

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 3 August 1978

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. A. M. Whyte)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

## QUESTIONS

## CLASSIFIED PUBLICATIONS

The **Hon. R. C. DeGARIS**: Has the Minister of Health a reply to the question I asked recently concerning classified publications?

The **Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD**: Without knowing the volume number and publisher of the publications listed, it is not possible to supply a definite answer. The same titles are often used for magazines published in the United Kingdom, United States of America and Australia and sold in all countries.

## CHRISTIES BEACH HEALTH CENTRE

The **Hon. C. M. HILL**: I ask leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health regarding Government facilities at Christies Beach.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. C. M. HILL**: I have received a letter from Mr. Grant Chapman, M.H.R., whose electorate includes the Christies Beach area. Attached to his letter is a copy of a letter he received from the Chairman of the Committee of Management of the Christies Beach Community Health Centre, seeking information which should properly be dealt with in the State area. Accordingly, Mr. Chapman passed on to me this letter, which states:

On behalf of the committee of management of this centre, I write to seek your assistance in a matter of importance to the Christies Beach community. A matter of concern to our committee is the subject of action by the State Government in adopting any of the improvements in casualty retrieval services in the southern area outlined prior to the last State elections. We understand that upgrading ambulance services, the use of a retrieval helicopter and a scheme involving local practitioners, ambulance teams and the Flinders Medical Centre was to be examined by a task force in 1977. To date, none of the promised activities have materialised, and this committee joins other local community groups in asking your assistance to express to the South Australian Government our concern at the lack of action in the areas described.

The letter is signed by a doctor, who is chairman of that committee. Would the Minister like to comment on the contents of the letter, and can he explain the allegations of inactivity by his Government contained therein?

The **Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD**: The honourable member knows very well that the question in relation to helicopter retrieval in that area was investigated by the Chief Secretary on his recent overseas trip. In relation to upgrading the ambulance service, I am not sure how far the St. John Ambulance Service has gone with its new project in Noarlunga, which was to have been tied in with the Christies Beach area. I shall get a report about that. I point out that decisions were made in accordance with a promised programme of funds being available from the Federal Government. We have now heard, as the honourable member would know, that funds for health centres, hospitals, and similar projects, will not be forthcoming from the Federal Government.

The **Hon. C. M. Hill**: Don't keep giving excuses.

The **Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD**: The honourable member is going mad again. Whether as a result of broken promises or broken agreements by the Federal Government, I do not know what action will be taken in the future. We are looking at the position. If the honourable member believes that health services are being restricted as a result of Federal Government cutbacks and if he is concerned about this matter (and I stress this point, because the honourable member has shown no concern up to the present as a result of announced Federal Government cutbacks), I urge him to see what he can do to change the Federal Government's view in relation to its funding under the hospitals and health programme and under the community health centre programme.

## CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS

The **Hon. J. C. BURDETT**: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Premier, who is the Minister in charge of the Classification of Publications Act. My question relates to the classification of publications.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. N. K. Foster**: Question!

The **Hon. J. C. BURDETT**: I refer to the publication *Oui* for April 1978, which appears in the list as being unclassified and which does not have on its cover any of the classifications under the Act, namely, any combination of A, B, C, D and E. A sticker on the publication bears the letters "S.A." and "R" enclosed in a diamond, and it states "Not to be available to minors". This is not a classification which is permissible or prescribed under the Act. Is the Minister aware of this? Does he or does he not consider that the use of this unauthorised sticker may mislead people with a mind to do so to purchase the publication?

The **Hon. N. K. FOSTER**: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. The honourable member was quoting from a magazine. Is he prepared to table it?

The **PRESIDENT**: That is not a point of order. The Hon. Mr. Burdett asked his question of the Minister, and I hope the honourable member will receive a reply.

The **Hon. J. C. BURDETT**: I have not finished my question, Mr. President. Is the Minister prepared to take any action and, if so, what action?

The **Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD**: I will draw the honourable member's question to the attention of my colleague.

## ENERGY CONSERVATION

The **Hon. R. A. GEDDES**: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, about energy conservation.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. R. A. GEDDES**: Yesterday, in reply to a question that I had asked about the Government's policy on educating the public on the need for energy conservation, the Minister said:

Inevitably, the financial stringency imposed by the Federal Government will make it very difficult to finance such a campaign from State sources.

Can the Minister inform the Council how much money he considers is necessary to educate and alert South Australians concerning the need to conserve indigenous petroleum products?

The **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON**: I will refer the

honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

### FEDERAL CUTBACKS

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** I seek your guidance, Mr. President. I wish to direct a question to the person in this Chamber who considers himself to be the acting Leader of the Opposition. Is there such a person?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** Your old mate Ren is gone. Who is taking his place?

**The PRESIDENT:** The honourable member knows his rights and to whom he can direct questions. He knows well that there is no such arrangement, portfolio or shadow portfolio but, if he wishes to ask a question of a member of this Council, he can address the honourable member concerned.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** I ask a question of the person in this Chamber who considers himself capable of taking the place of the Leader of the Opposition. I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question regarding Federal Government cutbacks.

**The PRESIDENT:** To whom is the question directed?

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** To the person in this Chamber—

**The PRESIDENT:** To a member.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** To the Hon. Mr. Hill. I am sorry that I cannot ask it of the Hon. Mr. Burdett, but the Hon. Mr. Hill has been here longer. I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking my question.

**The PRESIDENT:** On what matter?

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** The Federal cuts.

**The PRESIDENT:** The question is out of order. I refer the honourable member to Standing Order 107.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** I desire to direct a question to the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Ren DeGaris, on the question of Federal cuts.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Standing Order 107 provides:

At the time of giving notices questions may be put to a Minister of the Crown relating to public affairs; and to other members, relating to any Bill, motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the Council, in which such members may be specially concerned.

Federal matters are not within the jurisdiction of members of this Council.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** Economic cuts. I thought the Federal cuts could be a public matter! Nevertheless, I seek leave of the Council to make a brief statement before addressing a question to the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber regarding Federal-State finance.

**The PRESIDENT:** The question must be directed to a specific member.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** Mr. DeGaris.

**The PRESIDENT:** That is to whom you should direct it.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** I thought he was the Leader of the Opposition!

**The PRESIDENT:** It does not matter what you thought. The honourable member must ask a specific member.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** Thank you, Mr. President. I know there will be a blow-up in the Party between September and October, but I did not think it would be pre-empted by a statement from you, Sir.

**The Hon. R. C. DeGaris:** In which year?

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** You will learn if you keep to the Party machine instead of wandering around in Hindley Street late at night (I have my sources of information). My question concerns the attitude adopted by the present

Federal Government to most of the States, especially South Australia. I do not want to go into the individual cutbacks, whether it be in regard to the Australian Broadcasting Commission, education, or any of the assistance grants, etc.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** Sit down!

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** After what you said to Brian Chatterton, you ought to sit down and pull the chain.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat when "Order" is called. I suggest to the honourable member that he must address his question to a member of this Council, and he must relate that matter as a matter of concern to this Council or to that member. The honourable member's question is quite out of order.

### CHRISTIES BEACH HEALTH CENTRE

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I wish to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Health regarding the Christies Beach Health Centre. In the letter to which I have referred, the writer indicates that his committee understood that upgrading ambulance services, the use of a retrieval helicopter, and a scheme involving local practitioners, ambulance teams, and the Flinders Medical Centre were to be examined by a task force in 1977. I ask the Minister whether the task force has examined those matters and, if it has, whether it has made its report. If it has reported, can a copy of that report be placed before Parliament?

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** True, the needs of the Christies Beach area are being considered. The report is entirely for the purpose of the Government, so that the Government can have a basis for what is needed there. The report, like any other internal investigation report, has been prepared so that the Government can see what should be done in this area. We are considering the report, including the suggestion by the task force about the use of a helicopter. The Government is considering the matter of use of a helicopter to best advantage generally. It may be that it can be used by the Police Force as well as for the retrieval of patients. These are the sorts of matters that are being examined. This is an internal matter, and I intend to leave it at that.

### ALCOHOL AND DRUG ADDICTS (TREATMENT) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act, 1961-1976. Read a first time.

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** I move:

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

It amends the principal Act, the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act 1961, as amended by the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act Amendment Act 1976, which was assented to in December 1976 but which has not yet been brought into operation. That Act was designed to enable persons found to be intoxicated in a public place to be picked up and taken home or to a sobering-up centre and was passed, together with an amendment to the Police Offences Act providing for abolition of the offence of public drunkenness.

After the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act Amendment Act 1976 was passed it was determined that, owing to financial and other considerations, the premises

of voluntary agencies and police stations would have to be used as sobering-up centres, at least for quite some time. However, under the terms of that Act only premises specifically established for the purpose could be declared to be sobering-up centres. This Bill, therefore, is designed to enable both institutions established for the purpose and the premises of voluntary agencies and police stations to be declared to be sobering-up centres.

In addition, the Bill makes provision for any police station that has not been declared to be a sobering-up centre to be used as a temporary place of detention for intoxicated persons until transport can be arranged to the nearest sobering-up centre. This is intended to cater for those situations where it is not practicable for the police to take an intoxicated person direct to a sobering-up centre, owing to the distance involved or the need to perform other duties.

Apart from these changes, the Bill, if enacted, would not affect the principles relating to the apprehension and detention of intoxicated persons that were approved by Parliament in 1976. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 makes amendments to definitions of terms used in the principal Act that are consequential on amendments to the substantive provisions of the principal Act. Clause 4 amends section 5 of the principal Act by empowering the Governor to declare any premises (in addition to any institution established by the Minister) to be a sobering-up centre. Under this provision it is proposed that various police stations and voluntary agencies would be declared sobering-up centres.

Clause 5 makes an amendment to section 6 of the principal Act that is consequential on the amendments made by clause 7. Clause 6 amends section 7 of the principal Act to provide that the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board shall have a supervisory function with respect to the conduct of sobering-up centres conducted by voluntary agencies. Clause 7 amends section 8 of the principal Act so that the person in charge of a voluntary agency conducting a sobering-up centre, or the police officer in charge of a police station declared to be a sobering-up centre, may be appointed to be superintendent of the centre for the purposes of the principal Act.

Clause 8 amends section 29a of the principal Act, which is the present provision providing for the apprehension of intoxicated persons and their detention at sobering-up centres. The clause amends subsection (2) of the section by making clear that a police officer or authorised person who has apprehended an intoxicated person may remove and take into custody any dangerous object that he finds on the person. The clause also amends the section by providing that an intoxicated person apprehended under the section may be taken to a police station and held there for not more than four hours from the time of apprehension but must, before the expiration of that period, be either released, if he is sufficiently sober, or transferred to a sobering-up centre. It should be pointed out that, although the amendments fix the maximum periods for detention at a sobering-up centre by reference to the time of apprehension, the periods are, in effect, virtually the same as those fixed by the section with its present wording. Clauses 9, 10, 11 and 12, the remaining clauses, all make amendments purely consequential on

amendments explained above.

**The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 2 August. Page 252.)

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** I support the motion as moved by the Hon. Mr. Foster, and I take this opportunity of reaffirming my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. In passing, I notice that this is never done by members of the Government. One wonders why. I am glad to see that this year the Governor, through the Governor, has treated this Parliament with a little more respect than it did last year, because the Speech with which Parliament was opened last year was an insult to this Parliament. From memory, I think it consisted of four paragraphs. At least this year the Government has outlined a fairly substantial legislative programme. The Hon. Mr. Blevins, in seconding this motion, remarked that it is a source of some amazement to him that we always get a weather report. I know that what he said was meant facetiously.

**The Hon. F. T. Blevins:** It wasn't meant facetiously. You've missed the whole point.

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** If the Hon. Mr. Blevins would stop interrupting, he would hear me say that he went on to pay what I believe to be a very sincere tribute to the man on the land. He said that, since being in this place, he has obtained a completely new understanding of country people and their problems. It is a great pity that more of his city colleagues have not had their eyes opened in the same way.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** The only land cultivation you do is frogs at Walkerville.

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** I do not believe that has anything to do with it.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** You admit that you train frogs in your backyard at Walkerville.

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** The honourable member interjecting has spent much time in abusing farmers. The fact that the Governor's Speech always contains what the Hon. Mr. Blevins refers to as a weather report is an indication of the importance of the rural scene in South Australia. Although South Australia is becoming of growing importance as an industrial State (or it was until this Government came into power), we are still very largely dependent on a stable rural economy. Apart from the fact that the breaking of the drought this year will enable individual farmers to get back on their feet, its effect on the economy of South Australia cannot be overstated.

Of course it was inevitable (I am sure that all members expected this) that the Government, through the Governor, would take the opportunity of attacking the Federal Government and try to lay the blame for its own mismanagement on other shoulders. There can be little doubt that we will see a repeat performance when the Budget is brought down in a few weeks time. The Commonwealth Government has taken a responsible stand on the economy, even though in many areas this stand would tend to be unpopular. It is recognised that Government spending is the greatest single cause of inflation. The Federal Government has taken action to curb its own spending, and asked for the co-operation of the States in this regard. Unfortunately, this was not forthcoming. Even non-Labor States did not co-operate to

the extent that they might have done in this respect, and the Commonwealth was therefore put in the position of having to force the States to play their part in stabilising the economy of this country. It did this by quite savagely cutting funds to the States, as I am sure the Hon. Mr. Foster will agree.

It was forced to do this so that States would curb expenditure, and so even unwillingly play their part in curbing inflation. It is a pity Government members in this State do not have the honesty of their New South Wales colleagues and the New South Wales Premier, Mr. Wran, who praised the Federal Government for the way in which it was tackling Australia's problems.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** And they got a good vote as a result.

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** True. The Governor's Speech listed many measures it is intended to bring before us. There are so many, I wonder whether the Ministers are bringing forward legislation to somehow try to justify their existence. Someone in this debate (I think the Hon. Mr. DeGaris) mentioned that we were over-legislated. I could not agree more. We may not be the best governed State in Australia, but we are certainly the most governed.

I will not deal with many of the matters in the Governor's Speech at this stage. I will wait until they are brought before us before making further comment. I should like to comment on the speeches made by the mover and the seconder of this motion. Since being in this place with the Hon. Mr. Foster, I have listened to many of his speeches, sometimes with amusement and sometimes with exasperation, but I always used to think that the views expressed by the Hon. Mr. Foster were sincerely held. But as time has passed, I have begun to doubt that. I believe that the Hon. Mr. Foster is here for one purpose only (and that was proved again today)—to disrupt the workings of this Chamber and to make a farce of the Parliamentary system in this place.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** The Liberals made a farce of this place for 130 years, mate, by not allowing people the right to vote. Why don't you make some reference to that?

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** The Hon. Mr. Foster is simply proving my point. He has nothing to contribute. His speeches are never constructive; they are always destructive. They rely heavily upon personal insult and abuse. In moving this motion, he made personal attacks not only on members of this Parliament but also on one occasion on the family of a Liberal Party member. That is certainly not debate. If that is to be his only contribution, he would serve his Party and this Parliament much better by sitting down and keeping quiet.

The Hon. Mr. Blevins raised a point which is bound to raise a lot of controversy, the question of the right to die. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Blevins in this matter. I can think of nothing worse than being kept alive on a life support system, and at this moment I can say that I would prefer to die. I stress that I say this now. It is one thing to say one would sooner be dead than kept alive that way when one is in full possession of one's health and faculties. It could well be a different story when one is actually faced with the prospect. One of the strongest instincts in man is the desire to live; as a general rule that instinct will override all others. A person who may be horrified at the thought of living on a machine may sign a directive, as suggested by the Hon. Mr. Blevins, but, when given the opportunity, when actually faced with the prospect, of living on a machine or dying, that person may regret having signed it. But of course by the time it reaches that stage he may not be in a position even to know that he was going on a machine, and would not be able to revoke the directive. It would be much too late.

Two cases in recent months received world-wide publicity. One was a young man, whose name I have forgotten, in America whose fiancée and family opposed the doctor who wanted to remove him from the life-support system. In this case the young man recovered and married the girl who fought so hard on his behalf. Another case which I am sure honourable members will have followed early this year and late last year was Karen Quinlan. Her father had a court battle to have his daughter removed from a life-support system, to allow her to die or to live naturally.

Both of these cases are distressing, but they point to the difficulty of making a judgment in these matters. For this reason, I believe that Parliament should not become involved. There is no problem in this connection in South Australia. I have not heard of any problem and, if the Hon. Mr. Blevins has heard of a problem, he did not mention it. The matter is best left to the judgment of the doctor in charge of the case. Each case should be treated individually and, almost, certainly, in conjunction with the family. It would be dangerous for the Legislature to become involved in this matter. While I have sympathy for what the Hon. Mr. Blevins was trying to do, at this stage I would oppose any move to legislate.

I cannot agree with the honourable member's contention that Upper Houses are worthless. I believe that Upper Houses and Lower Houses should be democratically elected, and I played my part in ensuring that this happened in South Australia. Like the honourable member, I was pleased that the New South Wales referendum resulted in a resounding "Yes" vote, but I cannot agree with the following statement of the honourable member:

If the Party in control in the Upper House cannot have its own way, then it can, and does, reject outright the Bill from the people's House.

Let us consider what happened during the last session. The total number of Bills considered by the Legislative Council was 87, and the total number of Bills passed by both Houses was 75. So, 12 Bills are in question. Three of those 12 Bills were not Government Bills; they were private members' Bills. The first was the Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Bill, introduced by the Hon. Mr. Burdett, which passed this Council but did not pass the Lower House. The second of the three Bills was my Bill, the Industrial Code Amendment Bill, which was not passed by this Council. The third Bill was the Minors (Consent to Medical and Dental Treatment) Bill, introduced by the Hon. Miss Levy. Although that Bill was not passed by this Council last session, it was referred to a Select Committee, which has presented its report. The Council passed the Bill yesterday.

That leaves nine Bills of Government origin, of which five have been referred to a Select Committee. I have no doubt that those five Bills will be restored to the Notice Paper and dealt with in due course. One of the nine Bills, the Contracts Review Bill, was withdrawn and referred to the Law Reform Committee. The Members of Parliament (Disclosure of Interests) Bill lapsed in this Council because the Government did not wish to proceed with it. That leaves two Bills that were defeated by this Council—the Motor Fuel Rationing Bill and the Licensing Act Amendment Bill. So, two Bills out of 87 Bills were defeated by this Council.

**The Hon. Anne Levy:** How many Bills did you wreck through your amendments?

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** Is the honourable member suggesting that the Opposition does not have the right to move amendments?

**The Hon. F. T. Blevins:** How many Bills did you amend?

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** Many of our amendments improved the Bills. If we all behaved as Government members do, I would be forced to agree with the following statement of the Hon. Mr. Blevins:

All Upper Houses do is duplicate the work of the people's House without adding anything of value at all.

I do not agree with that statement but I agree that, if we all had to toe the line as Government members do (whose decisions are made outside the Chamber, not within it), that would be a true statement. However, at present it is not a true statement. Every member on this side of the Council at some stage or other has crossed the floor. How many Government members have done that? When you, Mr. President, were a back-bencher, you crossed the floor many times. Opposition members are not subject to the same control as are Government members.

Queensland is the only State that does not have an Upper House. During the last week of the last session of the Queensland Parliament 50 Bills were introduced and passed. There were complaints from the Opposition, and rightly so, that it was impossible to consider those Bills properly. I am sure that, if the Hon. Mr. Blevins had been a member of the Opposition in Queensland, he would have complained as loudly as his colleagues did. It shows that an Upper House can act as a brake. In his book *Considerations on Representative Government*, J. S. Mill, in the chapter dealing with the second Chamber, states:

A majority in a single assembly, when it has assumed a permanent character—when composed of the same persons habitually acting together, and always assured of victory in their own House—easily becomes despotic and overweening, if released from the necessity of considering whether its acts will be concurred in by another constituted authority. The same reason which induced the Romans to have two consuls, makes it desirable there should be two Chambers; that neither of them may be exposed to the corrupting influence of undivided power, even for the space of a single year. One of the most indispensable requisites in the practical conduct of politics, especially in the management of free institutions, is conciliation; a readiness to compromise; a willingness to concede something to opponents, and to shape good measures so as to be as little offensive as possible to persons of opposite views; and of this salutary habit, the mutual give and take (as it has been called) between two Houses is a perpetual school; useful as such even now, and its utility would probably be even more felt, in a more democratic constitution of the Legislature.

That was written in 1861, and it is just as applicable today, and it will be just as applicable in 2061. There are more functions that an Upper House can perform.

Four days short of three years ago, when I made my maiden speech in this Chamber, I raised the question that I will now deal with. I make no apology for raising it again. I refer to the development of a committee system in the Legislative Council similar to that operating in the Senate. An article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 3 November 1970 states:

The Senate is now undergoing the most fundamental and dramatic changes witnessed in the Commonwealth Parliament since the States decided to federate 70 years ago. The introduction of a wide-ranging committee system will make the red-carpeted Upper House potentially the most powerful Parliamentary chamber in Australia.

**J. R. Odgers**, in *Australian Senate Practice*, states:

The Senate's committee system is a major development in the strengthening of the Australian Parliamentary system of Government. In particular, the committee system furthers the effectiveness of the Senate's role as a House of Review. No modern legislature can discharge its functions fully and effectively without the assistance of committees.

To begin with, the volume and intricacies of legislation are considerable. It is a perennial complaint that legislation is rushed through Parliament in the end of session rush without proper examination. Secondly, adequate opportunity must be allowed in the Parliamentary time-table for Parliament to keep the Government accountable for its performance. And, thirdly, time must be found for general debates on national issues, such as defence, foreign affairs and the economy. In addition, with the trend towards more public participation in decision-making, Parliament must be able to find out what interested organisations and individuals may think about proposed laws and other matters of national concern. To this end, formal channels of communication with the nation's legislature are necessary.

There is not the opportunity in the Parliamentary time-table for the full discharge of all these functions, nor does the floor of Parliament lend itself to the investigatory role. The answer is the committee system, with committees sitting at Canberra or travelling when necessary throughout the country, taking Parliament to the people, and hearing evidence from competent witnesses. From such inquiries follows the presentation to Parliament of informed reports and recommendations for improvements in the laws.

Mr. Odgers goes on in greater detail, and I will not read any more of that. Some of what he says is applicable only to the Federal sphere, but there is much that is equally applicable to the States. He states:

To begin with, the volume and intricacies of legislation are considerable. It is a perennial complaint that legislation is rushed through Parliament in the end of session rush without proper examination.

That certainly applies to the States, and especially to this State. He also states:

Secondly, adequate opportunity must be allowed in the Parliamentary time-table for Parliament to keep the Government accountable for its performance. And, thirdly, time must be found for general debates on national issues, such as defence, foreign affairs and the economy.

That is applicable to the States. He states:

In addition, with the trend towards more public participation in decision-making, Parliament must be able to find out what interested organisations and individuals may think about proposed laws . . .

That is also applicable to the States. The committee system in the Senate is comparatively new. Like all major changes, it was not established without some opposition. Like this Chamber, the Senate had used committees for specific purposes. In 1967 two committees were established, one investigating containerisation and the other investigating the metric system of weights and measures. The reports of these two committees were highly acclaimed and I have no doubt that it was these committees in particular that led the Senate to recognise the worth of the committee system.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** For 130 years you were in power and did not suggest it. Why now? It's because you are in Opposition.

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** I have not been here for 130 years.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** It was not in the Senate years ago. It's a modern innovation.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** The Senate's done nothing with it. The Government has not accepted any recommendations or any findings from that system.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** Thank you, Mr. President. If the Hon. Mr. Foster cares to examine my speeches, both in this place and in another place, he will know that I have advocated this system for a long time.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** You've been in Government for

years, but you did nothing.

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** That has nothing to do with it.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The honourable member's continuous interjections are a bit overbearing. It is not necessary. He made his point about "130 years ago", but that has no relevance to what the Hon. Mr. Carnie is saying.

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** In alluding to the reports on containerisation and the metric system, I refer to what the 22 June 1968 issue of the *Bulletin* had to say, as follows:

Parliamentary committees of inquiry are often greeted with cynicism. They are often expensive annoying affairs which produce thoroughly predictable recommendations. But they can be useful, too. Given broad sensible terms of reference and good staffing they can throw up valuable information and conclusions. In an area where the individual Parliamentarian is becoming overwhelmed by the specialisation and sheer volume of Governmental activity, one of his few means for creative action is in committee. The American Congressmen realised this long ago. The Australian Senate committee's recently released report on containerisation stimulates this conclusion. It is a very worthwhile effort.

In November 1967, the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Whitlam) in the House of Representatives in delivering his policy speech for the Senate election at that time, had this to say about the Senate committee system:

The Senate can take important initiatives in drawing attention to important national problems, establishing the facts about those problems and suggesting remedies for them. The Senate has unlimited opportunities to search out the facts, sift the evidence and propose remedies on a whole range of urgent national questions. We therefore propose that a Labor majority in the Senate will establish committees from both sides of the Senate to inquire into and report upon education, health, natural disasters such as fire, flood and drought, housing, poverty and the urgent question of control, exploitation and ownership of our best natural resources by overseas interests, particularly minerals and submerged lands. These are all fields in which the national Parliament must accept increasing responsibility.

In November 1967, Mr. Whitlam advocated the Senate committee system. I have referred to the containerisation report, and on 29 May 1968 the report of the committee inquiring into the metric system of weights and measures was brought before Parliament. The Chairman (Senator Laught) made the following statement:

Until quite recently there were comparatively few select committees of the Senate. But in the present Parliament there has been an acceptance by the Government and by all parties in the Senate of the need for development of the committee system. This development follows the trend in many Parliaments overseas which have found that increasing government responsibilities and the inadequacy of time and opportunity on the floor of the Parliament have made necessary the delegation to committees of certain of the inquiry work of a Parliament. These committees are becoming the workshops of Parliaments. They provide a long needed opportunity for the representatives of industry, commerce, trade and other organisations to put their views fully before the legislature in a way which would be quite impossible under other Parliamentary procedures. This can only make for better government.

This is the most important part:

In addition, committee work results in an informed body of senators who, because of the specialist knowledge gained by them through listening to the evidence of experts are able to make more useful contributions to debates in the Parliament. The establishment of the committee system in the Australian Senate is one of the most significant developments in the modern approach to the role and functioning of Parliament.

It is a trend which, I am sure, will make an important contribution to improving the working methods of Parliament.

If that can be said of the Senate, it can be said equally of the Legislative Council. The committee system operates in other Commonwealth countries as well as Australia, such as New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and Canada. I will leave out the United States, where the system also operates, because of the different system of government there. In 1970, after investigation and debate, the Senate established five Estimates Committees and seven Legislative and general purpose standing committees. That system, with few changes, has operated very well since then. Despite what the Hon. Mr. Foster says, the system is working well.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** What has it achieved?

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** There always will be a place for *ad hoc* Select Committees to deal with specific matters, but there is also a strong case to be made out for having standing committees.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** It has nothing to do with standing committees.

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** I am speaking about standing committees. I now refer to some of the reasons why I believe that the standing committee system would work here. They are as follows:

- (a) It permits a continuing surveillance of defined fields;
- (b) a standing committee can from time to time make progress reports on chosen matters coming within its prescribed jurisdiction;
- (c) standing committees do not suffer from the handicap of select committees which are under pressure to complete inquiries by stated dates;
- (d) standing committees create an awareness, both within the Public Service and at large, of the relevant legislative chamber's "watchdog" functions in certain fields of government;
- (e) the system creates within the Parliament certain areas where there is a willing disposition to leave the matter to the relevant House, thus enhancing that House's status;
- (f) the system provides a unique opportunity for organisations and others to make representations and submissions to the Parliament regarding the administration of the laws within a committee's jurisdiction;
- (g) committee activity is particularly appropriate in neglected areas such as statutory corporations;

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! If the Hon. Mr. Cameron wishes to join in conversation with the Hon. Mr. Foster, I ask him to take a seat there so that the conversation will be less audible.

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** The final reason is as follows:

- (h) committee activity is appropriate for matters which are not controversial, political issues (such being matters likely to be debated on the floor of the House, while other matters receive scant attention).

Reducing all those reasons to their essence, it seems that the use of standing committee systems has become widespread in various Parliaments because of two main factors. First the volume and complexity of business before Parliament is so great that it can be coped with only inadequately on the floor of the House within the restrictions of a Parliamentary timetable: use of committees effectively enables excessive work to be delegated and thus to be coped with. Secondly, proceedings on the floor of the House are not entirely appropriate to investigations which are a proper function

of a Parliament: committees can more conveniently conduct such investigations, including the examination of witnesses and documents. Thus, the adoption of an effective standing committee system strengthens the Parliament in performance of its legitimate role, particularly as against ever more powerful Government. Such an effect must enhance the value and reputation of the House concerned.

I recognise that to establish such a system in South Australia would be much more difficult than was the case in the Federal Parliament or in New Zealand, the United Kingdom, or Canada, because this Council is comparatively small. After the next election, we will have a Council comprising 22 members but, obviously, the President and Ministers would not be members of such committees, so that leaves 18 members available for committee work. Therefore, members would have to serve on more than one committee.

Again, there is the question of staff, because if committees are to function properly, clerical and research staff must be available. Again, there is the matter of alteration of the Constitution and the Standing Orders. These are all difficulties, but if the will is there, doubtless problems will be solved.

The Senate introduced the system gradually, and its first move was to appoint five Estimates Committees. I suggest that we should appoint three Estimates Committees. The Estimates would be allocated to each committee according to the Ministerial responsibilities and representative capacity of each of the three Ministers in the Legislative Council. Each committee would consider a Minister's department and other departments that the Minister represents in the Council. Such a procedure should lead to a more orderly and more effective examination of annual Estimates. A feature would be that, in addition to the Minister, departmental officers should appear before the committees and answer questions, with the proviso, of course, that departmental officers should not be expected to have to answer questions on matters of policy. I appeal to the Council to give serious thought to my suggestion, and I have no doubt that such a system would make this Chamber even more effective than it is now.

I wish to mention one matter, in conclusion. The Hon. Mr. Foster's contributions to the proceedings usually seem to deal with personal abuse. He has done it today, as well as on other occasions. I refer particularly to two occasions this week when he accused members on this side, particularly the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, of hiding behind scurrilous lies.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** He did. Yesterday he admitted that he circulated the document. You had better read *Hansard*.

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** I have read *Hansard*.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** Read the document.

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** I have done that, too.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** So you admit it was circulated to the Liberals.

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** Yes, that has not been denied, but the person responsible for that document chose to remain anonymous, for obvious reasons, I imagine.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** You know who wrote it. De Garis did. When he goes as far as he went yesterday, he is guilty.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** The Hon. Mr. Foster is again indulging in his standard habit of engaging in personal abuse.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** The person who gave me the document told me who did it.

**The Hon. M. B. CAMERON:** I rise on a point of order,

Mr. President. I draw attention to the fact that the Hon. Mr. Foster is not in his seat.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** I'll go back to my seat and take a point of order, too.

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** Mr. President—

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** I take a point of order. The document was given to me by one of their colleagues on the other side, who told me who was the author, and it was DeGaris.

**The PRESIDENT:** That is not a point of order. It is a question of opinion, and we have heard your opinion so much today that—

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** Well, how did I get the document?

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** Irrespective of who wrote the document, the person chose to remain anonymous, but, if the Hon. Mr. Foster reads the *Samcor Newsletter* of 23 March 1978, he would see what another member of the staff of Samcor had said.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I take a point of order, Mr. President, under Standing Order 181. During the whole of the speech by the Hon. Mr. Carnie this afternoon, the Hon. Mr. Foster has been in conflict with that Standing Order, which deals with undue interjections. I fail to see why a member should have the privilege of breaking Standing Orders for almost an hour without being severely reprimanded.

**The PRESIDENT:** It is a point of order, and—

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** And you're going to uphold it.

**The PRESIDENT:** If I take the matter to its extreme, which I have no real desire to do—

*The Hon. N. K. Foster interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** If the Hon. Mr. Foster cannot accord the Chair sufficient respect when a point of order has been taken against him, he is making the position very difficult for me. There is a limit to how far I will extend my understanding to him, and I think he has had better than a fair go today. The Hon. Mr. Carnie.

**The Hon. J. A. CARNIE:** This Samcor newsletter article which is headed "Where is Samcor going?", states:

We all know that Samcor is losing money, employees are losing jobs and many of those left are losing faith. Whilst we have no control over drought conditions and lack of stock— This was written in March; the drought conditions no longer apply—

we do have some control over the morale of Samcor and we can all do something constructive towards building a team spirit, so that Samcor will have a works to be proud of, and more importantly, the employees will feel a sense of responsibility towards not only their own job, but an understanding of the jobs of others. A comment was made in a recent J.C.C. meeting that Samcor used to be a happy place to work and people looked forward to coming to work, but that morale was now at "rock bottom". I would like to say that from my own observations, I agree that this comment is unfortunately true. I do not have any simple magic answer to it, but let's start by using this newsletter as a forum for suggestions, constructive criticism and ideas for improvement.

One thing of which I am sure is that we are now competing for contracts in world markets, which means that both our quality and our price must be better than all others. Our reliability and reputation has got to be unquestionable. We all have a responsibility to help re-build a happier workforce to achieve harmony and most importantly, to communicate. "Lack of communication" is a very tired phrase, but a very real problem. Misunderstandings and numerous time consuming problems arise through lack of communication. Let each and every one of us make that little bit more

effort—don't let's waste energy calculating how many sick days we have left, to ensure we don't miss any, let's aim for a full year's work and treat sick leave as the privilege that it is—for when we are sick.

Those of us who are fortunate enough to be employed must rebuild the morale and the team spirit and Samcor's reputation in readiness for better times which we all hope are not too far away. Let's get off our lethargic backsides and try and make this place tick again with enthusiasm, responsibility and the willingness to give a little more. I know a lot of you will think when you read this that you are giving your maximum now, and you may be right, but those who aren't will recognise themselves.

O.K., so I sound like I'm preaching—I'm not. I'm an employee too, with a job to do and frustrations to contend with. My sole reason for writing this article is that I am very concerned at the unhappiness and bitterness that exists at the moment, and it is in danger of becoming a way of life. The remedy is in our own hands, to improve morale and change our own attitudes. Let's get stuck into the job and all earn the right to share in the pride each time we win a new contract.

It is signed by Ann Fox. That says in a shorter way much of what was said in the document to which the Hon. Mr. Foster referred. If he continues to say that there is not a lack of morale and dissatisfaction at Samcor, he is continuing to bury his head. I support the motion.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture):** I, too, support the motion. On Tuesday, during this debate, the Hon. Mr. Dawkins attacked a speech that I made at the National Convention of the Rural Youth Movement. During his speech I tried to interject and ask the honourable member if he had actually read the speech. I can see from reading *Hansard* that it was a pointless interjection, because he obviously had not read the speech, and neither had the person who wrote his speech for him. In his speech he tried to sustain an argument that I had made an attack on the rural media and the farming community. That was quite an extraordinary statement to make. I think it was based on the following extract from my speech:

The major problem that arises in this area of communication is the degree of cultural difference that exists between people within departments of agriculture and farmers. Departmental officers acquire degrees or diplomas which require considerable skills in writing and reading. Farmers, on the other hand, usually have a much lower standard of education (in Australia it is rarely above high school standard) and they do not necessarily use the written word to acquire information. For instance, the departmental officer's reaction to a problem is to write a fact sheet or bulletin, while a farmer seeking information will usually listen to *The Country Hour* for answers.

Within the South Australian Agriculture and Fisheries Department we are attempting to bring these two sides closer together. We are emphasising to our extension people that written material must be assessed to ensure that it is the most effective way of carrying a particular message to farmers. The old criteria of writing down the message to impress colleagues or to build up promotion prospects is not acceptable. This traditional need to produce a list of published papers as supporting evidence of one's fitness for promotion in the public service has long been the bane of effective and flexible extension information and one that is being corrected in South Australia as quickly as possible. It seems extraordinary to me that the Hon. Mr. Dawkins has made a value judgment on the statement that I said there was this degree of cultural difference between farmers and officers of the Agriculture Department. I made no such value judgment. I was just stating a

communication gap existed, and giving the reason for it.

I think the Hon. Mr. Dawkins displays a considerable degree of intellectual arrogance when he says that, because farmers do not necessarily use skills in reading and writing, they are somehow ignorant or inferior. I made no such statement, and I think it is a sad reflection on him that he should make that statement in this Council. I was making the point that a genuine communication gap existed and that we had to do our best to try to breach that gap.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins also went on to accuse me of saying that rural media journalists have no training. It is an extraordinary statement to make, particularly when he quoted part of my speech only a few paragraphs earlier. In that speech I said:

Most journalists have diplomas in agriculture or similar disciplines.

So they obviously have a high degree of training. I was making the point that I felt they would benefit from wider training, including units in government or political science. I am pleased that this view is accepted by some of our educational institutions. I congratulate Roseworthy College, for example, on giving its students units in government and political science in its diplomas. The students are thus given that wider training. The point the Hon. Mr. Dawkins was trying to make is not even assisted by his own quotations from my speech.

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** It was a correct quotation from your speech.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** It was inaccurate.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** It was taken out of context.

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** That is not so.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** You didn't mind doing that, did you?

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** I read it exactly as it was.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** In addition, the honourable member, in his attack on me, used—

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** I didn't attack the Minister; I criticised his speech.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The honourable Minister will be seated while I point out to the Council that today we have had so much pointless interjection. Although I believe that some interjecting is acceptable and even stimulating to the debate, when it reaches a point of ridicule and makes it impossible for the speaker on his feet to be heard, it must cease. I have asked for decorum a number of times, if honourable members want me to take sterner action I shall do so.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** In his attack on me, the Hon. Mr. Dawkins used the editorial in the *Stock Journal*. That editorial showed an extraordinary degree of paranoia. Part of the editorial is as follows:

This policy has been pursued to much greater effect in recent years by a genuine attempt to throw off the stigma which has existed in some minds—and still does in the minds of a few—brought about by our ownership.

Because we are owned by the major stock and station and woolbroking firms in the State, we have been looked on in some sectors of rural industry purely as a mouthpiece for these people.

I found that to be an extraordinary statement, because most of the editorial was devoted to my speech at the National Convention of the Rural Youth Council. I draw attention to two quotes, one quote being from my speech and one being from the *Stock Journal*. The following is the quotation from my speech:

Reporters do not seem to understand that Ministers, Cabinets and Parliaments do not suddenly make decisions based on personal whim, but only after careful investigation and sounding out of those who will be affected. The reports

of these investigations and seeking of opinions are the very foundation of policy decision making. Journalists vie with each other to gain personal possession of reports first. But what is disappointing is the quick and loud protest they make if a press release containing a summary and interpretation of the report is not prepared and made available with the report.

The other quotation is from the editorial in the *Stock Journal*, which made the following criticism of me:

- How long is it since he held a press conference or gave a briefing to the media?
- Wasn't he without a full-time press secretary for nearly six months?
- Does he consider himself easily accessible to the media?
- Does he consider his press releases to always be acceptable to the media?

In other words, the *Stock Journal* is in almost every way confirming the very criticism I made: reporters are not prepared to read reports and do their homework. They depend on press conferences, press secretaries and media releases to provide them with summaries and interpretations of reports. It was extraordinary that my remarks should be confirmed by the *Stock Journal* editorial.

It is often said that international travel broadens the outlook, but obviously the Hon. Mr. Dawkins is the exception to the rule. He said he had been to India. I can only assume that he was on one of those trips where one goes to 25 countries in 20 days. The time he spent in India must have been very short, because his remarks were incredible. He said that India was under a left-wing Socialist Government; this was at the time of the emergency declared by Indira Gandhi. The type of socialism to which he has referred is the type of national socialism undertaken by Nazi Germany. It is incredible that he should have such a superficial view of the Indian situation.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins also said that he was unhappy with the marriage between the Agriculture Department and the Fisheries Department. I am glad he mentioned this point because it was, after all, the only point on fisheries in the Liberal Party's platform at the last election. Members of the fishing industry have told me how deficient the Liberal Party's platform is in this respect. Members of the fishing industry have said, "The Liberal Party could come up with only one thing: it did not like the merging of the two departments, despite the economies made possible." The Liberal Party's policy is contradictory to its frequent statement that the Government should economise. When economies are made, the Liberals criticise me. The Liberals could not come up with any fisheries policies at all despite the fact that they claim to be in close contact with rural and fishing communities. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins made a personal attack on me.

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** I criticised your lack of practical expertise.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** What is extraordinary is that, in saying that my property was the most run-down, inefficient, and uncared for property in the Barossa Valley, he claimed that those were the words of other people. I find this most extraordinary because, after he made his speech, I telephoned Mr. Burge—

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** I simply indicated where the property was.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** He is quoted in *Hansard*.

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** Just to indicate where the property was.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** So was Mr. Thumm. When I telephoned Mr. Burge, he denied that he had made these assertions to Mr. Dawkins, whose credibility is

completely at stake. He makes incredible assertions in *Hansard*, quoting neighbours of mine and trying to implicate them. Unfortunately, I have not been able to contact Mr. Thumm to ascertain his situation regarding these opinions put into his mouth.

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** That is completely untrue. They were not put into anyone's mouth, and the Minister knows it.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** I will certainly contact Mr. Thumm, because I believe the Hon. Mr. Dawkins has taken Mr. Thumm's name in vain and put him in the firing line in trying to associate Mr. Burge and Mr. Thumm with unfounded criticisms.

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** I simply tried to identify the location of the property. The Minister knows that. I did not even mention that it was the Minister's property.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** After the years that the Hon. Mr. Dawkins has spent in this Council, he should have the experience to think for himself, rather than trying to make an attack that cannot be sustained.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** I rise on a point of order regarding the statement of the Hon. Mr. Dawkins. He made an attack—

**The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS:** Sir, I rise to—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I will control the situation. Will the Hon. Mr. Foster please resume his seat? The honourable Minister has given certain explanations regarding the difference of opinion between himself and the Hon. Mr. Dawkins. I am sure he does not need support from any other members. It is not a point of order: it is merely an observation. The Hon. Mr. Cameron.

**The Hon. M. B. CAMERON:** I, too, Sir, have a few observations to make. First, I should like to raise in this debate the matter raised in another place yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition. I refer to the Frozen Food Factory. In his explanation to a question the Leader of the Opposition in another place referred to a series of figures that are now contained in *Hansard*. Therefore, I seek leave to have the same set of figures inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

**The PRESIDENT:** I think we are starting to clutter *Hansard*.

**The Hon. M. B. CAMERON:** Is that your ruling?

**The PRESIDENT:** Yes.

**The Hon. M. B. CAMERON:** As leave is not granted, I will refer to the figures, and deal first with roast beef (the figures in the first column give the description of the item and the second column contains the price of the goods obtained from the Frozen Food Factory). The information is obtained from a price list provided by the Frozen Food Factory. The factory price for roast beef is \$5 a kg, based on the factory price of \$50 for a 10 kg carton. That price is for cooked meat. By looking in the yellow pages of the telephone directory for an independent wholesale outlet I came up with the name Mac Cocking Proprietary Limited, 37 Wright Street, for finest quality frozen vegetables and foods. I assume that is a reliable outlet. Its price for roast lamb in gravy (the unit comprising 2 kg) is \$3.40 a kg. I understand that today in another place the Premier insinuated that the Leader's figures applied to an independent outlet providing uncooked supplies. Certainly, I do not know how you can have uncooked roast beef in gravy, but I am sure that the Premier can explain that in some way. The fact is that the Leader's figures reflect the true situation on a cooked basis, and they show that the price from an independent outlet is \$2.93 a kg, which is close to half the price charged by the frozen food factory, the only difference being that the food factory does not refer to gravy. Perhaps the cost of putting gravy

on roast beef can double the price! I doubt it, and I doubt whether any cook in South Australia would assume that that would be the case.

Roast lamb is quoted at \$6.10 from the factory, but only \$3.70 from the independent outlet. With roast lamb the price was quoted with the lamb in gravy. In another place, I understand that it was stated today that the difference could be in quality, but I have yet to find a difference in quality to account for such a huge difference in price, again almost double.

**The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield:** What is double?

**The Hon. M. B. CAMERON:** It is \$3.70 to \$6.10.

**The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield:** You referred to \$5 when you started.

**The Hon. M. B. CAMERON:** If the Minister would put the paper down and listen—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** You're altering your figure.

**The Hon. M. B. CAMERON:** I am now quoting roast lamb, for the Minister's benefit. I have finished with the roast beef. I refer to the figures again: \$6.10 and \$3.70. It is almost half. There are 10 other items on the list that I will not deal with. However, turning to frozen peas, the price from the factory is \$1.50 and from the independent food outlet 91 cents. A supermarket purchases them for its own resale at 73 cents. I am sure the Government is able to buy as well as the supermarket.

My point is this: how can the peas be subject to re-cooking as the Premier suggested? Peas are taken straight out of the bag for use at the end of the cooking process. I am willing to supply to the Minister both these documents that show clearly the situation obtaining at the Frozen Food Factory. This information highlights the cost difference. The food items indicated were picked almost at random from the food lists, but most other items would show the same difference if a comparison were made. Is the Minister not willing to examine these figures and do something about the Frozen Food Factory, because the cost is certainly not justified to the people of this State? In fact, I dare the Minister to compare the prices of the Frozen Food Factory with the prices provided by an independent outlet. At the end of such an exercise I know what he will find—that the cost will be halved by getting supplies from free enterprise. The Government should have the gumption to admit its mistake. It should do something about it. There is no justification for waste at this level. It cannot even be justified on the grounds of saving in regard to waste. Anyone who reads the Corbett Report will see that that report makes clear that the Frozen Food Factory will not lead to any saving of waste under the present system.

The reason for this has been made clear to me. These items are provided in packets, not all with the required number of meals in them. In the case of chicken, which is set out in packets of 20 pieces, if a hospital or one of its sections requires 23 meals, two full packets are sent. Each packet comprises 20 chicken pieces. The first packet will be used fully, but from the second packet three pieces only will be taken out, and the remainder wasted. I do not know how that system can possibly result in savings.

Even more serious is the fact that we have built this Frozen Food Factory to save money for the State, while in the process many people who were employed in hospitals and institutions for the purpose of cooking have lost their jobs. I understand that all those people were given 12 months within which to relocate themselves.

Further, at the Regency Park College of Further Education, a school of food and catering has been

provided, and that is now producing cooks and chefs. What will they do? By establishing the factory, we have destroyed many job opportunities for people who are being trained at the college. It seems a pity that two buildings, which are almost within sight of each other and which have cost much money, are now in conflict with each other. Obviously, the costs of the food factory will be more than the cost involved by leaving a position as it has been or by turning the whole matter over to private enterprise and obtaining the food from a place where some saving to the taxpayer results.

The second matter I wish to raise is one about which I have already asked a question in the Council. I refer to the abattoirs in Mount Gambier. It does not seem to have got through to the Minister of Agriculture that a serious and artificial situation now exists in Mount Gambier regarding these two abattoirs. At present, there is nothing to prevent abattoirs from developing in Victoria, a short distance over the border from South Australia, and taking all the business from the South Australian abattoirs, because Victorian abattoirs would be able to by-pass Mount Gambier and have total access to the metropolitan area, while their two counterparts are prevented from supplying meat to the Adelaide metropolitan area. That is the most absurd position that I have known.

This Government is refusing to accept that a South Australian industry (in this case, two abattoirs at Mount Gambier) is in dire straits regarding job opportunities. The jobs of nearly 70 men are being affected by the Minister's refusal to make a decision. I would be willing to take a bet that, if this had happened before the most recent State election, the position would have been met and access to the Adelaide metropolitan area would have been given to the Mount Gambier abattoirs. I say that because at that time the Government was doing anything it could to buy votes in Mount Gambier. Every time Mount Gambier was mentioned, there was no problem and money was poured in. I have heard that \$30 000 000 was poured in.

**The Hon. J. R. Cornwall:** Can you verify that?

**The Hon. M. B. CAMERON:** I will have to seek the honourable member's support, because I think that many of the things promised will not come to pass. The matter regarding the abattoirs to which I have referred is one on which no decision will be made prior to Christmas, and there is no certainty that a decision will be made then. Cattle can be slaughtered at Victorian abattoirs and in such places as Goulburn and Camperdown and sent back to metropolitan Adelaide.

Why the Minister cannot correct the position and allow South Australian industry to be protected is beyond me. His attitude shows a total lack of interest in that part of the State. If the Labor Party wants to win back the District of Mount Gambier, I suggest that the Government prevaricate no longer and that it make a decision now. The Minister can sum up the case for and against, without anyone else having to do anything for him.

Another matter that has received considerable publicity is the building of a paper mill on the Murray River system. I have been surprised at the meek acceptance by this Government of the provision of an industry that has the potential to endanger the Murray River. An example of the meek acceptance is this report in the *Advertiser* of 7 July, headed, "Mill waste undetectable":

Any pollution from the proposed newsprint pulp mill at Albury would be virtually undetectable in South Australia, the Minister of Works, Mr. Corcoran said yesterday. Nevertheless, I have instructed the South Australian commissioner on the River Murray Commission to keep me informed that every requirement is met by the company

before final approval is given, he said.

The report goes on to deal with other items that do not cut across the statement to which I have referred. One thing that we should not tell a company that is thinking of establishing an industry, even before the pollution authority has made up its mind, is that the effluent from that industry will have a negligible effect on us. Telling the company that virtually gives it the green light.

The River Murray Commission has power over only 25 per cent of the Murray River system, and then it has power only over quantity, not over quality. The present position should not occur in relation to any industry that may lead to pollution of the river until the commission is given power only over quantity, and quality over the whole Murray River system. Part of a report in the *News* of 6 July 1978 states:

At present the River Murray Commission only has a total staff of eight or nine to administer one of the longest river systems in the world, with a catchment of one seventh of the whole area of Australia.

In addition the existing commission is completely powerless unless all State Governments and the Commonwealth agree to action.

The commission is dependent on the States for most of its information and the States were responsible for implementing any proposals.

By world standards the administration of the Murray is shameful and by any standards the River Murray Commission is pathetically weak.

For once, I totally agree with a member of the Labor Party: that statement was made by the Federal member for Hawker, Mr. Ralph Jacobi. It was an excellent statement and I fully approve of it. It came out the day after the matter involving the paper mill became a controversy.

Why the Minister is not speaking out against the mill and telling New South Wales that we will not have anything of it (not that we have any power to disagree) until all Governments give us some power over the river is beyond me. The Minister has a wonderful opportunity to force at least the New South Wales Government to come to the party. I have read at length the environmental impact study report on the mill. One interesting part of it states that, to detect an increase in the problems of effluent quality, there will be tanks, with fish sensors in them.

The fish will have sensors on them, and I assume that when they waggle their tails fast, because it is becoming uncomfortable, the alarm goes and the factory stops. I suppose these things are worked out scientifically and everybody will be happy with it. I can think of an even better sensor, and we will not have to worry about or watch the fish. Instead of building a 15.9 kilometre pipeline to take the effluent away from this factory down the Murray River so that it goes below the water intake for Albury-Wodonga, it could be taken six kilometres back to the Hume Reservoir so that Albury-Wodonga can share the effluent with us. I guarantee that then there will never by any problem with effluent.

It is interesting that the person from Australian Newsprint Mills said he would be happy to do that, although he thought he might have problems in Albury-Wodonga and with the New South Wales Government. I see this as one of the requests we should put to the New South Wales Pollution Commission, if it is making the decision on our behalf, and that seems a ridiculous situation. The water could go back to the Hume Reservoir, and, if it is as good to drink as the company says it is, and of such high quality, there should be no problem. There will not be the need for that extra 15.9 km pipeline.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** Why shouldn't they recycle the same water?

**The Hon. M. B. CAMERON:** Precisely; that is the next point I am coming to. The Hon. Mr. Hill has a lot more common sense than the Government on this matter; at least he can see the next point and see what we should be asking for. I said to the A.N.M. spokesman (and he has been helpful to the Opposition) about a fortnight after we first raised the matter, when the company realised we were having some impact, that, if it was as good to drink as they claimed, why not recycle it back through the factory as drinking water for the employees? One fellow said he would be quite happy to have it in his whisky (he must have pretty poor quality whisky). If it is that good, let the company put it back through the factory. If those two things happen, I am sure South Australia will have no further groans about the paper mill. The environmental impact study made clear in one section, under the heading "Process Wastewater", the following position:

The alternative of discharge to Eight Mile Creek was also considered, but is not proposed because flow in Eight Mile Creek is at times negligible, which would require effluent standards to be impracticably high; it could possibly cause erosion problems; and the creek discharges into the River Murray above the water supply intakes for both Albury and Wodonga.

That is a very good reason for it not going into the river at all. If it is no problem, why is that requirement put into the environmental impact study? Why did the Albury city engineer, when he was asked whether he was prepared to have it back, state that he would not take a chance on that because there could always be accidents. Those were his words, and I could supply a copy of them to any honourable member who would like to see them. I do not want to dwell on that matter.

These are the questions I think should be answered before we go any further with agreement on this matter. They are serious questions. Who will monitor the testing of the effluent and the various procedures associated with the treatment plant? I think that is a very important question because, if the company is going to monitor them, it is a bit like having Samcor monitor the standards of meat inspection instead of having Commonwealth inspectors. If the effluent flow proves unacceptable, who will make the decision to permanently close or temporarily suspend the operation of the plant? That is another important question. Will South Australia, in the event of the effluent having a deleterious effect on the quality of our water, have any power to request the closure of the pulp mill? Of course we will not. What testing has been done on the long-term effects of effluent on all river life? What are the results of those tests and over what lengths of time have the tests been conducted? I think if honourable members had the answers to those questions they would be surprised at the result.

Why are fish being used as sensors instead of other means? I understand bacteria are better indicators of effluent. I do not know how fish sensors work. I am worried that every time they get hungry the alarm might go off. They might be like Pavlov's dog.

**The Hon. F.T. Blevins:** It is a tried and true monitoring system.

**The Hon. M. B. CAMERON:** I accept that. I would like to see something with a little finer detail associated with it, and I understand there are now better methods available. If so, we should insist on them. It should be a requirement that within a certain period of time the mill effluent becomes totally recycled. South Australia would then be finally happy.

It should be a requirement that before any industry is

established at a town on the Murray River the outfall of the effluent from that industry should be above the town that establishes it. That way we have the best sensors of the lot. The best method of detecting pollution is to have it done by the people who are going to benefit from the industry. I support the motion.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** In supporting the motion I would like to convey my sympathy to the family of the late president of the Council, Mr. Potter. It is a fate that must befall us all at some time, but it is a particular tragedy when it happens when one is still able to work and carry out one's duties.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris, and indeed the Hon. Mr. Carnie, have during this debate castigated the Hon. Mr. Foster for what they said was a concentration on personal abuse in his contributions in this Council. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris should put his house in order before he starts making that sort of criticism. It was only on Tuesday this week that we had one of the most underhand and scurrilous attacks by any member on another member in this Council, and that was the attack by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins on the Minister of Agriculture, already referred to in this debate. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins deliberately misread what the Minister had to say in his speech to the rural youth group, and deliberately quoted it out of context to give a misleading impression. He resorted to personal abuse. It is all very well for the Hon. Mr. DeGaris to criticise members on this side, but let him put his house in order before he does so. Let us see the Hon. Mr. Dawkins try to wriggle out of the hot water that he got himself into by interjecting during the Minister's speech this afternoon. I would like again to record what the Hon. Mr. Dawkins said to show that what he tried to say by interjection was completely false. This is what he said:

What one also cannot doubt are the opinions of neighbouring farmers, gardeners, and vigneron in the Barossa Valley who say that, if one wants to see the most run-down, inefficient, and uncared for property in the Barossa Valley, one should go to a certain property at Lyndoch adjacent to the properties of Mr. Thumm and Mr. Noel Burge. These are not my opinions: they are those of "farmers with a much lower standard of education" (to quote the Minister) but, having taken their advice and having seen for myself, I cannot but agree.

Apart from the fact that this conjures up a somewhat bizarre spectacle, if not a grotesque one, of the Hon. Mr. Dawkins in sneakers creeping up to the Hon. Mr. Chatterton's property in the dead of night trying to find out whether it is a well-run property, it is as I say, a scurrilous and unfair attack.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins tried to get out of it. He said he did not refer to the Minister's property. He said that one should go to a certain property at Lyndoch adjacent to the properties of Mr. Burge and Mr. Thumm. He did not refer to the Minister's property, but it was obvious what he meant. All honourable members would be fully aware of that. Any attempt by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins to slide out from under would be revealed for what it was. He said he had not quoted Mr. Burge or Mr. Thumm. Again, the Hon. Mr. Dawkins might be technically correct. However, he did say that one should refer to the opinions of neighbouring farmers, gardeners, and vigneron.

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** I was precisely correct, not technically correct.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Why did the honourable member refer to the properties of Mr. Burge and Mr. Thumm?

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** To indicate where the other property was.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Which was the Minister's property.

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** Yes.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I am happy that the honourable member is now happy to say that he was referring to the Minister's property, even though he did not do so directly in his speech. He also referred to neighbouring farmers, gardeners, and vigneron. He also mentioned Mr. Burge and Mr. Thumm. It is clear that the Hon. Mr. Dawkins was implying that he had obtained an opinion from Mr. Burge and Mr. Thumm.

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** That is completely and utterly false.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** That is the only conclusion that one can draw; otherwise the honourable member need not have referred to Mr. Burge and Mr. Thumm. The honourable member could have said, "One only needs to go to the Minister's property." He need not have said "adjacent to the property of Mr. Thumm and Mr. Noel Burge." Why did he say that? He said it because he wanted to imply that those people had said the Minister's property was run-down.

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** That is a complete and utter falsehood, and the honourable member knows it.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I hope the Hon. Mr. Dawkins will cease interjecting.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** It is clear from the way in which the honourable member is behaving that he has a guilty conscience. On reflection, he has decided that what he said was a bit unfair. Now, his conscience is pricking him.

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** It is a pity the honourable member did not have something sensible to say.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** The Hon. Mr. Dawkins has found himself in hot water.

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** Surely you do not think I am in hot water.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Mr. Sumner will continue his speech without interjection.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Thank you for your protection, Mr. President. It is odd the Hon. Mr. Dawkins found it necessary to sneak up to the Minister's property. He went there—

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** I have been past it many times. Why don't you get on to something else?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** The honourable member is squirming and attempting to get out of the disastrous situation he finds himself in. It was an unnecessary and unfair attack based on personal abuse.

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** That is absolute rubbish.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Before the Hon. Mr. DeGaris starts to criticise Government members, particularly the Hon. Mr. Foster, he should put his own house in order. During the Address in Reply debate in this Council and in the other place, Opposition members have developed a fascination for the word "socialism". Opposition members think that, if they repeat the word often enough, South Australians will somehow get frightened. Opposition members have been using this tactic for some years, but it has not put any fear into the hearts of South Australians. As Opposition members have used this tactic in this debate, I should like to state what the word "socialism" means.

To me, socialism is, first of all, a thoroughly democratic notion. One has only to look at the performance of the South Australian Labor Government and the Whitlam Government in connection with electoral reform. The Labor Government introduced electoral reform into this State in the face of opposition from conservative factions. The Whitlam Government attempted to introduce fair

electoral systems throughout Australia, but these were opposed by Conservative Governments in Queensland, Western Australia, and Victoria. The South Australian Government is now attempting to introduce industrial democracy in this State. The Whitlam Government attempted to bring local government more into the structure of the Australian constitutional system, when the Whitlam Government insisted that local government should be represented at the Constitution Convention. The South Australian Labor Government introduced universal franchise for local government in the face of opposition from members opposite.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** All?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** The Hon. Mr. Cameron and the Hon. Mr. Carnie were exceptions. The performance of democratic socialist Governments in Australia indicates that they are committed to the democratic system, participation, and community involvement. On the economic front, they are committed to the use of resources for the general good and to the reduction of inequalities. They are committed to providing equal access to services for all Australians.

To try to portray the Premier as a South Australian Brezhnev is obviously absurd. That absurd suggestion should be enough to make members opposite cringe. Only recently on the steps of Parliament House the Premier addressed a rally protesting against the treatment by the Soviet Union of its dissidents. Let us not hear so much of this ranting and raving by members opposite. If they got on with constructive criticism, it would be much better for all of us.

Another matter I wish to raise concerning criticism made by honourable members is that they should know what they are talking about. Certainly, Opposition members do not know what they are talking about regarding socialism, and they do not know what they are talking about in another area as well. I refer to what is understood as the republican system of government in Australia. I refer to the Hon. Mr. Dawkins' speech in this debate, when he made the following statement:

I reaffirm my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen and my continuing belief in the Westminster system of government, as opposed to republicanism.

In other words, the honourable member thinks that the Westminster system of government is a system that is incompatible with republicanism. True, I do not take issue with his reaffirming his loyalty to the Queen. He swore his oath of loyalty to the Queen and, if the honourable member wants to do so, it is reasonable enough for him to reaffirm his loyalty.

It has always seemed odd to me that in this State and country we should have a head of government, living 13 000 miles away, who visits here but rarely, while we have the trappings of colonial rule still hanging about us. The most obvious trapping is the appeals to the Privy Council. Another trapping is that some Bills passed by this Parliament must receive the assent of the head of State, who lives 13 000 miles away.

Apart from that, it seems to distort our view of the world when our head of State lives in the United Kingdom. It tends to connect us with the United Kingdom when the reality of the situation is that we are geographically and increasingly economically part of South-East Asia. Nevertheless the Queen is head of State. True, it is legitimate for the Hon. Mr. Dawkins to reaffirm his loyalty to her—

**The Hon. J. C. Burdett:** Did you reaffirm your loyalty to her?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I have affirmed my loyalty to her as head of State. Nevertheless, it seems strange that

we in Australia, and I refer to people of this generation, should be affirming our loyalty to a head of State who lives in a foreign country.

The other point raised by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins concerns his continued belief in the Westminster system of government as opposed to the republican system. Put simply, there is nothing inconsistent with the Westminster system of government and republicanism. We can operate a republican Westminster system of government merely by changing the head of State.

Having a republic does not mean that one cannot have the Westminster system of government. The two systems are perfectly compatible. Indeed, I read recently that there are constitutional moves to do away with the Queen as the head of State in Canada. Of course, it is intended to retain Canadian membership in the Commonwealth of Nations, and that position pertains in relation to many countries that have become republican.

One example of such a republic that may appeal to honourable members is the position in South Africa. That republic still retains in form, at least, a Westminster system of government although in fact it is a dictatorship. The white population, at least, has retained the Westminster system of government. There are other notions about republics being dictatorships. True, some are dictatorships. I refer to South Africa, and Argentina in South America, but there are many republics that are democracies as well, for example, Switzerland, France, Italy, West Germany, Israel, Austria, and the United States. To refute an argument in support of a republican government on the basis that it is a dictatorship or something similar is obviously absurd.

Another criticism that is used against a republican form of government is that it means a presidential form of government, such as that which exists in the United States, with an elected head of State, who is also the chief executive officer. Of course, that is not true, either. Although it is true in the United States, in other countries, such as Italy and West Germany, the position is different. As in our system, the Prime Minister is the chief executive officer and the President is the ceremonial or formal head who, in some cases, is elected directly by the people, and in other cases by Parliamentarians, as in Italy. It does not necessarily mean the presidential style of government as in the United States, which is a criticism often made of the republican form of government.

Another criticism levelled is that if a nation becomes a republic, it cannot remain within the Commonwealth of Nations. That, too, is nonsense. There are many republics in the Commonwealth: in fact, a majority of the nations in the Commonwealth of Nations presently are republics, that is, they do not recognise the Queen as their head of State: they recognise her only as the head of the Commonwealth of Nations. I do not wish to debate republicanism at length in this Chamber—

**The Hon. J. C. Burdett:** Are you a republican?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Yes. It seems necessary to refer to this matter in view of the Hon. Mr. Dawkins' obvious misconception on these matters, and perhaps the misconception of other members in this Chamber, too.

I refer to the 11 December 1976 *Age/Sydney Morning Herald* poll showing that, while 58 per cent of the people favoured the retention of the existing system, and only 39 per cent were in favour of a republic, a completely different set of ideas was held by young people. This was surprising. For people aged between 18 and 20 years, 51 per cent were in favour of the republican system and 46 per cent in favour of the Monarchy. For people between 21 and 24 years, 54 per cent were in favour of a republic and 43 per cent were in favour of the retention of the

Monarchy. Of people between the age of 25 and 34 years, 50 per cent were in favour of a republic and 47 per cent were in support of the retention of the Monarchy. Therefore, for people under the age of 34 years it seems that a majority favour a republican system.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** Have you the figure for those over 50?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I have given a balance by referring to the 58 per cent in favour of the Monarchy and only 39 per cent supporting the notion of a republic. If you want more—

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** I'll accept that.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** The overall majority was in favour of the existing system. However, regarding the figures of people under the age of 34, we may eventually face the position where this matter becomes the subject of political controversy much more so than presently exists. Obviously, the majority of those younger people, if that poll is correct, favour a republican system.

Another interesting figure concerns the number of people born in continental Europe, as opposed to the United Kingdom. Of those people polled, 67 per cent favoured the concept of a republic and only 32 per cent supported the Monarchy. That figure is significant, especially as in Australia there would be between 20 per cent and 25 per cent of the population who are of non-Anglo-Saxon origin and who have never owed traditional allegiance to the Queen of England.

It seems to be odd that we, as a nation in South-East Asia, 13 000 miles from the United Kingdom, should recognise as the head of our country the Monarch or head of State of the United Kingdom. I am not surprised that the figures for these Continental people should be so heavily in favour of republican government.

The next matter to which I refer is the Constitutional Convention, the fourth session of which was held in Perth last week. There has been much criticism surrounding that session because of the slow progress made. Progress has been slow over the whole period of the existence of the convention but, despite that, some significant reforms have taken place. One of those was the referendum last year when the retiring age of High Court judges was set at 70 years and a system for filling Senate vacancies was written into the Constitution, despite the fact that in 1975 that question had been a matter of deep concern and often bitter controversy in the Australian community.

There was general agreement at the session of the convention held in Hobart in 1976 about simultaneous elections for the House of Representatives and the Senate. That agreement was not ratified at the referendum, but the margin by which it failed was small. There also has been general agreement about the removal of many obsolete provisions from the Constitution and about the interchange of powers clause being included. That has been reaffirmed since the first session of the convention, which was held in Sydney in 1973.

At the Perth session, the question of advisory opinions from the High Court was agreed to in principle and was referred to a committee for discussion. The question of what conventions surround our Constitution also was referred to a committee for further discussion. Those decisions indicate that, whilst progress has been slow, some advance has been made. There seem to me to be two factors that tend to slow down progress, and that is understandable.

The first of these is the division between Parties and the different ideologies of Parties. That was exemplified markedly by the debate on the Supply questions at the Perth session. Some people said that the item should not have been placed on the agenda, because it was a matter of

much controversy. However, it would seem odd to me if the convention did not consider the most serious constitutional crisis in our history in relation to the Houses of Parliament and the Governor-General. The debate in Perth occupied a whole day and many people thought there was no point in having the debate. I suppose there is some legitimacy in that opinion, but to have ignored the matter would have been to ignore the reality that the Senate did block Supply and that there was a constitutional crisis surrounding it.

I feel that we will be debating that issue again, not at the next session of the convention but perhaps in the next 20 or 30 years, because I am convinced that, to survive as a nation into the next century, there must be an end to the power of a hostile Senate to throw the Government out of office whenever it wants to do so.

**The Hon. J. C. Burdett:** Do you believe that there should be a Senate at all?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Yes. I am not debating that.

**The Hon. J. C. Burdett:** You do believe that there should be a Senate?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I have put my views previously. I am not opposed to the existence of the Senate at present. Perhaps in 20 or 30 years time a hostile Labor majority in the Senate will throw out a Liberal and Country Party Government in the Lower House, and that is when we will get some action. Members opposite will complain about that.

**The Hon. J. C. Burdett:** Not at all.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I hope the honourable member is around when it happens. If he is, we will see his reaction and that of his colleagues. They will see what a farcical and unstable situation can be produced, and then we will get change. I feel that, in the long run, the decision made in Perth will be changed.

The other fact that runs through the convention is the issue of States rights. It permeates every topic. One of the most obvious examples occurred in Hobart, when the Queensland Liberal Party and National Party delegates voted against the proposal that citizens of territories should be able to a vote in referendums to change the Constitution. Not all Liberal members at the convention took that view. I must say, as someone who tries to see Australia as a nation, that I find the attitude extraordinary. The attitude taken by the Queensland delegate seems absurd and against Australia as a nation.

That is the extreme example on States rights, but there are other examples and they cross Party lines. At one stage in the session in Perth, Mr. Ellicott, a former Attorney-General in the Federal Liberal Government and now Minister for Home Affairs, said that he felt that the Federation was a compact between the people of Australia, not between the States. He was castigated for that by certain Liberal Party and Country Party politicians.

While the A.L.P. is often portrayed by members opposite as being a terribly centralist Party, the States rights issue is also raised through some of the Labor delegates. One can refer to the Premier of Tasmania (Mr. Lowe), who tried to reach a compromise on the question of the blocking of Supply. Instead of accepting Sir Charles Court's proposition, which was that the Senate had the right to block Supply but that there should be an automatic election if that blocking continued for more than 30 days, Mr. Lowe suggested that as a compromise the Senate should have the right to block Supply, but that the Government in the Lower House would only have to go to an election if the Prime Minister agreed that there should be an election immediately, or alternatively at the end of the financial year in which Supply was blocked.

Of course, most Labor delegates did not agree to that decision. Mr. Lowe was to some extent putting a position based on States rights. His position in Tasmania was somewhat mirrored in Western Australia by Labor members. This subject permeates almost every discussion at the convention and tends to shift and change across Party lines, as I have indicated in the examples. I feel there is far too much emphasis on States rights at the Constitutional Convention. If we are to get anywhere with constitutional reform, we must look at Australia as a nation and not in the narrow parochial fashion of individual States. I agree with Mr. Ellicott on that matter, even though many of his Liberal colleagues do not agree with him.

**The Hon. J. C. Burdett:** A centralist stand instead of States rights?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** No, that is misrepresentation of the alternatives. I do not think the alternatives are between a centralist stand and a States rights stand, but I believe that too much emphasis is placed on States rights to the detriment of looking at Australia as a nation and looking at Australia in the next 30 to 40 years, when we must start thinking as a nation, and not look at ourselves as a collection of States engrossed in parochial attitudes and policies, as tends to happen now, as is manifested at the Constitutional Convention.

**The Hon. J. C. Burdett:** I agree, but don't you think that some at the convention placed too much emphasis on centralism?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I have not seen any really obnoxious centralist proposals put at the Constitutional Convention. The Hon. Mr. Burdett may be able to refer me to some, but it seems to me that most of the so-called centralist propositions put at the conference were really sensible means of rationalising our governmental system. The Hon. Mr. Burdett may be able to refer me to some matters that I can reply to sensibly.

While there may be some people who put a strong centralist line, most people accept the federal nature of the government system in Australia, but take the view that we should not get involved in a States rights sort of argument to the detriment of taking a national overall view. These two aspects—the Party divisions and the States rights—could well continue to run through the debates at the convention, but I still feel that, although progress is slow, the convention ought to continue. It is a review that will take some time.

Of course, the Constitution was formulated in the 1890's. There have been enormous changes in the world and in Australia since then, particularly of a technological and economic nature. For us to be able to cope with these changes, I believe we need a Constitution more adapted to modern times. The energy crisis and the problems in national economies, not just in Australia but in the world, mean that we must have a policy not based on parochialism or an outmoded Constitution.

I make two suggestions about the running of the Constitutional Convention: first, it should sit longer. It is unfortunate that the conventions have lasted only 2½ days on the last two or three occasions. There is expense involved in getting people to the convention and once they are there we ought to make it worth while and sit through until the agenda is completed. Secondly, the participation of the Prime Minister or Premiers is not absolutely essential for the success of the convention. I certainly feel that the support Mr. Whitlam gave initially, and the support Mr. Fraser and the Premiers have given, has been important, but I am sure that the Prime Minister and Premiers have a considerable amount of work to do at their desks. I know many of them feel it is a waste of time

listening to repetitive speeches, as they had to do during the Supply debate at the recent convention.

There is no doubt delegates from the States and Commonwealth could be led by another Minister, and other delegates from Parliaments could contribute to the debate. Perhaps the Prime Minister and Premiers could attend on the day or two that they now attend for the opening, to ensure that the convention is given the status it deserves. However, I feel that if we sit longer there is no need for the Premiers or the Prime Minister to be there all the time. Two-and-a-half days, with half a day taken up with administrative matters, leaving only two days to debate issues, is too short. If we are to make progress and have matters referred to specialist committees when we meet, we need to go through the whole agenda.

Finally another theme that has run through the Address in Reply debate in this Council and the other place is the Opposition's criticism of the State Government in its handling of the economy, and particularly its criticism of the State Government for blaming the Federal Government for what is happening. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins said that we should not blame the Federal Government, that we should put our own house in order. That would be all very well if we were on our own and the only Government that was complaining about the Federal Government and the cut-backs, but we are not. I refer to the *Advertiser* of 23 June this year, which reported as follows on the Premiers' Conference:

The six State Premiers sat in stunned silence as the Treasurer, Mr. Howard, detailed cuts for the community health programme, the school dental scheme, growth centres, water resource projects, urban public transport, the national railway network and children's services programme.

Welfare housing is hardest hit. It will be cut by \$70 000 000—from \$400 000 000 to \$330 000 000. Mr. Howard bluntly told the Premiers it was time they bore their share of restraint in Government spending.

When Mr. Howard ended his summary the Premiers remained silent for almost two minutes before the New South Wales Premier, Mr. Wran, said: "I think we had better adjourn on this." Angry and disappointed, they emerged from the conference room warning of big jumps in unemployment, huge cuts in State programmes and a further slump in the building industry.

The South Australian Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said: "This is the worst experience that I have ever had as Premier of something crazy coming out of Canberra. It's back to the stone age."

He agreed with the Queensland Premier, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, that Mr. Fraser would be forced to recall the Premiers to Canberra.

"I think Mr. Fraser doesn't realise what a whirlwind he is going to reap at the grass-roots level, as a result of this kind of policy," Mr. Dunstan said.

Mr. Bjelke-Petersen said: "As the potholes get bigger, the hospital beds get fewer, the schools get more dilapidated and the trains stop running, I'll refer all inquiries to the local friendly Federal member."

He said his Government would cut back in all sectors and blame the Federal Government.

The Western Australian Premier, Sir Charles Court, said: "I cannot recall any capital works programme offered to Premiers that would be as bad as this one."

"You would have to go back to the Depression period. It will be disastrous for the building industry."

The Victorian Premier, Mr. Hamer, said the cuts were extremely severe—more severe than any of the States had expected.

So, the States were unanimous in criticising the Federal Government. Is Dr. Tonkin saying that, if he had been

Premier, he would have praised Mr. Fraser? The Opposition has continued to castigate the State Government because the State Government has criticised the Federal Government concerning financial allocations.

**The Hon. J. C. Burdett:** It is because you blame everything on the Federal Government.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Every State Premier has made the same kind of criticism as we have made. Most of our economic difficulties result from economic policies currently being pursued at the Federal level. If there had been greater allocations to the States, the States would have been able to put more money into public works, thereby creating more employment. If Dr. Tonkin had gone to Canberra as Premier, would he have happily accepted the handouts? Of course not. He would have been as trenchant in his criticisms as were the other Premiers. The national Government must act to improve the national economy. What the State Government can do is very limited. The South Australian Government tried to keep unemployment low with its unemployment relief scheme, but we could not counteract the Federal Government's policies of deliberately creating unemployment to reduce inflation. The State Budget is \$1.2 billion or \$1.3 billion, which is less than half the Federal Government's \$3 billion deficit. This shows how limited are the State's resources and how limited is our scope for action in trying to do something about the economy. So, the State Government's criticisms of the Federal Government are justified. It is not good enough for Opposition members to criticise the Premier following his justified attacks on the Federal Government. I support the motion.

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health):** I, too, support the motion. I express my personal sympathy and condolences to the family of the late Hon. Frank Potter, who served this Council for 19 years. He was President from 5 August 1975 to 26 February 1978. He gave valiant service to the State. Members opposite have complained because some Government members have not reaffirmed their allegiance to the Queen. I do not feel it necessary to reaffirm allegiance to the Queen. Because members opposite have to bolster their waning views, they have to keep repeating their allegiance to the Queen. By way of contrast, I paid my allegiance to the Queen when I came into this place, and I have not wavered. I thank honourable members for the points they have raised in this debate. Some members rightly congratulated the Government on its achievements.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** What achievements?

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** The honourable member knows how things have improved in connection with my portfolio. He was in Government when Glenside was in a hell of a mess. He was in Government when nothing had been done at Northfield for 40 years, yet he asks: what has this Government done? This Government has provided great benefits in many areas of need. The Hon. Mr. Hill knows about the disgraceful state that schools and hospitals were in before we came to power. He knows that we had to pour millions of dollars into upgrading schools and hospitals, yet he does not utter one word of praise. The Prime Minister has said that life was not meant to be easy, and he is certainly ensuring that life is not easy. There is not one word of condemnation of the Federal Government from members opposite, not a word about how it is on the wrong track.

Not all Australians have been as fortunate as Mr. Fraser, to inherit a well-developed property and an abundance of wealth. In an interview with his biographer, the Prime Minister's sister recalled the Depression years

when, as a little girl, she would be driven in the family limousine by the chauffeur to hand out milk-arrowroot biscuits to the men in the food lines.

True, things were not meant to be easy, but they were all right for Mr. Fraser. While life is not meant to be easy for the man in the street, Mr. Fraser is travelling around the country costing the taxpayers of Australia \$65 000 for a six-day trip. That is about \$10 000 a day to run around the countryside, while at the same time urging everyone else to cut back on expenses.

In addition, he has the theory that it is cheaper by the dozen, and he is merely buying two jet aircraft instead of one! True, life is not meant to be easy, but the taxpayer will foot these costs at the mere whim of the Prime Minister. In his speech, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris claimed that the Premier's popularity had fallen. The men most worried about their popularity should be the Leader of the Opposition and the present Prime Minister. Indeed, it was interesting to read in yesterday's paper of the increase in popularity of the Leader of the Opposition in Canberra so that it now exceeds the popularity of Mr. Fraser.

Regarding any popularity contest between Mr. Dunstan and the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Dunstan received 53 per cent of the vote, yet Mr. Tonkin received only 23 per cent. Whose popularity is waning? Further, it was interesting to note that the result of the Morgan Gallup poll was printed only in an early edition of yesterday's *News*. It was promptly taken out by the time the later edition was printed. A report on that poll was not contained in this morning's *Advertiser*, either, yet that newspaper claims to be so responsible. Certainly, if there had been a drop in Mr. Dunstan's popularity it would have been splashed across the front page.

Conversely, one reference of disapproval regarding Mr. Fraser and we hear no more about it, yet that newspaper claims it is responsible in its reporting. It was not responsible yesterday, either. I received a telephone call from a reporter concerning a matter connected with my portfolio. I set out the details clearly for the reporter. He understood them clearly, yet half an hour later he rang back saying that his editor did not want that type of answer, so he did not print the answer that I had provided.

That newspaper came out with a heading saying that Banfield said something else. Yet I did not say something else. Clearly, it did not matter what I said, because the editor changed it. He did not like the information given to the reporter. Is this the sort of responsibility that this newspaper brags about? The press believes that it should be left alone, that there should not be any control, yet this is the sort of practice indulged in.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** Which newspaper was it?

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** It was the *Advertiser*, and it was the *News* that withdrew the report containing the popularity poll from its second edition.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** No-one read it.

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** Of course not, because it was taken out. With the existing price of the *News* there is no way that the public can afford to buy both editions, so they save up for the last edition. The *News*, which is already running a campaign of revolt against taxation, has increased its price by 16½ per cent at the same time as running this campaign.

**The Hon. F. T. Blevins:** The *News* really is revolting.

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** Of course it is. An earlier increase in the price of the *News* on 27 June 1977, when coupled with this latest increase, was an increase in just over 12 months of 36 per cent. Yet, that newspaper has the hide to tell the Australian people to revolt against taxation.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** What about the water rates?

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** The honourable member is concerned about water rates. Is he concerned about the charges levied by the Government? Let the honourable member say so.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** You're concerned about the paper increasing in price, yet you're increasing your taxes all the time.

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** I am concerned about the hypocrisy of the newspaper people in this State when they increased the price of their newspaper by 36 per cent in less than 18 months, while at the same time having the audacity to seek to lead the people in revolt against taxation. The newspapers are the first to complain when services are cut, and they are the first to complain when members of Parliament obtain any increase in salary. Their prices increase, and they do not have to refer an application for price increase—

**The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw:** What about the Prices Commissioner?

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** The newspapers are not under price control, and the honourable member knows that. Perhaps he agrees with the sort of thinking that goes on. I suppose that, if he agrees with what the *News* is doing, and by his interjection I assume that he does, he has already signed the warning to politicians printed in the *News* as follows:

WARNING TO POLITICIANS

TO ALL POLITICIANS!

Slash my taxes and reduce Government spending. If you don't I'll vote against you when you come up for re-election.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

..... Postcode.....

Tax Revolt,

Now mail your coupon to: Box 318,

GPO, Adelaide, 5001

Judging from his attitude, his was probably the first coupon received. I can understand why people want to vote against the Federal Government at the next election, but I am not happy about the hypocritical manner in which a newspaper can do this sort of thing, while at the same time increasing the price of its own newspaper.

Earlier this afternoon the Hon. Mr. Carnie referred to members from this side giving out personal abuse. In his criticism he stated that he did not believe in members expressing such personal abuse to one another, yet he promptly went on for the following five minutes abusing us and making statements involving personal abuse about members from this side of the Council. Again, we have the greatest of hypocrisy.

The Hon. Mr. Sumner pointed out this afternoon the personal attacks that had been made on members from this side of the Council by members opposite, yet the Hon. Mr. Carnie and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris had complained about personal attacks stemming from this side. However, they did exactly the same thing during the course of their speeches.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins, too, has come in for much criticism, and rightly so, for the things that he said in the debate. The honourable member did not like it this afternoon when the comments got under his skin, when he was told the truth. He then tried to drown the speakers by way of interjection, but he could not get away from the truth.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins also claimed credit for increased allocations for local government from \$80 000 000 to \$140 000 000. That local government receives anything at all can be attributed directly to the former Labor Government. The Liberal Party was in office for 20 years without doing anything for local government, yet now the

Hon. Mr. Dawkins wants the Liberal Party to take the credit for the recognition of local government.

Mr. Whitlam was the first Prime Minister in our history to recognise local government's full role as a third tier of government in Australia. The Fraser Government can take no credit for this whatever. It is merely continuing the work established by the Labor Government. At the same time, Mr. Fraser has forced every State in Australia to go to the unnecessary expense of taxing its own Grants Commission to distribute that money.

This was formerly the task of the one Grants Commission in Canberra. The States now have to spend money from the Grants Commission that would otherwise flow direct to local government. Regarding the 2 per cent of income tax revenue promised by the Fraser Government, we can only hope that it will materialise. That Government has shown no great hurry about this, any more than it has shown any great hurry to carry out the promises it gave to the people at the election.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** Local government will get its 2 per cent.

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** Of course it will: but when?

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** During the present Government's term, as was promised.

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** Let us see what the record of the present Government's promises to the electorate is. The Federal Government promised in its election speech that there would be no change in the Medibank system. It had previously opposed a levy for Medibank. It promised that there would be no change when it came into Government, but it was not there long before it imposed a Medibank levy. So much for one of Fraser's promises! It also promised a reduction in unemployment, whereas the Opposition knows that unemployment has jumped by nearly 50 per cent. Another one of Fraser's promises! So, can local government rely on promises given by the Fraser Government? Of course it cannot.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** It has jumped 115 per cent in this State over the same period.

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** It does not matter what the position was. It was during the term of the Commonwealth Labor Government that Fraser made these promises, and he has not done anything about them. He has imposed a Medibank levy, and has increased the number of unemployed, contrary to his promises. He also promised to reduce the deficit, but what do we find? Even that is 50 per cent higher than was his own estimate of what it would be. The Hon. Mr. Hill has the hide to say that we can rely on the Fraser Government's promises. The Fraser Government promised that there would not be cut-backs in Government expenditure. The people affected by the cut-backs are those who can least afford it. His areas of cut-back are in health, education, and welfare—the very people who need the support from the Federal Government. While it is cutting back on expenditure in the areas of need, where is it spending money? Thousands and thousands of dollars have been spent on overseas trips for Fraser, who claimed that he was not going to be a tourist Prime Minister.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** Of course Whitlam wasn't!

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** I am talking about Fraser's promises and where the cuts will take place. Regarding cutting back on expenditure, Fraser finds it necessary to buy two personal jets for his own use. Does the Hon. Mr. Hill approve of things such as this? He never once criticised it.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** They're not for his own use.

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** They are for his own

personal and private use. One is to be used so that his wife can attend parties in Melbourne, and the other is for her husband to jet off to Brisbane to try to square off with Bjelke-Petersen, who will not have a bar of him. Thus, he must have the two planes. Fraser might well attempt to back down on agreements made between State Governments and himself. The Fraser Government has even refused to pay country hospital accounts for Aborigines in accordance with an agreement reached between the Aboriginal community and the Commonwealth, whereby the Government would meet their expenses while in hospital. The Aborigines have suffered as a result of the Fraser Government's renegeing on an undertaking previously given, and there has not been one word of condemnation by this Opposition. Things were much different when Mr. Whitlam was in Government, yet day after day the Opposition accused that Government of over-expenditure.

Yesterday, the Hon. Mrs. Cooper said, "Don't blame the Federal Government." The Hon. Mr. Dawkins said, "We must stand on our own two feet," contrary to expectations built up over the years and to the taxation agreements that have been made. Never mind about getting money from the Federal Government—reduce taxation, and continue to provide the necessary services in this State! The Hon. Mr. Hill yesterday criticised me for keeping idle five wards at the Flinders Medical Centre. I could not open them because of the lack of money resulting from a dishonoured agreement by the Federal Government, but he blames us for it. I heard no condemnation when the announcement was made that the Federal Government intended to ensure that the States cut back by 5 per cent the bed occupancy rate. What are we to do? If we have reached the bed occupancy rate by about March, we have to say to patients from March on, "You cannot come into this hospital, because we have reached our quota as set by the Federal Government." That is the sort of position the Federal Government is trying to bring about in this State.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** You should reallocate some of that \$560 000 000.

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** We were working under an agreement between the Commonwealth and the State for hospital buildings, but what do we find? Two years ago, we received \$13 000 000 from the Federal Government, and we were assured that that rate would continue. The following year, that rate was cut to \$5 000 000 for hospital buildings, despite the assurance given by the Fraser Government. What is happening this year? We are not getting a brass razoo from the Federal Government for hospital buildings. The Hon. Mr. Hill has the audacity to ask whether we would be spending our \$16 000 000 last year so that we could qualify for the miserable \$5 000 000 that would be given by the Commonwealth Government.

Although they cut us back by \$8 000 000, the Hon. Mr. Hill says, "Spend your money, it doesn't matter what the Federals don't give you." That is the way he would run this country. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins suggested we should put more money into the Stuart Highway and not complete the South-Eastern Freeway. That is the Opposition's philosophy: half a dozen unfinished projects! The Hon. Mr. Carnie said that Opposition members did not have to toe the Party line. How often do we find Opposition members voting *en bloc*, with a 10-all result, and you, Sir, nine times out of ten supporting their view by casting your vote in their favour?

We read in the paper recently, and it has not been denied in this place or in the other place, that Opposition members cannot ask a question without getting Ross Story's permission. Today, we see he dropped the same

story in both Houses. Yesterday, Mr. Tonkin raised the question of costs at the Frozen Food Factory, and today the Hon. Martin Cameron made the same speech here. The Hon. Mr. Cameron put it over without a blush. We know that Ross Story is under pressure: so he should be. He has to police the people opposite and has an almost impossible task.

I remind members that there was a unanimous decision by the committee to set up the Frozen Food Factory, and that committee included the Hon. Gordon Gilfillan, Mr. Wardle, and Mr. Bill McAnaney.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** Wasn't it the costs that were being condemned?

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** You have no communication between your Party, any more than you had communication between Ministers in this place and another place when you were in Government. If the Hon. Mr. Hill had read *Hansard* or seen his Leader on television last evening, he would realise that Mr. Tonkin complained about the Government's taking on this project when private enterprise could have done it.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** He spoke well.

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** Of course he spoke very well, because the Liberal Party has spent practically the same amount on Mr. Tonkin as it had spent on grooming Steele Hall: it spent \$250 000 trying to groom Steele Hall to become Premier. The Hon. Mr. Hill said that it was unreasonable to place so much emphasis on the national economy as the reason for the difficulties besetting this State, and said that the Government itself must accept a large share of the blame.

The Government places the emphasis on the national economy, because that is where the problem lies. Those are not our words; they are the words of Mr. Hamer (the Liberal Premier of Victoria), Sir Charles Court (the Liberal Premier of Western Australia), and Mr. Bjelke-Petersen (the Country Party Premier of Queensland). Bjelke-Petersen says, "Don't blame us. Write to your friendly Federal member."

**The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw:** Members of the other place have gone home.

**The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD:** I would have finished my speech before now if members opposite had not raved on so much. Members opposite do not want to hear the facts, because they will have to squirm as much as the Hon. Mr. Hill, the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, and the Hon. Mr. Carnie squirmed earlier this afternoon. The Hon. Mr. Cameron would not even stay to hear my reply. He was not game to take any more. The effect of the Federal Government's policies on health, education, and welfare will be felt from the cradle to the grave. The Federal Government has cut back on assistance for the school dental programme. It was a Federal programme; it was not our programme. We were distributing services for the school dental programme on behalf of the Federal Government. In connection with training, at the beginning it was funded by the Federal Government on the basis of 100 per cent capital and 100 per cent recurrent. In connection with field service, Federal funding was 100 per cent capital and 75 per cent recurrent.

In 1976, it did not take the Federal Government long to start cutting back. In that year the Federal Liberal Government cut back Federal capital funding to 90 per cent, making the States find 10 per cent. The same thing happened in connection with the training of therapists. Then, the scale was further cut before it was approved. In July 1977 the Federal Government reduced its capital funding to 75 per cent, making the States find 25 per cent, while recurrent Federal funding was changed to a 50/50 basis. There was no discussion with the States about this

matter, yet members opposite say that we should not complain about the Federal Government.

This year alone, the cost to the State as a result of the Federal funding cutback will cost this State, on the school dental programme, \$370 000. Members opposite can complain, but what is the position regarding the community health programme? The Commonwealth contribution to operating payments has been reduced from 75 per cent to 50 per cent. The Hon. Mr. Hill agrees with that, because he is nodding his head. That cutback will cost the State an extra \$1 960 000, which will have to be found from State revenue.

What is the position regarding the domiciliary care programme? The Commonwealth contribution under the States' grants home care arrangement has been reduced from 66½ per cent to 50 per cent and that will cost the State a further \$335 000 a year. Members opposite are pleased about that.

I have indicated, in relation to the hospital development programme, that in 1976-77 we received \$13 000 000, whereas in 1977-78 we received \$5 100 000. That sum has now been cut down to nil, and that will cost this State an extra \$5 000 000 above what happened last year.

Regarding welfare services (and members opposite do not want to listen), they are being cut to the quick. The shadow Minister of Health, who has not said one word in condemnation of the cutbacks by the Federal Government, has shown no concern for the health and welfare of South Australians. Regarding welfare officers, the Commonwealth contribution towards their employment by local government under the States' grants home care arrangement has been reduced from 75 per cent to 50 per cent. In 1978-79 this will cost local government in South Australia \$16 000, yet the Hon. Mr. Dawkins had the hide to forget that that charge has been put on to local government as a result of the cutbacks.

The only redeeming thing that came out of speeches from members opposite this time was what the Hon. Mr. DeGaris omitted. For years since I have been here he has talked about democracy, how everyone should be equal and how the Constitution should be altered. He has been unable to convince anyone in that regard. When I first came into this Chamber I was told by a leading member of the Liberal Party, "You're lucky that you have Central No. 1 District". I said, "How's that?" He said, "We're not prepared to stand candidates in that area, just in case we win. Wouldn't it look a farce if we were all Liberals in here!" At that time the Liberals had 16 members and Labor had four. Members opposite were not game to put candidates in the field in that seat.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris talks about democracy and how we should have one vote one value; he talks about how things have changed, yet he was in Government and did nothing about changing the voting system. The Opposition even opposed the right of spouses to have a vote. They even opposed there being one roll for elections for this Council. Members opposite talk about democracy and the right of people to elect members to the Council, but that is just so much baloney. As I have another function to go to that will be a darned sight better than putting up with what is happening here, I will conclude. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

**The PRESIDENT:** I have to inform the Council that His Excellency the Governor has appointed Tuesday next, 8 August at 2.30 p.m., as the time for presentation of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.31 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 8 August at 2.15 p.m.