select Committee and as all interested people will be allowed to give evidence to that Select Committee, I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Allison, Bannon, Duncan, Mathwin, and Slater; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on 14 September.

**BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 3 August. Page 320.)

**Mr. GUNN (Eyre):** On behalf of the Opposition, I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works)** moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mrs. BYRNE (Todd):** I wish to refer to road safety, a subject that interests everyone, particularly parents of

teenage children. Accidents can happen to anyone, irrespective of age. They can happen unexpectedly at any time while a person is a driver, passenger, pedestrian, or innocent bystander. We all fear accidents. Many factors cause vehicular accidents; for example, dangerous or careless driving, road conditions, speed, excessive consumption of alcohol, unroadworthy vehicles, failure to obey or understand road rules or road signs, dust raised by vehicles overtaking other vehicles, vehicles approaching from the opposite direction and throwing up stones, and so on.

It is pleasing that the death toll as a result of road accidents declined for the year ended 31 December 1977; that was the third successive year in which the road toll declined. The following are the figures from 1972 onwards: 1972, 312 deaths; 1973, 329 deaths; 1974, 382 deaths; 1975, 339 deaths; 1976, 307 deaths; and 1977, 305 deaths.

The number of people killed in 1977 was the lowest since 1971, when 292 fatalities resulted from vehicle accidents. It can be assumed that the increase in penalties had a material bearing on this reduction. It is hoped that the number of deaths will continue to decrease dramatically. We would all prefer such deaths to be totally eliminated, although we must be realistic about this. Nevertheless, one death is one too many.

In the 1976-77 annual report of the Road Safety Council of South Australia, under the heading "Road Fatalities" the following information and statistics are set out:

During the year deaths due to road crashes rose by four to 321 from the 1975-76 figure of 317. Of the 321 persons killed, 145 occurred in the metropolitan area and 172 in country districts. There was a reduction of 13 in the number of passengers killed, but an increase of six motorcyclists and seven pedestrians over the 1975-76 figures.

The under-25-year age group figured prominently in the fatalities, and there is ample evidence that alcohol and speed were significant factors in the cause of the crashes.

	Details of Fatalities					Total
	Drivers	Motor Cyclists	Passengers	Pedestrians	Pedal Cyclists	
1976						
Jul ...	6	2	3	6	—	17
Aug ...	14	4	10	4	1	33
Sep ...	10	5	4	4	1	24
Oct ...	5	—	6	8	—	19
Nov ...	10	1	4	2	1	18
Dec ...	14	7	6	5	1	33
1977						
Jan ...	9	4	10	2	1	27
					(1 other)	
Feb ...	11	6	8	5	1	31
Mar ...	10	8	6	6	1	31
Apr ...	10	3	10	6	—	29
May ...	11	2	10	3	1	27
Jun ...	11	2	8	8	4	33
TOTAL:						
1976-77	121	44	85	59	11	321
1975-76	120	38	98	52	9	317

Motor cycle accidents, deaths and responsibility is a subject I have already expressed much concern about in this House. The 1976-77 Road Safety Council annual report indicates that special attention was directed to motor cycle riders, and that is certainly necessary. The statistics to which I have referred do not indicate the number of people injured or the extent of injuries (perhaps permanent) caused by road accidents. I do not know whether such statistics are recorded but, if they are, they would be most revealing.

The extent of misery, anxiety, pain, worry, and heartbreak caused to people involved in accidents, as well as to their relative and friends, can never be assessed. It has been claimed that more than 50 per cent of all fatal collisions occur in rural areas, and that alcohol is probably a contributing factor in at least 50 per cent of fatal accidents.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Have you any statistics on juvenile drunken driving?

**Mrs. BYRNE:** No, I only have those statistics that I have quoted. An awareness of the risks and dangers of taking excess alcohol when driving in country and metropolitan areas must, and no doubt will, be continued to be promoted. When new penalties came into effect the council conducted an intensive advertising programme about increased drink-driving penalties. Research carried out after the completion of the programme by an independent research organisation revealed that the approach used was successful, resulting in an increased community awareness of the penalties to more than 80 per cent.

Since its inception in 1966 the council is to be commended for its conscientious and dedicated efforts in educating the public in respect of road safety, the aim being to educate all road users and potential users to a degree where they are aware of and capable of handling all the situations that are likely to occur with the greatest possible consideration for road safety.

The activities of the council in promoting and educating the public in road safety are extensive, and the various work it has undertaken includes the practical side through road safety instruction centres, field activities, promotions, literature, the official journal *Road Alert*, Road Safety Combined Operations Committee, school monitoring system, road safety education in schools, student driving education, the Publicity Advisory Committee on Education in Road Safety, Committee of the Australian Transport Advisory Council, and branches and committees.

The practical approach, coupled with the council's activities in schools, youth groups, community services, church groups, Government and semi-government bodies, and commerce and industry provides a broad approach in tackling road safety problems. All this work, of course, costs money, but it is money that is well spent.

Finance allocated to the council by the State Government in the year ended 30 June 1977 amounted to \$485 273; the Commonwealth grant amounted to \$18 500, a total of \$503 773. Donations were also received, including some from car manufactures. It is obvious that the council's work is valuable, necessary, and of great community service in the interests of road safety.

**Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** We are all aware of the scathing attack that the Minister of Transport made on our colleague in Canberra, Mr. Nixon, particularly in the past few days. He set out on Sunday to demonstrate disgust with the handling of the Australian National Railways, South Australian Division, by the Federal Minister and, indeed, called on him to give some public assurances that no South Australian lines, irrespective of their profitability or cost, will be closed to the public. I have not had a chance to study the report that the South Australian Minister of Transport apparently bases his criticism on, and for that matter I do not think that he has either.

It would seem that, largely on rumour, he set out to maliciously attack the Federal member on the eve of the Budget release. There may not have been political connotations in that effort but there seemed to be some. I draw to the attention of the House the record of the

Minister of Transport that has been written over the past few years when South Australia owned those lines. I should have thought that there was adequate opportunity during that time for the South Australian Minister to act responsibly and declare to the public that there would, in fact, be no closures. It would seem from press releases that have been brought to the attention of this House by the Leader in recent times that our Minister has been pondering the idea but has never been quite game enough to take the necessary action and close the lines in question.

**Dr. Eastick:** He put the Semaphore line up once, too.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** He has put up several lines. I agree that recommendations have come from his respective Commissioners in that division. That is not the point I wish to dwell on. I should like to show the House the completely hypocritical attitude of the Minister in his recent attack. I advert to a situation that occurred within a division of public transport that was and still is directly under the control of this Minister, the Bus and Tram Division, now administered by the State Transport Authority. I refer to the private operation that before 30 June 1978 serviced an area between Adelaide and Meadows. After a closure decision and by direction of the Minister, the S.T.A. service was terminated at Chandlers Hill.

This decision completely neglected patrons beyond that point from Kangarilla/Clarendon and Meadows who included commuters working in the city, aged people seeking public transport access to metropolitan Adelaide, and children attending Urrbrae High School, and it completely severed that link.

The Government forced Premier Roadlines out, by competing on subsidised rates on the attractive part of the route, and refused to continue to provide a service beyond Chandlers Hill. That happens to be right at the outer boundary of the District of Mawson, and on the common boundary between Mawson and Alexandra. This may be accidental, but seems to have similar political connotation to the reference I made a moment ago.

I cite another case where the same principle seems to have been observed. The service Premier Roadlines conducted for many years to Yankalilla, Normanville, Myponga and the southern zones, was terminated at about the same date for exactly the same reason. The Crawford company, which owns Premier Roadlines, announced at the time of closure that it could no longer economically continue that service while suffering the bias and subsidised erosion from the Government's own service in the more attractive parts of the route near Adelaide. It was forced out of that service.

Again the State Transport Authority, under the direction of the Minister, ordered the S.T.A. service to terminate at Noarlunga, that being the southern and outer boundary on the District of Baudin, and spot on the common boundary between Baudin and Alexandra. That might be another example, either by accident or for some other reason, why the rural District of Alexandra held by the Opposition ceased to enjoy this service.

Several other cases have been drawn to my attention around the boundary of the metropolitan area. Private enterprise has been forced off the road by unfair competition, and by subsidised public services being provided in the inner metropolitan area. These actions have so eroded the routes as to force private operators off the run, but then there has been a refusal to provide a public service under the canopy of the State Transport Authority.

In no circumstances do I reflect on the Chairman or his officers within that authority, because it is quite clear that they are acting under directions, and indeed those

directions are most unfair and, in my view, most improper. The activities of the State Minister do him no credit whatever, and I repeat that he is being quite hypocritical after what he has done in relation to the isolation of the people of Moana, Port Willunga, Aldinga, Sellick Beach, Sellick Hill, Myponga, Carrickalinga, Normanville, and Yankalilla.

All the residents adjacent to those townships have been completely isolated by the stroke of a pen by this Minister, simply because, after forcing the public operator off the run, he has refused to extend the services beyond the boundaries of the respective Labor-held districts I have mentioned. It may be an accident, but I do not believe that to be so. I believe that the actions taken are very much politically coloured and orientated.

I am disgusted with the attitude the Minister has adopted on this. He has made it quite clear that he does not propose to extend the services beyond Chandler Hill and Noarlunga, and he has left on a limb aged people, persons seeking to commute to the metropolitan area for employment, and children seeking to gain education within the metropolitan boundaries which they cannot enjoy outside those boundaries. They are completely isolated from public transport.

The two areas specifically mentioned, Meadows being the terminus of one and Yankalilla of the other, have no access to rail or public bus transport of any kind. To me, it is a disgrace, and the Minister should be hiding from it, not being so hypocritical as to criticise the Federal Minister, Mr. Nixon, for acting responsibly, along with other Ministers, in preparing and delivering a Budget of the calibre of that delivered in recent times.

I appreciate the opportunity of addressing the House in this adjournment debate. I hope that, when the Minister is available, he will peruse the comments made and observe those made by my colleague who sits behind me, ignoring interjections from the other side, and having some thought for those persons I have mentioned, particularly on Sunset Strip between Moana and Sellick Beach, who have no other form of transport and who are dependent on public transport, as everyone else is entitled to be, for access to the metropolitan area.

I remind the Minister that section 7 of the State Transport Authority Act requires the authority to ensure, as far as is practicable, that adequate public transport services are provided within the State. The Act does not refer to "within metropolitan Adelaide" or metropolitan anywhere else, but where there is a need, and where it is practicable to provide such transport within the State of South Australia. The Minister should lift his sights beyond the boundaries of Labor-held districts.

**Mr. BANNON (Ross Smith):** Since about 8 p.m. yesterday, one issue has overshadowed the whole of our political, economic, social and other thinking in South Australia, and indeed in Australia as a whole: that is the Federal Budget brought down by Mr. Howard. I should like to devote a few minutes to discussing some of its implications.

The Hon. John Howard, Treasurer of the Commonwealth of Australia, is a whiz kid promoted and pushed on by the Prime Minister. He was a failure in both mathematics and economics whilst at school, and he has demonstrated in the Budget he has presented that he had not improved his knowledge of either subject and that probably the failure that he had in those early years has made him extremely insecure, both in handling finance and studying economics, which has had the inevitable effect, as it would have on any Minister in that situation, of putting him completely in the hands of the public servants

who advise him.

The Federal Government recently appointed, as Head of Treasury, Mr. John Stone, a man notorious in financial circles for his extremely reactionary and backward attitude to public financing and the state of the economy. He has had full and complete rein in the preparation of this Budget. Mr. Howard made some statements that are palpably untrue. He said, for instance, that the Government was prepared to pursue higher levels of economic activity and greater job opportunities, yet just about every measure brought in by Mr. Howard—the increase in taxation, the restriction and withdrawal of public services over a whole range of topics and areas—will have precisely the opposite effect to creating greater job opportunities.

Pursuing them it might be, but at an extremely slow pace and without any intention of catching and grabbing the problem of unemployment. He went on to say that the Australian economy is now responding positively to policies directed to its basic problems. The economic scene, he said, was characterised by declining inflation. Indeed, inflation has declined, although willy nilly, because there has been such a low level of activity in Australia that not much else could be done. If goods are not being bought and sold, the cost of labour has been artificially suppressed, and real wages and their purchasing power have been declining, obviously inflation will also decline. Having made that true statement that inflation has declined, the Treasurer went on to say:

There is moderately expanding demand and activity and a more settled and predictable policy environment.

What sort of nonsense is that? There has been no sign whatsoever of expanding demand and activity, and the Budget will ensure that it will not occur for at least another 12 months.

As for a predictable policy environment, if it is meant that the Government has consistently examined all areas of expenditure by itself and by those depending on it, such as State Governments and local government, and has ensured that it has been kept to a minimum, that staff have been put under the axe and services reduced, that is indeed predictable. However, whether that has created an environment which helps demand, jobs and, indeed, even inflation, is doubtful indeed.

Mr. Howard made great play during the course of his speech of the problems experienced by the Government in the past financial year in balancing its Budget, of coming out with a deficit that was far in excess of the prediction made at the time of the delivery of the last Budget by the now forgotten and discredited Mr. Lynch, and led us to understand in some way that this was due to circumstances beyond the Federal Government's control. However, it is important in this context to examine statement No. 5 attached to the Budget speech, which outlines the Budget outcome for 1977-78 and analyses, in tabular form, just where this major deficit was incurred.

This is extremely significant. Of course, this is hidden away and does not take pride of place in the Treasurer's major speech, because it suits the Government to have this sort of thing hidden. However, if one turns to the back of the Budget papers (back, in fact, to page 174) one finds statement No. 5. If one looks at the columns therein, one sees that we are in a vicious circle which has been created by the Federal Government's policies and which has been made even more vicious by the Budget that has just been brought down. For instance, if we look at the table which shows outlays and compares the Budget estimate with actual expenditure, and the difference, we find a number of headings under which there has been a major over-expenditure in terms of outlays. However, the most

significant of all, which stands out quite clearly above all the others, because it is at least three times more than any other single item in terms of over-expenditure, is that on social security and welfare. The sum of \$242 000 000 more than was estimated was spent on social security and welfare payments, despite the Commonwealth Government's efforts to keep them at an absolute minimum by discouraging people from applying for unemployment and sickness benefits. Those two payments, in themselves, comprise \$155 000 000 of the \$242 000 000, and payments of pensions and allowances to invalids, handicapped and widows were \$96 000 000 greater.

That difference between "estimate" and "actual" in social security and welfare payments can be related fairly and squarely to the total failure of the Federal Government's policies to stimulate employment and provide a healthy economic environment. People would not be claiming unemployment benefits if they had employment, and the estimates made would be right if people had been working. So, that \$242 000 000 can, by and large, be attributed wholly and solely to the effect created by the Federal Government's policies.

If we turn to the receipts table, a couple of pages further on, we find a similar situation. What is the major downturn or difference between Budget estimate and actual? It is a difference, incidentally, in terms of total taxation revenue of about \$977 000 000. The major effect is in such things as the collection of income tax from individuals, amounting to \$399 000 000 down on Budget estimates, and \$356 000 000 down on gross pay-as-you-earn collection of taxes. Why are taxes so down? Because the Government's policies have ensured that fewer people are employed, and they are in the other column I mentioned, and are claiming unemployment benefits as well. As fewer people are employed, therefore less tax is being paid. Those in employment are in employment where the real value of their wages has dropped, where they have less overtime and less opportunity to earn more.

Regarding the whole shrinking both of the public and private sectors (the two are interlocked and go together), we cannot contract the public sector without it having drastic effects on the private sector. All of these have added up to a short-fall of nearly \$1 000 000 000 in income tax collections. Set those two figures against each other and add them up, and that is the total of the Commonwealth Budget deficit, which is the excuse for this horrendous Budget, which in many crucial areas is raising taxes and attempting to raise revenue in inequitable and unreasonable ways.

One of the classic examples is what has been done in health insurance. People are being driven willy-nilly into private health insurance funds, which are demonstrably inefficient, which failed in their major task of providing adequate health coverage throughout the 1960's and the early 1970's, and which resulted in the Medibank system being introduced purely to cover the deficiencies and gross inefficiencies of those health funds. Now, we are being told that we must all get back into them, whether or not we like it. If we want to take the risk of the new Commonwealth scheme of a 40 per cent payment on standard medical care, that is our look-out.

The irony of that is that the people who will take the risk are those most at risk—not those who can afford that risk who are all smart enough to get into the private health schemes and take the higher tables and benefit from the reduction in premiums that will occur by forcing everyone into those private health funds. What we are going to get is what we had in the 1960's—another group of disadvantaged people who believe that they cannot afford to pay for health insurance, but who get sick or are required to be hospitalised, and who find that they are completely uncovered by any medical fund, and are financially at risk. Those lower income groups are being thrown at risk again.

Motion carried.

At 8.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 17 August at 2 p.m.