

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 31 July 1979

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

NEW MEMBER

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS, to whom the Oath of Allegiance was administered by the President, took his seat in the Council in place of the Hon. Jessie Cooper (retired).

JOINT SITTING

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the minutes of proceedings of the assembly of members of both Houses for choosing a member to replace the Hon. Jessie Cooper.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Automatic Data Processing Centre, Wakefield Street,
Largs Bay Primary School Redevelopment,
Mount Barker High School Redevelopment,
Mount Barker South Primary School—Stage I,
Reynella East High School,
Willunga High School Redevelopment—Stages I and II.

COUNCIL MEMBERS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to congratulate the Hon. Mr. Sumner on his elevation to the position of Leader of the Government in the Council and the Hon. Mr. Cornwall on his elevation as a Minister in this Council. I assure them both of the ready co-operation of the Liberal Party on all matters concerned with legislation in this Chamber and wish them well as new Ministers of the South Australian Parliament.

Also, I extend a welcome to the Hon. Legh Davis, who has just come into this Council as the member replacing the Hon. Jessie Cooper. I wish him well in his service to this State as a member of Parliament.

Finally, I pay a tribute to the work of Tom Casey and Don Banfield, whom I must now look much further to see. I must admit that the view has improved, but whether that applies to intellectual capacity remains to be seen.

QUESTIONS

ROXBY DOWNS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking a question of the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy:

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In the weekend press I noticed a statement about the investment by British Petroleum in a mining venture in South Australia. There is much confusion in this Parliament and throughout South Australia about the Government's real policy on the development of Roxby Downs. Therefore, will the Minister take up this matter with his colleague in another place and make a clear statement to the Council about the Government's policy on the future of Roxby Downs and the development of that area?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I will obtain the information for the Leader. On behalf of myself and the Hon. Mr. Cornwall, I thank him for his congratulations. Congratulations were extended on behalf of the Opposition in the May sitting, and I said then most of the things that I wanted to say. However, I would like to add my words to those of the Leader of the Opposition in welcoming the Hon. Mr. Davis to this Council and hope that he enjoys his stay amongst us.

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking a question of the Minister of Environment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There have been reports of an unusually high number of resignations from the Environment Department. There have also been reports that morale in the department is not as high as it should be and that some existing staff members are contemplating resigning. Also, some time ago the Minister announced a special police investigation into problems associated with trafficking in and trapping protected birds. That inquiry was initiated, as I recall, by disclosures made by a Mr. Field in the southern suburbs.

At that time there were press statements to the effect that departmental morale was adversely affected as a result of that inquiry that the Minister had announced. In view of that situation, will the Minister tell the Council whether it is true that there has been an unusually high number of resignations in his department and, to the best of his knowledge, whether some officers are still contemplating resignation? Further, will he say what is the present state of the inquiry which he announced and to which I have just referred?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I am not aware of these mass resignations that the honourable member refers to. In fact, there were some minor changes within the department and, as the Council would be well aware, the previous permanent head did resign prior to my appointment to go back into the private sector. The so-called many resignations to which the honourable member refers is obviously a figment of his fertile imagination. As far as morale is concerned, I am pleased to inform the honourable member that it is high at the moment and rising all the time. That has been due to many things, not the least of which is the appointment of a new Minister of considerable capabilities and certainly the appointment of the new permanent head, who is an outstanding figure in the environment scene in not only Australia but the world. He has few peers in this country and stands high amongst his peers overseas in those activities in which he is actively involved.

As to how many people may be contemplating resignation, I am not a mind-reader and am therefore unable to comment, but again that may well be a figment of the honourable member's imagination. I have had some discussions with the Police Commissioner on the progress of the inquiry being undertaken. However, it would be quite inappropriate and quite wrong for me to reveal these matters at this time, and I am sure the honourable member will appreciate that.

CAVAN BRIDGE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to ask a question of the Minister representing the Minister of

Transport regarding the Cavan bridge.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On 31 May last I asked the Leader of the Government in this Chamber a question about the progress of construction on the dual Cavan bridge and also about the Two Wells-Virginia by-pass. Has the Minister a reply to that question?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I took up this matter with the Minister of Transport, and he has informed me that the Cavan rail over-pass structures and associated roadwork to the Salisbury Highway junction should be completed in December 1979. Subject to funds being available, the Virginia-Two Wells by-pass should be completed by the end of 1982.

ABORIGINAL VOTING RIGHTS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Lands, representing the Chief Secretary, a question about voting rights for Aborigines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The most recent edition of the newsletter from the South Australian Campaign Against Racial Exploitation contains considerable material regarding attempts being made in some parts of Australia to prevent Aborigines from having or exercising the right to vote. Part of the report states:

At present, Aborigines are in a special situation with respect to voting rights. They are not required to enrol and they therefore are not required to vote. We believe that it has suited successive Governments to leave Aborigines without the vote, and thus render them powerless in political terms.

This situation has been seized upon by the Governments of the Northern Territory and Western Australia, who have drawn up legislation which, while purporting to prevent manipulation of Aborigines, in fact seeks to make access to voting rights more restrictive. We see this further erosion of the democratic rights of Aborigines as part and parcel of the promotion of mineral interests in the areas where many Aborigines live. This state of affairs has also been used in States such as Queensland and South Australia to prevent responsible people such as field officers of the Aboriginal Legal Service and workers with the trachoma team in Queensland from educating Aborigines about their right to vote.

I was indeed disturbed to see this reference to such practices occurring in South Australia. However, I realise that, if attempts have been made to prevent field officers with the Aboriginal Legal Service educating Aborigines about their right to vote, this would be not a State matter but a Commonwealth one, as the Aboriginal Legal Service is financed not by the State Government but by the Federal Government. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Chief Secretary to reassure members that no officers of the South Australian Government are in any way trying to prevent Aborigines from learning about their rights to register and vote in elections?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Chief Secretary and bring back a reply.

HOSPITAL RATIONALISATION

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I noticed in a press report that the Minister of Health said that he was planning to rationalise hospitals, particularly rural hospitals, in this State. Will the Minister of Agriculture ask his colleague, if

this report is correct, to explain the reasons behind any proposal to rationalise hospitals?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Health and bring back a reply.

SPORTS MASSEURS

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Community Development, a question regarding sports masseurs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: During a trip to Eastern and Western Europe last year as Minister of Recreation and Sport, I was fortunate enough to have discussions with a professor Dr. Ludwig Prokop, who is a world authority on sports massage in Western Europe. We in Australia have over the years been blessed with first-quality masseurs, particularly in relation to football and many other sporting clubs. Unfortunately, however, the qualifications of these people have over the years more or less drifted into obscurity. It would be in the interests of the sporting fraternity not only in South Australia but throughout Australia if courses were established so that the training of masseurs employed by sporting organisations could be enhanced. I ask the question because I have in the past two weeks been approached by young people who wish to train as qualified masseurs. Will the Minister of Agriculture convey my question to his colleague to see whether more masseurs could not be trained through the Recreation and Sport Department, as this is an important adjunct to the welfare of this State's sporting fraternity?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport and bring down a reply.

DEPUTY CORONER

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Attorney-General on the appointment of a full-time Deputy Coroner.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I understand that, because of the heavy burden of work placed on the Coroner, Mr. K. B. Ahern it is not possible for him to inquire into all accidental deaths, including road deaths, contrary to what was intended when the new Coroner's Act was introduced in 1975. I take this opportunity to pay a tribute to Mr. Ahern who, in my opinion, is carrying out his duties very well indeed. I believe that the Government is considering the appointment of a full-time Deputy Coroner, which appointment would appear to be catered for without amendment to the present Act. I realise that at present there is a need to restrict expenditure in this State, but there is no point in having coronial inquiries unless the whole job can be done. Is the Government considering appointing a full-time Deputy Coroner or providing other assistance for Mr. Ahern? If not, why not, and if so, when may such an appointment be made?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: This matter is not under active consideration at the moment. The Coroner put a number of matters to me some time ago, and they are now under consideration. I will certainly bear in mind what the honourable member has said, and I will discuss the matter with the Coroner. If there is a need, then obviously the

Government will try to do something to overcome the problems which exist.

UNDER-AGE DRINKING

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to ask a question of the Attorney-General regarding under-age drinking.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I have become aware, on more than one occasion, of the concern of the police and parents about the prevalence of children under 18 years of age drinking alcohol. From investigations I have made I have become well acquainted with this problem. It appears that young people have parties in their homes and that, in order for a guest to gain admittance to these parties, he must have a dozen containers of beer. These children, some of them only 14 or 15 years of age, make their purchases at drive-in bottle departments. The police question them, take their names and put them before a juvenile aid panel. Some hotels (I will disclose their names, if asked) employ bouncers. The children concerned take great delight in getting past these bouncers, believing that if they do get past them they have a licence to drink. The police then see the young people drinking and report them. A constituent of mine was concerned that those children then have to appear before a juvenile aid panel. As recently as last Wednesday I was present at the Campbelltown Community Welfare Centre, where I sat in on a juvenile aid panel. The panel expert was well respected in the community, and I heard him tell the child in question that he did not consider the offence very serious, but that he had to talk to him. He told him that he should not drink, but should drink at home if he wanted to. In fact, he encouraged the child to drink in the home, rather than going out and underhandedly buying liquor or drinking in hotels.

A Sergeant Walsh was present, and I asked what action the police were taking in respect of 16-year-olds purchasing alcohol at drive-in bottle shops and drinking in bars. I said, "Don't you do anything about the root cause, namely, the people selling liquor—the hotels? What are you doing about them? Do you arrest them, or challenge their licence?" He replied, "We do not do that." Will the Attorney-General investigate this matter and ascertain how many offenders, namely, the sellers of alcohol to juveniles have been charged with the offence of serving alcohol to children under the age of 18 years?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I do not know whether one can obtain in specific terms the information the honourable member requires. He has made certain allegations, some of which clearly come within the responsibility of the Police Department, which is the responsibility of the Chief Secretary. I will arrange for the problems he has brought to the attention of the Chamber to be assessed, where appropriate, by my department and, where appropriate, to be referred to the Chief Secretary, and bring down a report for him. If the honourable member has any specific instances of problems with under-age drinking, or with police policy with respect to it, I would appreciate it if he could advise me privately of those specific problems, and I will also refer them to the police.

GREENACRES LAND

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: The State Transport Authority owns an area of land bordered by Mullers and Floriedale Roads, Greenacres. I approached the Minister of Transport on behalf of the Assemblies of God Church, Klemzig, concerning the use of the land, and the reply was as follows:

Investigations into the possible use of this land by the Government have not yet been completed, and I regret that I am still not in a position to give a firm answer on your request. I will do so as soon as a final decision has been made.

The letter is dated 11 September 1978. I ask the Minister several questions concerning this land: first, whether the investigations into its use have now been completed and, if they have, what is its intended use? Secondly, is it intended to put this land up for public auction? Thirdly, has the Government had any approaches from or discussions with any private developers with a view to making the land available for a shopping centre?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

FESTIVAL CENTRE ORGAN

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture representing the Minister of Community Development.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: It was stated in the press that the Festival Centre organ cost \$427 000, plus \$29 000 for installation, a total of \$456 000. In June 1976 the Crown Law Department advised that a contract was to be signed between the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust and F. Rieger, of Swarzach, Austria, for a sum in Austrian schillings equivalent to \$188 000 Australian to supply the organ. In addition, Perry Engineering received a contract to design and supply the mobile base frame, air castors and drive units. The final consideration for that contract was slightly under \$60 000.

The value of these two contracts amounted to \$248 000. The public donated about \$290 000 towards the cost of this organ, and many donors are curious as to how prudently this money was spent. Therefore, can the Minister say in what manner the balance of \$179 000, being the difference between the supply cost of \$427 000 and the \$248 000 committed to the two main contractors, Rieger and Perry Engineering, was spent?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Community Development and bring down a reply.

DOG FENCE

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief statement before directing a question to the Minister of Lands about the dog fence.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Much publicity has been given recently to the concern of landholders adjoining the dog fence about the condition of the fence. I understand that the Minister recently inspected part, if not all, of the fence. All South Australian farmers benefit from the fence, yet over the years the attitude has developed that it is only the local people directly adjoining the fence who need to be concerned about it, pay for it, or undertake action for its repair. Before the construction of the fence,

wide areas of South Australia were affected by the dingo population. Is the Minister contemplating any action to assist landholders to maintain the condition of this fence, either by direct grants or by spreading the burden of the cost over a wider area of South Australia, because the cost is becoming an increasingly heavy burden on landholders with direct access to the fence?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: True, I did inspect about 120 kilometres of the fence in the vicinity of Mount Lyndhurst Station, between the Strzelecki Creek track, and the Birdsville track. It is also true that the fence is not in good condition. This is due to several factors, not the least of which is the quality of wire that has been provided in recent years to pastoralists in the area. It is also true that most members of the farming community who run sheep south of the fence in South Australia benefit from the dog fence. I agree with the honourable member when he implies that the cost burden for the upkeep of the fence should be spread more equitably across the farming community. The Government presently makes some contribution and pastoralists make some contribution, but the greatest burden falls on the owners of property immediately adjacent to the southern side of the fence. I have several propositions under consideration about how the fence can be upgraded and maintained. One of the realistic propositions that we will have to consider is the formation of regional or local committees, as is done in the western part of the State, but not in the greater part of the eastern areas. That is one of many options. I have my officers from the Lands Department and the Environment Department (both those departments are involved) examining the various problems. I am waiting for some sort of formal representations to be made by the Stockowners Association. I am well aware of the problems. I believe the burden should be spread more equitably throughout the farming community, and eventually I hope to come up with some reasonable and practical solutions.

ENERGY RESOURCES

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a brief statement before directing a question about energy resources to the Attorney-General.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: When this Council last met we heard members of the Opposition for almost the complete sitting call Government members all sorts of terrible names, including "socialists", claiming that the Government was plundering the right of private companies to develop energy sources and resources. We have seen the ejection of at least one member of the Opposition from the Shadow Cabinet—

The PRESIDENT: I do not want this session to start with one of those meandering questions.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is not meandering.

The PRESIDENT: If you cannot explain your question—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I can.

The PRESIDENT: That is exactly what I want.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: My question concerns energy resources. One member in this Council has been removed by the Leader of the Opposition in another place from a shadow portfolio, and another Opposition member in this Council has resigned from Parliament.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What has that to do with it?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The honourable member will learn in a moment if he will contain himself. Consistently we heard the cry from the Hon. Mr. Hill and others that

energy resources should be left to private enterprise to develop. Therefore, I ask members of the Opposition to acquaint themselves with the editorial in today's *News*. It refers to the Prime Minister's indulging in the purchase of oil in direct opposition to oil companies. Does the Attorney-General consider that the Opposition's arguments advanced in the May sitting were false? Will he confer with the Leader of the Opposition in another place to see whether the Opposition is willing to alter its tactics and opinions on energy resources instead of continuing to condemn members on this side of the Council because of our energy policies?

The PRESIDENT: The Minister may or may not wish to answer the question.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The honourable member will be pleased to know that I have not changed my mind on this matter since the May sitting, when the Santos Bill was canvassed widely in this Chamber. That legislation was passed, enabling the energy resources of the Cooper Basin to be protected. The honourable member referred to the *News* editorial, which I have not yet read and which referred to the Prime Minister's making some comment on Government-to-Government oil purchases. In the whole energy field there will be greater involvement by the Governments of all countries because of the critical situation confronting them. Clearly, in such circumstances, Governments must step in to ensure that the public interest is protected.

I was somewhat intrigued by the second part of the honourable member's question. He suggested that I should confer with the Leader of the Opposition in another place, apparently to try to convince him to stop his members misrepresenting the position. They may well do that: they may stop misrepresenting the position, but I will leave that to their individual consciences. It is certainly not my practice or intention to confer with the Leader of the Opposition in another place.

ETHNIC AFFAIRS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Attorney-General about the administration of the Ethnic Affairs Branch.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: When the House was sitting in May I asked the Minister a question concerning the administration of the Ethnic Affairs Branch. The change in the leadership of the Government had taken place not long before. Ethnic people in this State were somewhat concerned that the administration of the Ethnic Affairs Branch, which had previously been within the Premier's Department, had apparently been transferred from the Premier's Department. Quite a number of people were not sure whose administration it came under or within which department that branch was being administered. I stated at the time that members of the ethnic community had mentioned to me that they were somewhat upset that the new Premier did not appear to be taking as much interest in their affairs as had the former Premier. In his reply the Attorney-General said that the Ethnic Affairs Branch had been transferred to the Public and Consumer Affairs Department. That information was relayed to the ethnic people who had kept in close contact with me, but they were still somewhat mystified by the fact that their section of the Public Service was being lumped in with a consumer affairs department. They believed that this was somewhat strange.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Who are they?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is a long list and would take the time of the Council.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: They found that that change somewhat belittled them as ethnic communities in this State. I explained that possibly the transfer to the Public and Consumer Affairs Department might be temporary and that the Government was perhaps still looking at the question and might well improve the system, which was instituted when the Premier apparently decided that he did not want to have a great deal to do with ethnic affairs. Now that some time has lapsed since that date, can the Attorney-General say whether the Ethnic Affairs Branch is permanently slotted into the Public and Consumer Affairs Department, or are alternative arrangements contemplated, which will prove to be more satisfactory from the viewpoint of ethnic people in this State?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The honourable member has made a lot of wild accusations. He has purported to talk on behalf of the ethnic people of South Australia. I ask the honourable member to explain who the people are who have made complaints about the positioning of the Ethnic Affairs Division in the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs. I would be happy to see a deputation of these people, should the honourable member care to convey to them that I would see a deputation from them, when they could explain the problem as they see it. I would be perfectly happy to explain the Government's position to them. I make that as a genuine offer to the honourable member and to those people who have come to see him about the matter.

The situation is that the branch was administratively within the Premier's Department. Nothing has happened except that that division has now been transferred to the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, which is the department directly under my responsibility. I am the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs. It is also true to say that the Hon. Mr. Hill is the shadow Minister assisting his Leader in ethnic affairs, and his Leader in another place is the shadow Minister of ethnic affairs. So, honourable members opposite agree clearly with the Government's approach to this matter. I said on the last occasion that I would have the day-to-day administrative responsibility for this area—the nuts and bolts administration of the division. Given that that is the case, it is clearly sensible that that division should be in the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs.

The Hon. Mr. Hill clearly does not know what is in the department; it is not just a consumer affairs department. The word "public" in the department's name indicates that the department encompasses a number of other areas. As it is directly under my responsibility it was appropriate that it should find its administrative place in my department. That does not mean that the Premier does not take any interest in the field: he is ultimately the Minister responsible and, on any matters of policy or concern where people cannot get satisfaction from me, they are perfectly free to go and see the Premier, as he is ultimately responsible for the policy in this area.

That is no different from what honourable members opposite have proposed. The Leader of the Opposition, should he become Premier, will be the Minister of Ethnic Affairs, and the honourable member opposite would be the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The Premier's Department would be administering it.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: That is a matter of administration. The Opposition sees a similar situation in its Ministerial arrangements as we do. There has been

absolutely no downgrading in terms of ethnic affairs policy. As the honourable member knows, it is an area that I have been interested in ever since my election to Parliament in 1975. I spent a considerable time in my back-bench days liaising with the ethnic community. I have some experience in the area and definitely some genuine interest, concern and empathy with the South Australian ethnic community. I am glad that the Premier has asked me to continue my association with them by giving me the responsibility in a Ministerial capacity. I can assure him that I am devoting a considerable amount of my time to day-to-day administration in the area. I have not heard of any complaints about it. I repeat my offer to the honourable member that, if he would like to contact these people who have expressed their concern and if they would like to bring a deputation to see me, I would be happy to see them.

BUILDING INDEMNITY FUND

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Attorney-General on the Building Indemnity Fund.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Building Indemnity Fund is provided for in Part IIIC of the Builders Licensing Act, and it was inserted in the Builders Licensing Act Amendment Act of 1974. It was put there as a result of an amendment moved during the passage of the Bill leading to that Act by the Hon. Mr. Hill. It required a small sum to be paid into the fund by licensees in respect of each house built, thereby providing an indemnity fund to assist home builders where liability against a licensee was established but where satisfaction could not be obtained.

It may not be possible to obtain satisfaction because of the bankruptcy of a licensee or because he has disappeared. I have raised this matter several times, as I thought that the Hon. Mr. Hill's amendment related to a real and practical piece of consumer protection. However, the provision is not in force. When the Builders Licensing Act Amendment Act, 1974, was proclaimed on 14 August 1975 (page 884 of the *South Australian Government Gazette*), it was proclaimed except so much of the provisions of the said section 14 as enacted and inserted in the Builders Licensing Act, particularly Part IIIC, dealing with the Building Indemnity Fund. Does the Government intend to make operative Part IIIC of the Builders Licensing Act and, if so, when, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Government has foreseen considerable problems in the past with the Building Indemnity Fund and the possible effects that it might have on the cost of housing. As the new Minister responsible, I intend to examine the matter again and to assess it to see whether or not it is justifiable to bring the fund into operation. I have had a brief consultation with the Minister of Housing on the matter, and we will confer on it at greater length in the future. When those conferences and deliberations have been completed, I shall be pleased to make to the Council a statement regarding changes, if any, that might occur in the Government's position.

NEWS EDITORIAL

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I was interested in the

question directed to the Minister by the Hon. Mr. Foster, who asked the Government to confer with the Opposition on a Federal policy, as referred to in today's *News* editorial. I, too, should like to quote from that editorial, part of which states:

Meanwhile, from Victoria Square and the State Administration Centre there emerges more pussyfooting and equivocation.

I assure the Government that the Opposition will be only too willing to give it any advice that it can on this matter. If the Minister decides to confer with the Opposition regarding the Hon. Mr. Foster's question, it should also confer regarding the second part of the *News* editorial, as the Opposition will be pleased to give any advice it can on pussyfooting and equivocation from Victoria Square.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: It might surprise honourable members to know that, unlike them, I have not had time to read the *News*, as I have been too busy answering their questions. It seems that honourable members opposite obviously have time to catch up with what is contained in the *News*. I am not really able sensibly to answer the honourable member's question. However, I said to the Hon. Mr. Foster that I had no intention of conferring with the Leader in an attempt to try to stop his making from time to time statements that misrepresent the Government's propositions. If Opposition members make statements that misrepresent the Government's position, the Government will answer them in the normal way, just as it has done in the past.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Hon. R. A. Geddes be appointed to the Library Committee in place of the Hon. Jessie Cooper, resigned.
Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

This is the opening day of this part of the new session. I was going to say that we have a new ornament in the Council, but I will not, as the gentleman concerned is not an ornament. Indeed, he is a man who has been involved in many ballots, just as I have, and I am sure he is pleased to be a member not of another place but of this Council.

I have observed the Opposition during the course of the Hon. Mr. Davis's induction, and they are indeed a sad and sorry lot. Usually, on the first day of any session, all members are fit, having been in training for the session. Government members feel confident that the tide has turned against the Liberal Party. Honourable members should take note of how sick the Hon. Mr. Hill looks. This might be because the Hon. Mr. DeGaris is back from his overseas trip.

It is indeed a privilege for me today to move the adoption of the Address in Reply. I have never gained much from politics. Indeed, I have always sat on the back bench and served the Party well. However, recognition has not always come to me. Certainly, however, I am well acquainted with the people outside this Council. In this respect, I am referring to the working-class people, those who aspire to conduct small businesses, and who are getting a fair go from the State Government but not from the Federal Government, a theme that I will develop throughout my speech.

A few things happened during the last recess. I am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture is not present in the Chamber to hear my speech, although I am pleased to see that we have, to look after the rural scene, a forthright academic, who is also a farmer. That honourable gentleman does his best to represent farmers and, when one has to deal with people like Mr. Kerin, it is a difficult job. I received from Brian Chatterton correspondence dated 10 July, part of which is as follows:

Giles and McLeay . . . have demonstrated their failure to understand the rural adjustment scheme and the Federal funding which supports it. During 1978-79, the Commonwealth provided \$5 100 000. During 1979-80, they will provide only \$700 000 in cash. In addition, the Commonwealth has undertaken to provide \$1 400 000 for 1980-81, which they have told me can be allocated during 1979-80. I have treated this cheap attempt to inflate the Commonwealth level of funding from \$700 000 to \$2 100 000 with the contempt it deserves. Anyone with a knowledge of farming would know that it is impossible to approve an application for farm build-up and debt reconstruction and then put them on ice for 12 months until Commonwealth funds are available. The honest approach for the Commonwealth to take is to admit that only \$700 000 can be spent this year and that they have cut funds by 85 per cent, instead of trying to disguise the fact by an accounting con trick.

Here, we have a Liberal Government (I will refer later to Mr. Fraser) that says, "We will look after the farmers." Historically, farmers vote for the Liberal Party.

There will be a change, because when you take something off a person, irrespective of whether he is a trade unionist, a member of Parliament or a farmer, he reacts because it hurts. It also stops the advancement of the rural community, and I am talking about the workers in the rural community and the farmers themselves. Some people claim that members on this side of the House do not represent the farmers. However, history has shown, through the wheat stabilisation plan and the floor price plan for wool, that Labor has given more to the farmer and the farming community than any other political Party in the history of Australia. I will explain later why this section of the community does not vote Labor.

I have heard the Hon. Murray Hill parrot the words of Dr. Tonkin in another place on several occasions, when he has said that the Labor Government in this State is destroying the advancement of South Australia economically and otherwise. A press release, dated 27 July 1979, states:

Government approves W.M.C. \$50 000 000 proposal for Roxby Downs.

Every Opposition member over the last few years has said that people will not invest in South Australia while there is a socialist Government which stops private enterprise. However, you could not get a bigger organisation than W.M.C., yet it must have faith in the Labor Government and Des Corcoran to invest \$50 000 000 in this State. We have heard the Hon. Murray Hill and his colleagues from the other side, particularly the Hon. Mr. Burdett, saying that inflation is skyrocketing in South Australia; let me give the Council and the public of South Australia the true facts. In the March quarter South Australia had the lowest annual rate of inflation. In the June quarter, we shared the lowest annual increase with Melbourne and Brisbane. Adelaide's inflation rate for the June quarter was 2.5 per cent, compared with the national figure of 2.7 per cent. On an annual basis the June quarter showed Adelaide's annual inflation rate at 8.2 per cent, compared with the national inflation rate of 8.8 per cent.

Being the first speaker, I wonder what the Hon. Mr. Hill, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, the Hon. Mr. Burdett and

other members of the front bench opposite will try to cook up in an attempt to attack the new Labor Government led by a most astute politician, the Hon. Des Corcoran.

On 25 May I was shocked when I read an attack on the Federal Government by the *Advertiser*. That attack was something I would expect to read in the *Tribune* or some other communist publication. The *Advertiser* is the most conservative paper in Australia, yet it attacked the Federal Government over income tax in its edition of Friday 25 May. The article dealt with things that affect people in the community who vote us into Parliament. The article was headed "At a glance" and stated:

A tax surcharge of 2.5 per cent to continue at least until 30 November. No return to full tax indexation.

I remind honourable members that the Federal Government promised this when it won the last election. The article continues:

Medical benefits—Forty per cent Commonwealth benefit abolished with no benefit up to \$20 (but pensioners and the socially disadvantaged still fully protected).

Hospital charges—Shared room up from \$40 to \$50 a day, private room up from \$60 to \$75 a day, effective from 1 September.

Education—Programmes "rigorously pruned," but no figures given.

Primary Industry—Commonwealth Extension Services cut by half from \$10 000 000 to \$5 000 000. Rural adjustment scheme cut from \$41 000 000 to \$18 700 000. Nitrogenous fertiliser subsidy halved from \$40 to \$20 a tonne in 1980.

Homes—Introduction of limit on homes, including land, which qualify for a Home Savings Grant. Limit of \$35 000 for full grant reducing to zero at \$40 000 from today.

Travel and transport—Passport fees up by \$5 to \$25. Two-way radio licence fees increased for taxis, hire cars and private couriers, but not on CB radios. Grants for urban transport programme held at same level of \$40 000 000 in 1979-80.

Business—Trading stock valuation adjustment concession to be abolished from 1 July.

Customs duty of 2 per cent on most goods currently duty free, such as most business equipment.

Oil and coal levies—Crude oil levy to be increased, hitting oil companies but not affecting petrol prices. Promise to remove coal export levy of \$3.50 a tonne abandoned.

State finances—Specific purpose payments to be cut.

Last June I travelled around the world. Since my return home, petrol prices have doubled, and that affects the primary producers, business proprietors and the people we represent in the country who have to travel to work by motor vehicle. This money is not being spent on exploration, but it is going into the coffers of the Federal Government so that it can meet its balance sheet. That is tightening the belt to such an extent that workers are now revolting. Workers in our society can survive only if their wages can meet consumer needs and what they require to send their children to school. They can get that from only one place—the employer.

Many honourable members opposite have heard me speak, as a former trade union official, about the unfairness of wages compared with profits. As an example, it was only last week that B.H.P. made a \$183 000 000 profit. I have conducted many negotiations and led many strikes against that company, which crucifies workers by having the lowest pay rates in Australia. There are fitters and turners who work for B.H.P. and take home only \$120 or \$130 a week to keep their families. These workers have asked B.H.P., and I have been in conference with B.H.P. over this, for some wage parity with its profits, but the company has always said "No".

The employees, through their trade unions, have taken

the only recourse left to them: they have gone on strike. I have always supported one thing in my life, and that is the right to strike. One of my very close associates, Mr. Clyde Cameron, said to me one day, "Take away the worker's right to strike, and he is no different from a slave." A worker should be able to withdraw his labour if he feels the cause is just.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What about the worker's right to work?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I will be dealing with the worker's right to work later, because in the last election campaign Mr. Fraser promised that any man who wanted to work would get a job under a Fraser Government. He said that those who could not work would be protected by a good social services scheme. They are two lies which help my contribution.

The Hon. Murray Hill himself is a bit disgusted at Fraser. We could talk about Fraser for many hours but, before I do, let us look at Dr. Tonkin, the Leader of the Opposition in this State.

Only yesterday, on radio, in reply to a question asked by the interviewer, "Do you think Mr. Corcoran ought to go to an election in view of the great victory the Tasmanian Labor Party has had?" Mr. Tonkin said, "I think it's unwise, because he sacked some capable people in your organisation." Stan Evans is a conservative but a very effective Liberal Party member. He is a keen Opposition spokesman, with great credibility, but he was sacked, and there was more in that than met the eye. I also refer to you, Mr. Acting President. You crossed the floor with our socialists, but you knew you were doing the right thing. I heard the Hon. Mr. Cameron saying what a rotten thing we were doing by means of the Santos Bill. What is happening in Queensland? The *Australian* of 28 June 1979, under the heading "Lickiss acts on raiders", states:

The Queensland Minister for Justice, Mr. Lickiss, yesterday named members of a State Government committee to examine the implications of southern takeovers of Queensland-based companies.

This follows a decision last week by Cabinet to introduce legislation to shield local companies from unwanted southern takeovers.

Members are the Under-Treasurer, Mr. Hielscher, the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs, Mr. MacPherson, and the acting Director of the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development, Mr. Barker.

Mr. Lickiss will also seek submissions from Brisbane Stock Exchange, the Institute of Directors, the Confederation of Industry and Brisbane Chamber of Commerce.

The move to introduce anti-takeover legislation appears to be aimed at three southern companies—Clyde Industries, Henry Jones (IXL) and LNC Industries.

Clyde Industries has been buying into Evans Deakin. Henry Jones has been buying into Provincial Traders and LNC appears interested in Elphinstones.

We did all that under the Santos Bill: we were the starters. The Labor Party is always the innovator. We led the way in stopping Mr. Bond coming to South Australia and buying up our natural gas resources, taking control, and paying off his other debts by increasing the price of gas. I explained that clearly and openly in an earlier debate. I am concerned that Australia is being downgraded in the eyes of the rest of the world. I quote from the *Australian*, to which I do not subscribe, but which I obtained from the Parliamentary Library, in its issue dated 23 July 1979. Mr. Murdoch, the owner, promoted Mr. Fraser.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: He promoted Mr. Whitlam in 1972.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Yes. The front page of that issue states:

It is timely to recall that some union leaders are committed to destroying the Australia we know.

Prime Minister warns: Strikes must stop or else.

Tough-line backing for employers.

I have been involved in strikes for over 30 years. I have led them, but I have never liked them, because it meant that I had no money. History has shown that in democratic countries the workers have improved their standard of living only by means of direct action. Employers must be pressured into giving employees anything extra, such as additional annual leave, sick leave, or decent safety provisions at work. Action has taken place on the political scene by means of increasing agitation for quarterly basic wage adjustments. Everything the worker has ever got in the history of Australia (I can go back 30 years or more, and I have read the history books) has been achieved only by fighting for it.

Mr. Fraser, who said Mr. Whitlam hired aircraft to junket all over the world, left on a jet only a week ago with 14 dozen bottles of Scotch whisky. Talking to Gough Whitlam yesterday, I said, "He must be having a bath in it." Under Mr. Fraser, the deficit that he accused Mr. Whitlam of creating has doubled. Can anyone imagine Gough Whitlam taking 14 dozen bottles of Scotch on a two-week trip?

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Can you substantiate that?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I am saying it. The whisky was bought in Canberra and loaded on to the aircraft. The honourable member is amazed, but it is true. Have I ever told a lie in this Chamber?

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Where did he go?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: To Africa. The Opposition has referred to a waste of money at the Jam Factory. If it were 14 dozen bottles of jam Mr. Fraser had taken, I would not mind. But this was the Prime Minister, who said that he would stop the unions from striking. However, I warn the Opposition that it will never stop strikes. Before coming to Parliament, I was always critical of public servants, because I believed that the Labor Government gave them too much. My close friend Clyde Cameron gave them everything, and said that it would set a standard. We had a passive work force, and now Mr. Fraser is going to sack some of them. A man was sacked in Queensland two days ago because he would not tell the Federal member who destroyed the cockroaches in his office. He was carrying out a rank-and-file decision.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: What was the cost of your night in Canberra?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The Hon. Mr. Burdett was eating crayfish, and other Liberals were present. It cost about \$250, and we were doing a vital job. We never took over 14 dozen bottles of Scotch. We never had a Scotch, because we were thinking of the Government. I have nothing to hide, because I was never eating or drinking alone.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member does not have to answer interjections. I will see that he gets a fair go.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I can recommend good reading to Opposition members. I refer to the May-June publication of *Consumer Action* and the heading "Consumer prices soar". It is a well-known trade union axiom that a worker should be able to purchase the things that he produces, but presently workers cannot do that. Do honourable members and the public generally know that we now have work-tested unemployment benefits?

The former sympathetic Federal Labor Government paid unemployment benefits retrospectively. If a person was unemployed for a fortnight, he was paid the benefit

for that period. The Liberal Government said it would protect the unemployed and would give people on social security benefits a decent wage, something to survive on, yet now the Commonwealth Liberal Government has increased the waiting period from six weeks to three months for a person leaving a job.

I now refer to the recent document put out by Mick Young, a good friend of mine. Because the document is so hefty I cannot refer to it all, but it was published within the last week and states:

Firstly, people should realise the rates for unemployed people in Australia at the moment. They are:

Young unemployed person under 18 years . . . \$36 per week. Has not been changed in four years, so you can imagine the purchasing power of \$36 in 1979 compared with 1975.

Can honourable members believe there has not been an increase in that rate of \$36 for four years? The document continues:

Single adult unemployed . . . \$51.45 per week; Married couple . . . \$88.70 per week; plus . . . \$7.50 per week per child.

When you look at these figures you can imagine the enormous comfort that unemployed people draw from an announcement made previously by the Government that they were to abolish gift duty tax which means you can now give a gift of \$10 000 or more without drawing gift tax. I wonder how many of the unemployed people are able to save up \$10 000 to offer as gifts to their friends or family. But this does illustrate how morally corrupt the Fraser Government is.

On the latest guidelines, Mick Young states:

Firstly, there is going to be greater pressure on people with skills to be forced to take unskilled work. This means of course, in very simple terms, that the opportunities for the already unskilled unemployed are going to be negligible. From my experience as a worker in industry for 20 years, I know that a skilled man will always be employed before an unskilled person. This is a fact of life, and it has always been the case. Some years ago the Heath Government in England was brought down through the actions of the coal miners. Now Mr. Fraser is attacking the Public Service union, which has been a docile union. He might beat that union, but he will not beat the whole trade union movement. Does Mr. Fraser know that 57 per cent of people employed in Australia today are trade unionists?

I am most concerned about unemployment. In the last Address in Reply debate I referred to the publication *Australia Uprooted* and quoted extensively from it. I now refer honourable members to the publication *Australia Ripped Off*, which is available at a cost of 60c. This most enlightening booklet deals with strikes and unemployment, and at page 17 it has the heading "Being poor and without a job in 1979—what it's doing to people". This significant heading deals with the situation confronting Australia in 1979, and one can only sheet home the blame to the appropriate body—the Federal Liberal Government. It states:

The economic crisis is putting a tremendous strain on the health, family life and mental well-being of hundreds of thousands of Australians. The economic crisis has become an alarming social crisis. Unemployment has helped to produce more crime, more drug addicts, more teenage drunkenness and more marriage break-ups. The economic crisis is helping to boost the tragic statistics of mental illness, suicide, heart attacks and infectious disease. It has also become an important factor in the death rate of children among families of unemployed workers.

Australia is showing all the symptoms of a very sick society. And if unemployment continues into the 1980's at

anything like the present level there's no doubt that our society will get worse. At least one third of the unemployed are under 21. In some industrial centres half the school leavers can't find work and many face the prospect of "missing out" for the rest of their lives. For employers won't take on and train people with a history of unemployment. The President of the School Careers Advisers Association put it this way:

In today's job climate, if a school leaver doesn't get a job in the first six months he (or she) has had it. Employers take on their trainees, apprentices and cadets at the beginning of the year. If a young person has to wait until the next intake, he (or she) is competing with a new batch of fresh school leavers.

And while many youngsters can't get job training and skills, the new technology is eliminating many unskilled and skilled jobs.

At page 18 is the heading "Crime", which should be of concern to all honourable members. Certainly, it concerns the people who elected honourable members, and the article continues:

When young people are denied job opportunities they are also denied the prospect of economic self-reliance and self-esteem. They face poverty plus a sense of being social outcasts. Some try to escape their despair with drugs or drink, many become bitter and cynical.

In Australia today up to 30 per cent of all people arrested (depending on the State) are unemployed. In some States juvenile crime has shot up by 60 per cent during the economic crisis. In South Australia where accurate statistics are kept, offences committed by the unemployed were up by 240 per cent.

I have always believed that a person who commits a serious crime should receive a heavy sentence and be taken out of society, but I believe that convicted persons should be educated in gaol about the offences that they have committed. Just as is the case with convicted persons, the unemployed are denied decent lives and are turning to crime.

One could sentence them and keep on sentencing them. Unless we get over the economic crisis in all capitalist countries, we are destroying ourselves. We cannot say, "Lock them up and forget about them", because these people must come out eventually, and under our system they do not come out any better; in fact, they are sometimes worse than when they went in. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins usually asks, "Where did you get this stuff from?" He has not asked me today, but I always use the capitalist press. An article headed "Who runs the country? Workers and Inflation, Democracy in trade unions" was recently put out by John Halfpenny (a communist, and that would make the Hon. Mr. Dawkins happy), who is Victorian State Secretary of the Amalgamated Workers Union. Being a communist does not necessarily mean that what he says is incorrect. On page 5, under the heading "Who is irresponsible?", we see the following:

It was their irresponsible exercise of political power that sold out our resources, and almost converted the nation into a quarry. It was Liberal-Country Party Government that used its political power to force conscription on to young Australians and sent some to fight in Vietnam. They have the audacity to talk about irresponsibility.

How more irresponsible can you get than a Government that exercised its political power to subvert the interests of the nation and its people to court the favour of another nation? History has shown that those in our society who took for themselves the power to challenge a corrupt Government's power to conscript young people, and to involve this country in the Vietnam war, were acting responsibly and in the interests of the people of Australia.

I marched in the main streets of Adelaide against that war, in support of people looking for their own identity. The article continues:

Those who inspire the attack against the power and influence of trade unions and workers have one objective, and that is to conceal the real centres of power in this country. They want to conceal to the concentration of economic and political power in the hands of employers and their Governments which is responsible for the anarchy of capitalism, the anarchy of exploitation, inflation and rising prices.

They don't attack or challenge the power of the select group who control the mass media in Australia. They don't challenge the power of the six giant supermarket chains which control 87 per cent of supermarket business in this country. They don't challenge the power of the multi-national corporations which control all of the major energy and natural resources of this country.

They don't challenge the power of the few multi-nationals which control less than 1 per cent of manufacturing industry, but employ 42 per cent of the total workforce and share between them 49 per cent of the total manufactured output in this country. They don't challenge the power which the Liberal-Country Party Government's handed over to the multi nationals which caused the Senate Select Committee on Foreign Ownership and Control to remark:

The committee has been surprised at the complete openness with which overseas funds can flow into the economy, despite the fact that exchange control regulations exist and have been administered by the Reserve Bank since 1939. Australia appears to be one of the few countries in the world where foreign exchange controls are administered in such a manner.

I now refer to strikes. Workers ought to go on strike if they feel that they have been unjustly treated, and they ought to have the freedom to take such action. In the *National Times* of 4 August 1979, at page 49, it states, under the heading "The myth and reality of strikes":

Now that the phones and posts are working again, where is the chaos in Australian industrial relations? The Fraser Government says it is so bad the industrial laws have to be rewritten. Businessmen are increasingly gloomy. The chaos may indeed lurk somewhere besides the Public Service—but not in any one of the 17 major industries surveyed by Bob Mills.

The article concludes as follows:

The aim of the survey was to sample business perceptions of Australian industrial relations. The businesses sampled were in banking, insurance, finance, transport, motor vehicles, metal fabrication, engineering, oil, chemicals, packaging, electrical manufacture, textiles, brewing, food processing, building and construction, and building supplies.

The initial aim was to interview industrial relations managers, but most companies contacted used their chief executive or public relations officer as spokesman. Three companies declined to comment at all. Most of the rest commented on condition that the company was not identified.

The questions asked were: "Where is your perception of the state of Australian industrial relations generally? Do you think it is better or worse than in the last five or 10 years? What is the position in the industry in which your company operates?"

It is obvious from what one reads here that disputes are due solely to bad management. I had negotiations over a protracted period with one of the leading manufacturers in South Australia, and my members were on strike for over three weeks. I was worried, because when a trade union secretary has got his workers out he is trying to win, but sometimes he has to back off. History has shown that

strikes do not usually gain very much, but the trade unions get stronger, and if Mr. Fraser does what he intends to do he will make the trade union movement stronger.

A leading South Australian industrialist once telephoned me and said, "Jim, I am not going to concede to you—you can send these blokes to work sooner or later but you will get nothing from me." I said, "I know they will stay out," and he said, "I will tell you something about industrial relations: any employer who cannot organise his industry to allow for a strike for one month in a year should not be in business." Some employers like strikes. The transport dispute involving the buses in New South Wales five or six years ago was not conceded by the Government, because it would have lost thousands of dollars. The strike went for 13 weeks, but made nothing while the strike lasted. The worker gets nothing out of strikes; he has to fight to survive, and some employers encourage disputes when they are able to.

I should like now to indict the worst criminal of them all (others have called him a liar), Mr. Malcolm Fraser. On 2 June 1979, the *National Times* contained a report by Mr. Allan Austin. The ABC interviewed Senator Margaret Guilfoyle, who was asked how likely it was that the Government would break election promises in framing the August Budget. In reply, she said, "To answer that, you must examine the Government's record over the past 3½ years." That record deals with the whole scope of political, industrial, and all other aspects of our lives.

I refer now to employment, and one of Mr. Fraser's many lies. On 27 November, 1975, he said that under a Liberal and National Country Party Government there would be jobs for all who wanted to work. He also said in February 1978 that unemployment would fall. He said:

Inflation at an annual rate of 5 per cent is within our reach by mid-1979. It will go on falling under the policies of the Government.

However, it was reported in the press only yesterday that inflation would reach 10 per cent by Christmas. Regarding health insurance, Mr. Fraser said:

We will maintain Medibank and ensure that the standard of health care does not decline.

We all know what has happened in that respect. I now refer to taxation and wage indexation. It is important for one to note that the Federal Labor Government was brought down with the aid of Mr. Murdoch, because, it was said, Labor was sending the country broke. Mr. Fraser said on 21 November 1977:

We have brought Government spending under control . . . We have halved Labor's \$4 500 000 000 deficit.

However, the Whitlam Government's last Budget planned a deficit of \$2 798 000 000. Even after Mr. Fraser had worked on it for seven months, it rose to \$3 585 000 000. In 1976-77, Mr. Fraser shot for a \$2 608 000 000 deficit and got \$2 740 000 000. In 1977-78, he tried for \$2 217 000 000 and got \$3 333 000 000. This financial year, Fraser hoped for a \$2 813 000 000 deficit, but it is likely to be about \$3 300 000 000. Also, Mr. Fraser promised to reduce interest rates, but in this respect he lied and broke his promise. Regarding pensioners, the people who are not in trade unions and who are used by every political Party except the Labor Party, Mr. Fraser said:

We are committed to take politics out of pensioners' increases by giving automatic increases in line with price rises twice a year.

That is another lie and broken promise. Regarding the means test, Mr. Fraser said:

We stand by our commitment to abolish the means test on pensions.

In last year's Budget, the Federal Government announced

that Australian pensioners over 70 years of age would be subject to an income test in order to qualify for pension increases. Regarding generosity to the jobless, he said, "We will be generous to those who cannot get a job and want to work." However, from 1 November 1977 the Government started paying unemployment benefits in arrears instead of in advance, after a one-week eligibility period. This means that most unemployed people now receive their unemployment cheques in their fourth week of unemployment instead of the second week.

The rate for juniors of \$5.15 a day has remained unchanged during the Government's term of office. School leavers are no longer eligible for unemployment benefits during their vacation periods. Last year, the Government abolished indexation on benefits for single unemployed persons. Now, a person who leaves a job of his own volition will not get any money for three months.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Why don't you return to State matters for a change?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I will do so. When the Premier was in Canberra, he was "knocked off" for \$80 000 000. That is why the blame must be sheeted home to the Federal Government. Regarding legal aid, Mr. Fraser said:

We will ensure that no person is denied legal aid because of lack of means.

Despite small changes in eligibility requirements last October, it is still possible for pensioners and others living below the poverty line not to meet the stringent requirements laid down. Regarding the assistance plan, Mr. Fraser said, "The Australian Assistance Plan will be maintained." However, it was abolished in 1976. Other memorable utterances include the following:

At this stage, it is our intention to allow the passage of the Budget through the Senate.

Only 36 days later, however, the Liberal and National Country Parties used their majority in the Senate to block the Budget. On 27 November 1974, Mr. Fraser said:

Bill Snedden is the Leader. I support him completely.

On 6 February 1975, he said:

Bill Snedden has my full support. I repeat, as I have said on numerous occasions, that I support the elected leadership of the Liberal Party. There is no contest. The issue was decided in November.

However, the issue was not decided, because on 21 March 1975 Mr. Malcolm Fraser successfully challenged the leadership of the Liberal Party.

I should have liked today to deal with the Pilbara dispute, as I do not think that anyone in this Council or outside this place realises what it is like for people working in a region such as the Pilbara to be on strike for 10 or 11 weeks. These are ordinary people, and they are fighting a company that is ripping the guts out of Australia and wants to give the workers nothing in return. These people had only six claims, of which many people, including honourable members in this Council, have a copy. Four of the major points of their log of claims are as follows:

1. All workers annual entitlements to be accounted from the commencement of employment.
2. Paid meal breaks for all workers. Presently, continuous shift workers have paid meal breaks but day workers do not.
3. A redundancy clause in line with A.C.T.U. policy.
4. Sickness and accident scheme financed by Hammersley Iron.

At present, workers in their first year receive 60 hours sick pay on their base rates, which increases to 80 hours per year in their second year and after.

I remind honourable members that Commonwealth Railways employees have had two weeks on full pay and two weeks on half pay since 1948. These people also

claimed a \$40 a week wage increase. At present, they receive indexation increases only. They give the following examples of prices in the area. A seven-ounce glass of beer which costs 34c in Victoria costs 51c in the Pilbara region. All food in that region costs 17.5c a kilogram extra for freight. This food is carried by road freight and, with petrol prices increasing all the time, it will cost even more in future. Hammersley's response to the claim did not satisfy its workers. It therefore threatened to reduce the annual leave entitlement from six weeks to five weeks, and to raise rent and electricity charges by 100 per cent.

As a result, the workers rejected the company's offer. Even after the fifth week in dispute, 98 per cent of workers across the sites voted to continue the strike. Therefore, the Liberals and the troglodytes opposite can attack the workers and want secret ballots. However, after five weeks in an area like the Pilbara, 98 per cent of voters still voted for the strike. I thank honourable members for their involvement and have much pleasure in moving the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In seconding this motion, I first pay a tribute to Mrs. Jessie Cooper, who, until very recently, was a member of this Council. As was mentioned this morning, Mrs. Cooper was the very first woman member of this Parliament. She entered this Council in 1959, following an absolutely incredible challenge in the courts as to her right to take her seat after being duly elected. She was a member of this Council for 20 years, and I am sure all members will agree with me that she in no way disgraced our sex during that time.

Mrs. Cooper and I are poles apart politically and we disagree most strongly in our political philosophies, but I place on record my appreciation of her contribution to the debates in this Chamber. Her speeches were always well researched, well documented and thoughtful. They were never unduly verbose and always worth listening to, even though occasionally it made my blood pressure rise when I was listening to them.

She cannot have had an easy time as the first woman member of this Parliament, and I imagine she felt very alone and isolated, although joined by Mrs. Steele at the same election and six years later by Mrs. Byrne in another place. It was not until I entered this Chamber four years ago that she had any female company in this Chamber. I imagine she appreciated, as much as I did, the occasional glance across the Chamber as one of the male members uttered a particularly outrageous male chauvinistic remark. I certainly wish her a long and happy retirement. She now has her place in the history of this State as the first woman to breach the previously male bastion of Parliament.

It is certainly incredible that it took 65 years, from the time women received the vote in South Australia in 1894, to see a woman actually voted into Parliament. Of course, there have been numerous women candidates in elections during those 65 years but, true to the traditions of the first half of this century, women were endorsed as candidates by the major Parties only for seats which they had no chance of winning. A few women stood as independent candidates, but they, too, were never elected. As the days of independents seem to be past, future women in Parliament will be those selected by the major Parties for safe or marginal seats. South Australia was indeed tardy in electing a woman to Parliament. In 1921, Western Australia led the field when it elected Mrs. Edith Cowan. In 1925, New South Wales followed by electing Miss Preston Stanley. In 1929, Queensland elected Mrs. Irene Longman. In the Federal Parliament, Senator Dorothy Tangey, again from Western Australia, and Dame Enid

Lyons from Tasmania, were both elected in 1943 and served their Parties and Parliament with distinction for many years.

It is perhaps worth noting that of the few women who have been members of Parliament in this country, most have had very short terms, because they were unable to achieve a second term. This suggests to me that most of them were preselected by their Parties for very marginal seats, which they were not expected to win. If by some extraordinary chance these women did win one election, the seats reverted to the normal pattern of voting in the next election, and they lost their places in Parliament. It is only in more recent years that some women have had endorsement for safe seats where they could expect to contribute for more than a single term. Miss May Holman's service in Western Australia from 1925 to her death in 1939 is an early exception of this general rule.

I mean no disrespect at all to the Hon. Mr. Davis, who has joined this Council today, but I am sorry that the Liberal Party did not preselect a woman to take Mrs. Cooper's place. Although sorry, I am by no means surprised. The Liberal Party has an even worse record in respect of women in Parliament than has the Labor Party. At present, throughout Australia, there are only 35 women members of Parliament. There are six in the Senate in Canberra, two in Queensland, nine in New South Wales, four in Victoria, two in Tasmania, five in Western Australia, three in South Australia, and four in the Northern Territory.

Incidentally, as there is a total of 761 politicians in this country, 35 women means only 4.6 per cent. These are divided into 18 A.L.P., 13 Liberal, three National Party and one Independent—a slight majority to the A.L.P. We all know that there will be at least one more A.L.P. woman member of this Parliament after the next election, possibly more, while it is most unlikely that any more Liberal women will enter Parliament. Indeed, it is highly probable that the one Liberal woman remaining will not be re-elected as, following the old precedents, she was only pre-selected for a marginal seat, and such seats have a habit of changing Parties frequently. I trust the women of South Australia will realise what the Liberal Party has done in preselecting the Hon. Mr. Davis last Friday. I am sure that many of them will be angry at the way the Liberal Party has again ignored the claims of women to be members of Parliament—one woman, perhaps, in a marginal seat, compared to three A.L.P. women in safe seats. What clearer indication could the women of South Australia have of the way the Parties regard their sex? There has been much talk in recent years about equal opportunity for women, about women participating on an equal footing with men and achieving their rightful place in society. But quite clearly for the Liberal Party, it is only talk, lip service to an ideal with no intention whatsoever of doing anything about it.

The remarks made this morning by the Leader of the Opposition in another place, in the present circumstances, were some of the most hypocritical I have heard for a long time. I am sure the women of South Australia will agree with me that actions speak louder than words, and they will judge the Parties by results, not by mealy-mouthed platitudes which are not translated into action.

Who would ever believe that the Liberal Party would do anything for the women of this State, should it by some fluke ever become the Government, when it shows its contempt and disinterest in this way, by reducing its female representation in Parliament to virtually zero? The Labor Party, on the other hand, not only clearly states a belief in the principle of equality of the sexes, but can be seen to be doing something about it. When in Government

we do far more for the women of the community than the Liberals have ever done and, although we are still a long way from the 50 per cent female representation in Parliament which to me would make Parliament truly representative of our population, the A.L.P. can be seen to be moving in the right direction and giving women much greater opportunities than do the conservative Parties.

Just in case any member opposite wants to say, "What about Mrs. Thatcher?" I would point out that the current British Parliament has only 17 women members out of 625, a proportion of only 2.8 per cent, which is the lowest proportion of women in any House of Commons since the Second World War. As Conservative Parties are so obviously reluctant to pre-select women as candidates, a Conservative victory in the United Kingdom means a fall in the number of women in Parliament. To me it is not accidental that the States in Australia with A.L.P. Government have a higher proportion of women M.P.'s than do the States with Liberal Governments.

The differences in proportion may be small, but they are important. The three Labor States of New South Wales, Tasmania and South Australia average 5.3 per cent women members, whereas the three Liberal States of Queensland, Victoria and Western Australia average only 3.8 per cent women members. I sincerely hope that the women of South Australia will realise the significance of these figures and remember the way in which the Liberal Party has treated their sex when they go to the ballot box.

Incidentally, we have all noted that the Liberal Leader in the other place did not choose a woman for his redesigned shadow Cabinet. It certainly took him a long time to select his shadow Cabinet, even when given the power to do so (in fact, nearly a nine-month gestation period), though I doubt whether the significance of such a time span would be as apparent to most men as it is to me. One might wonder about the speed with which decisions would be made should the Leader ever become Premier, when it takes nine months to select a shadow Cabinet. Even now, the final decisions have not been made, because he has a shadow Cabinet of 14, when there are only 13 Ministers. Who is for the chopper should the Liberals win the next election? Which of the 14 is to join energetic and prominent back-benchers like the Hon. Mr. Geddes opposite and Mr. Evans, member for Fisher, who were chopped in the recent purge? All 14 must be looking over their shoulders, constantly waiting for the stab in the back that will consign them again to the back bench. Perhaps all 14 are even desperately hoping that the Government will create a fourteenth Ministry to save their skins. We know that the Liberal Party is not in favour of job security, for public servants or anyone else, but it is surely going to extremes of job insecurity to have 14 starters for 13 members of Cabinet. I doubt whether there has ever been a precedent for such a situation anywhere else in Australia.

I now turn my attention to a different matter, which has become a topic of concern to some members of our community. In recent months, the Liberal Party has been waging a dishonest and misleading campaign against succession duties, claiming that these constitute hard and oppressive taxes that penalise the majority of the population. Nothing could be further from the truth, and it is time that people realised the facts and ceased being conned by deceitful propaganda. Succession duties are a most equitable tax, with the money being raised most from the families most able to pay, and least from those with small or average assets. In response to a query of mine, I have been able to obtain data on succession duties recently paid in South Australia, showing clearly who pays succession duty and who does not.

The facts are that 64 per cent of estates pay no succession duty at all, due to the generous limits below which no duty is payable. A further 11 per cent of estates paid succession duty of less than \$500, hardly a crippling sum to beggar the inheritors. So we see that 75 per cent of estates pay either no duty or less than \$500, and the vast majority of our population have nothing to fear from succession duties.

At the other end of the scale, the small number of large estates contributed significantly to the State coffers. Less than 1 per cent of the estates were very large ones, and these contributed 20 per cent of the money raised by this tax. The top 7½ per cent of estates contributed 67 per cent of the revenue raised—over two-thirds of the money collected came from this small number of wealthy estates. It is no wonder that wealthy people are setting up front organisations to have this tax removed. If it were removed, the greatest beneficiaries would be the wealthy, not the average person. The wealthy are attempting to convince average people to press for the removal of this tax and hiding that this would benefit themselves far more than anyone else. Average people would probably suffer, as the abolition of this tax would doubtless mean the imposition of some other tax measure whose effects would not be so equitably distributed.

Before any members opposite start screaming about the difficulties of small struggling family farms, I point out that only 16 per cent of the large estates, defined as those who paid greater than \$5 000 succession duty, were rural ones. With the special exemptions that exist for rural estates, country people are not being disproportionately hit by succession duty. In fact, they are under-represented among large payers of this tax.

The importance of succession duties in reducing inequities in our society has rarely been given much prominence, nor have the far greater inequities that would exist if they were abolished. The abolition of Federal estate duty by the Fraser Government is a most retrograde step, which will cost the Federal Treasury about \$70 000 000 a year. Using 1975-76 figures, 60 per cent of the money raised by this tax came from only 6 per cent of estates, which means those with a total value of more than \$200 000 each—a huge sum four years ago and way beyond the assets of most people at that time (and even now, too). All other countries in the Western world have estate or succession duties—Australia is unique in abolishing this equitable tax measure at the Federal level. Furthermore, it is not generally realised that in the United States of America and in all the countries of Western Europe, except Ireland, there is not only income tax and inheritance tax, but as well either a capital gains tax or a net wealth tax, or both. Only in Australia do we have virtually no tax at all on assets, a situation permitted by a Federal Government which primarily looks after the interests of its friends among the rich. The result is that more of our tax revenue has to be raised from those least able to pay.

Most people do not, in general, realise that they are thus subsidising the rich, and that in all other industrialised nations the rich pay a larger share of the tax burden than they do in this country. There has been very little study of the distribution of wealth in this country, though an illuminating article by Raskill, in the *Journal of Political Economy* last year, threw some light on the inequities in our society. Raskill showed that the top 1 per cent of people in Australia owned 22 per cent of the wealth, that the top 5 per cent of people owned 46 per cent of the wealth, and that the bottom 50 per cent of people owned only 8 per cent of the wealth of this nation. The top 5 per cent own more than the bottom 90 per cent put together.

Men are far more likely to own wealth than women, particularly at younger ages, though even in the older age groups wealthy men outnumber wealthy women by almost two to one.

"Wealthy" in this case is defined as owning an estate with assets greater than \$15 000 in 1970 dollars. I stress the sex distribution of wealth even amongst elderly people, because it is well known that today there are eight widows for every one widower in Australia. Raskill also showed that the proportion of wealthy young men under the age of 30 was about half that of wealthy older men (10.9 per cent of the 20-29 age group versus 19.0 per cent of the 70-79 age group). This suggests that only half the wealthy men had personally accumulated assets over a lifetime, the other half having inherited their wealth or having received it as a gift, but not as the result of personal exertion, hard work, thrift, or such virtues supposed to be rewarded by material assets in Liberal propaganda.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: That is an assumption.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: That assumption results from the most logical explanation of the data. Otherwise, I cannot see how such a large proportion of young people can become wealthy by their personal exertion well before the age of 30.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Harry M. Miller did.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I said a "large proportion". There may be certain exceptions. Raskill's study is the only one that I know of that attempts to document the effect of inheritance on the wealth distribution in Australia, and it is doubtless limited in this aspect, as this was not the main thrust of Raskill's work. However, the Royal Commission on the Distribution of Income and Wealth in the United Kingdom specifically looked at the role of inheritance on wealth distribution, with some startling results, and I refer to the appendices of their report.

That commission estimated that in 1973 some 25 per cent of all personal wealth was transmitted wealth, not earned wealth, but that this average figure for the whole population disguised very great differences among sub-groups. The top 1 per cent in ownership of wealth in the United Kingdom not only owned 25 per cent of all personal wealth, but transmitted or inherited wealth accounted for 75 per cent of their wealth holdings. The top 2.5 per cent of wealth holders not only accounted for another 22 per cent of all the personal wealth in the United Kingdom, but this group had inherited or been given 52 per cent of their assets. Honourable members can see that certainly in the United Kingdom transmitted wealth contributes enormously to the assets of the rich, that many of the wealthy are so placed not through personal exertion but because of the accident of their birth.

I would be surprised if the situation were much different in Australia, although the current Federal Government is unlikely to set up a Royal Commission to adequately study this area for us. If inheritance is indeed a major contributor to large wealth holdings in this country, as suggested by Raskill's study and by analogy with the United Kingdom situation, there is certainly a case on equity grounds for the continuation of estate or succession duties, and/or the introduction of wealth taxes. The notion of large-scale inheritance is surely inconsistent with Australian ideas on equality. If some people start their adult lives with large fortunes, then true equality of opportunity is impossible. If democracy means equal worth and power for individuals, and power is certainly related to control of wealth, then large-scale inheritance of wealth means real democracy is a myth in our society.

I wish to turn now to a different matter which affects many people in our community, although it is given very

little prominence in the media. Honourable members may recall that two years ago in the Address in Reply debate I spoke of the extreme financial difficulties imposed by the Fraser Government on the Family Planning Association in South Australia. While a proportion of the clinical costs of Family Planning Associations are met by a health programme grant from Canberra, the non-clinical costs are met by a special family planning grant from the Health Department in Canberra, along with grants from State Governments. In 1977 I described to the Council how the Fraser Government had imposed a savage cut of 75 per cent in the non-clinical costs granted to the South Australian Family Planning Association, a much greater cut than that made to any other State, and that this was largely because our own State Government had treated its own association more generously than had been done by the other State Governments. Honourable members might be interested to know what has happened since that time regarding non-clinical costs to our local association.

Although only \$18 000 was provided by the Federal Government for the 1977-78 financial year the association had some accumulated funds which it was able to draw on, and not cut services too much during that year. However, for 1978-79 it had no reserves left, and applied for a grant of \$113 000 to maintain and expand activities. Our generous Federal Government initially awarded only \$24 000, just 21 per cent of what was required. When it was pointed out that this would mean not only a great curtailment of activities, but also a wholesale dismissal of staff as well, the Federal Government relented and, well into the financial year, gave a single grant of \$47 000 with a strong warning that this was not to be counted on as continuing beyond that financial year.

This meant that the association then had 63 per cent of what it needed for the 1977-78 year and curtailment had to occur. The Aboriginal health visitor had to be retrenched, as was one of the social workers working at the association. One education officer voluntarily reduced her hours by 20 per cent per week; hours worked by the sessional education officers were reduced, as were visits to country centres, with consequent hardship for country as well as city women. The person working specifically with handicapped people had her hours reduced by 20 per cent and the Director voluntarily took a cut in salary to save money. There were severe cuts made in funds for library resources, and for promotional material such as posters: altogether a sad and socially unjustified reduction in activity.

At present no indication has been given of what grants are to be awarded for the 1979-80 financial year, and unless the \$78 000 grant requested from Canberra is forthcoming, further cuts will have to be made. As the supplementary grant last year was specifically awarded for one year only, the association is not optimistic that its needs will be met, and fears further retrenchments and a reduction of activity. The gloom is reinforced by information which has been received regarding clinical costs in the 1979-80 financial year, the association having been told by Canberra that that grant will be maintained at the previous level with a small increase to allow only for inflation. No new clinical activities are to occur despite a continually rising demand.

Only last week the association decided that a new clinical session had to be provided each week at the Port Adelaide clinic, to cope with growing demand there, but to open this new session meant closing one somewhere else. With great reluctance the Ferryden Park clinic will be closed, and it is hoped that the clients there will be able to transfer to the nearby Parks health centre, though as yet the Parks centre provides no contraceptive clinics *per se*,

and has no medical staff able to provide such service after 5 p.m. each day. Whether the Parks Community Health Centre will adapt to meet the needs of the women of the area is at this stage uncertain, but I hope people will realise that if they miss out on family planning services it is due to the parsimony of the Federal Government, which refuses to let the association cope with the demands made upon it.

It is indeed highly ironical that the Fraser Government is refusing more money for the clinical costs of family planning and cutting grants for non-clinical costs when it is only four months since a great debate took place in the Federal Parliament on the Lusher motion, which proposed to cut out medical benefits for most terminations of pregnancy. Luckily the motion was lost, and I should incidentally like to congratulate the South Australian members of the House of Representatives on voting against the Lusher motion—Liberal and Labor; to a man they voted against Lusher. Those who followed the debate on the Lusher motion will have noticed how nearly every speaker, Labor or Liberal, back-bencher or Minister, stressed the need for increased family planning services in this country so that unwanted pregnancies would not occur. It was stressed time and again that this was the most practical way of avoiding abortions. The Minister of Health, Mr. Hunt, himself stressed this need for expansion of family planning services. Yet what do we see happening? A freeze on expansion of the provision of contraceptive services and a possible further savage cut in non-clinical, educative and promotional activities of Family Planning Associations. What hypocrisy on the part of the Federal Government, which will not even live up to what it admitted was necessary and desirable just four months ago. Again, I hope the women of South Australia will note what the Liberal Government is doing to them and judge that Government by its actions, rather than by its honeyed words of four months ago.

Finally, I express my sympathy to the families of the deceased former members of Parliament mentioned in the Governor's Speech. I should also like to make a request of you, Mr. President, concerning the printing of the names of the officers of this Parliament in the *Hansard* records. We all know that at the opening of our Parliament two months ago the position of Acting Black Rod was taken by Mrs. Jan Davis, and there was much publicity concerning the fact that a woman was performing this ceremonial role for the first time. It has even been written up as a first for the entire Westminster system of government in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association newsletter, which is circulated to all Parliaments in the British Commonwealth. Yet, *Hansard* records the officers of Parliament, using initials only, so that the sex of each officer is unknown to the reader.

The full names of honourable members are recorded in each *Hansard* volume so that sex is readily discernable to the reader, but for reasons unknown to me the same does not apply to the officers of Parliament. I should be grateful, Mr. President, if you could see whether this practice could be changed, so that first names are given of officers as well as of elected members. This would give credit where it was due and have the added advantage of pointing out the imbalance of the sexes which occurs among officers as well as among members at the present time. I support the motion.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.45 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 1 August at 2.15 p.m.