

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 23 July 1981

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PETROL SUPPLIES

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Members will be aware that petrol tanker drivers in South Australia who are members of the Transport Workers Union have decided to take strike action and that at this stage they do not intend to meet again before Tuesday. As a result, the Department of Mines and Energy is now preparing detailed advice for the Government on stocks which service stations are now holding. Later this afternoon, the Premier and I expect to be in a position to make a further statement following receipt of the department's advice. However, early indications point to a healthy situation with regard to stocks on hand in service stations.

With a continuation of normal demand for petrol, the stocks are certainly sufficient to last for a considerable time. In these circumstances, while the Government will be keeping the matter under close and constant review, it does not see the need, at this stage, to take any further action. At the same time, the Government would urge the public not to indulge in any panic buying of petrol. To do so would only worsen a situation which, at this stage, is manageable so long as there is co-operation from the public.

QUESTIONS

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about a Constitutional Convention.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: My question concerns the lack of action that has followed assurances given by the Premier, in September 1979, on the urgent need for some legislative reform of the South Australian Constitution to, as he put it, prevent the early calling of elections. This was to involve a Constitutional Convention, with public participation.

Since that time there have been various statements by the Premier and by the Attorney on the matter. Each statement seems to propel the issue further into the indefinite future. But in most of the references to date concerning the convention, which is supposed to last one week, the Government has spoken of having the convention discuss matters like the best length of a Parliamentary term, and how to control 'snap' elections. However, it is plain that, to gather together representatives of the community, legal and other experts, without whom such a convention would surely be a complete waste of time, and confine discussion to whether we should have three or four year Parliaments, would be ridiculous.

Other matters like the need for a Bill of Rights and the power of the Legislative Council in relation to Supply, and machinery for the review of Government actions, come within the ambit of any such convention. I suggest the time has come for the Government to become more specific about its plans. I hope that what apparently sounded like

a good idea to the Premier in 1979, when electoral considerations were foremost, has not now fallen by the wayside because it has proven too hard to handle. When is this promised convention to be held? Who will be invited? What will be the agenda, or at least the general ground rules of subject matter to be discussed? What will happen to any recommendations to emerge from its deliberations?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: At no stage have I or the Premier indicated that the Constitutional Convention conference will last for a week. We have said that a Constitutional conference will be convened to discuss, in particular, questions of how Governments can be compelled to serve their full term in office and the question of the length of those terms of office. There are other matters for consideration and inclusion on the agenda for such a conference, but it is premature to announce full details of those topics.

The present planning is for the Constitutional conference to be convened towards the end of November this year, subject to the availability of certain speakers and subject to the finalisation of arrangements for delegates who should be invited to that conference. At this stage it is premature to indicate the categories of delegates. If the conference does reach some conclusions on the topics that will be before it, I would expect that they would be decisions which the Government of the day will need to consider for possible legislation.

JUDGE'S STATEMENT

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about a statement made by His Honour Mr Justice Wells.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yesterday, His Honour Mr Justice Wells of the Supreme Court made a statement to jurors from the bench which was extensively reported in this morning's *Advertiser*. I share His Honour's desire in wanting to let the community know about the courts, the law and its administration and do not take issue with the fact that the statement was made. There is often much misunderstanding about the law which inhibits rational discussion of the judicial process. However, I believe it was ill-advised to enter into a discussion of the law of provocation, particularly in the context of the recent controversy about it.

The Court of Criminal Appeal will have to determine this question when the axe murder case comes before it. Mr Justice Wells may be one of the judges who will be eligible to sit on that case. His Honour's statement of law may or may not be correct, but I would have thought that this was something for an appeal court to pronounce upon after hearing argument. His Honour has run the risk of appearing to the public to have pre-judged this issue. This is particularly so when the subheading in the *Advertiser* refers to 'Provocation claim "merest nonsense"'. Justice must be seen to be done, and Mr Justice Wells may have unwittingly given the public the impression that he supported the ruling of his colleague on the bench, Mr Justice Sangster, while that ruling is subject to appeal.

Although I appreciate and respect the motives of Mr Justice Wells, I believe that he has run the risk of disqualifying himself from the appeal bench or, if he is not to sit on the bench, of appearing to pre-empt the appeal court's decision. I repeat that I am not criticising the fact of the statement. First, has the Attorney-General seen the statement made by His Honour Mr Justice Wells? Secondly, does the Attorney believe that it was appropriate for Mr Justice Wells to enter into a discussion of the law of

provocation in these circumstances and in this manner while an appeal was pending? Thirdly, if the Attorney considers that it is inappropriate, will the Crown take action in relation to Mr Justice Wells' disqualification from sitting on the appeal bench?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The answer to the first question is 'Yes'. The answer to the second question is that the judges are independent of the Executive, and it is not for me to reflect on the decision of His Honour to make such a statement. He was perfectly within his rights to make it and, in view of that answer, the third question is not applicable.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I ask a supplementary question. Does the Attorney believe that Mr Justice Wells' statement may have given the public the impression that he has prejudged the issue and is supporting the ruling of Mr Justice Sangster, when this matter is subject to appeal? Secondly, does the Attorney believe that Mr Justice Wells, in view of that statement, should be disqualified from sitting on the appeal bench?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The response which I have heard to the statement made by Mr Justice Wells has all been favourable. So far as the question of possible disqualification is concerned, that is a matter for the court, not for me.

FOOD PLUS STORES

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs on the matter of Food Plus stores. Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I am sure that the Minister is aware that British Petroleum is seeking to establish a number of stores at its service stations in the Adelaide area. I believe these are going to be called Food Plus stores, and it is hoped that they will be open for 24-hours a day. In a number of council areas where British Petroleum has applied to establish these stores, they have been opposed very strenuously by local business men and local residents, and I believe that so far those people have been successful in preventing British Petroleum from establishing these stores. I ask the Minister whether he has had any discussions with British Petroleum on the question of the establishment of these stores, or has had discussions with any other oil company, because I believe that other oil companies are interested in doing the same thing. If the Minister did have any such discussions, did he give any encouragement to British Petroleum to establish these stores in its service stations?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The question of the 24-hour stores is not within my portfolio but is within that of my colleague the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who has jurisdiction over closing hours. Any discussions have been with him; they have not been with me. It would not be within my jurisdiction to allow them, prevent them, or to have any bearing on the ability of British Petroleum or any other petrol companies to operate these stores. It is a matter of operation. I will refer the question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

MURDER CASE

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Attorney-General on the statement made by Mr Justice Wells and reported in the newspaper this morning. Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think most members would be pleased that Mr Justice Wells has made the statement he has made in the Supreme Court, as reported in the press.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I'm not complaining about that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No, I am not saying you are. I think you expressed some sentiments along those lines as well. In the first part of his statement Mr Justice Wells said that, despite suggestions to successive Governments, nothing had been done to enable the community to understand the courts, their workings, and the law they administered. I ask the Attorney-General what recommendations have been made. Have recommendations been made to this Government as well as the previous Government, and will the Attorney inform the Council what the Government may propose to do in relation to those recommendations?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am not exactly sure to what Mr Justice Wells was referring. I think it may well have been a judicial bulletin or gazette that had been referred to me as I understood it had been referred to previous Governments. No action on it has been taken by any Government for the principal reason, I think, of cost. However, it is a matter which can certainly be revived and further examined if it is seen to be a viable means of communicating to the public. I do have at present some recommendations for some more information to be made available to schools and to the community on the structure of the courts and their operation. Whilst no final decision has been taken on the publication of that material, that would necessarily be useful information in promoting a greater awareness of the roles and respective jurisdictions of the courts. I think that what His Honour Mr Justice Wells was referring to was largely an apathy on the part of the public towards judicial proceedings and the role of the courts, and to the fact that very few people take much interest in the day-to-day proceedings of the courts.

One can make that criticism of people's interest in the Parliament. A number of members have periodically raised questions as to how more people can be attracted to sit in on debates in Parliament and take an interest in what goes on within the Parliament. So, it applies not just to courts but also to the Legislature. Some means by which information can be communicated will certainly be given further consideration. The media also has a responsibility, but it is limited in the amount of information it can publish on the way in which courts and the Legislature operate.

FREE SPECTACLES

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question about free spectacles.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Is it about computers?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: No, not on this occasion. I have a copy of the *Murray Valley Standard* dated 27 November 1980.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: Have you only just got it?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: It has only just been sent to me by a constituent who believes that he has been cheated by the lies of this Government.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I rise on a point of order. I take exception to the honourable member's remark and ask him to withdraw.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Come on! That's being quite ridiculous—I said 'lies of the Government'. I wasn't referring to individual members.

The PRESIDENT: Will you withdraw?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Of course I will not withdraw.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Dr Cornwall has been asked to withdraw the remark that he made.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I rise on a point of order. I submit to you, Mr President, that there is no Standing Order which deals with it.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: No. 208—objectionable words.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The words that the honourable member used were 'lies of the Government'. That is not attributing a lie to any particular member of the Government. It is a general political comment about the Government. I do not believe that it ought to be deemed unparliamentary; nor do I believe that it is a reflection.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I rise on a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition has no right to speak.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If both sides will take stock for a moment, we will see what this is all about. Will the Attorney-General please tell me to which words he takes objection?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Hon. Dr Cornwall made a reflection and used the words 'lies of this Government'. Clearly, the way in which he used those words is objectionable, and I ask him to withdraw them.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Dr Cornwall has been asked to withdraw those words. Will he do so?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: No, I will not withdraw them, because they are clearly not unparliamentary. I did not refer to members individually. Are Government members going to suggest that, in the cut and thrust of normal debate in the Parliament, the use of the words 'lies of the Government' is unparliamentary? What are we coming to? They are totally paranoid if they say that.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Well, explain them.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I was about to do so.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: May I put a submission to you, Sir, on the matter?

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I submit that the Hon. Dr Cornwall is not required to withdraw the words because, if you look at Standing Order 193, you will see that the words which the honourable member used did not refer to any specific person, to the Governor, to the Parliament, to any member, or to any judges.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Read Standing Order 208.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: If considered in relation to Standing Order 208, I do not believe that the use of those words was objectionable. It has previously been ruled (and I agree) that calling an honourable member a liar is unparliamentary. However, I do not believe that, when the words 'they have told lies' are generalised in relation to the Government or a certain political Party, they ought to be deemed unparliamentary within the context of the Standing Order. If they were to be, clearly there would be a severe restriction on the debate.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! It has been a very interesting, although I think a fairly purposeless, exercise. Nevertheless, I rule that the honourable member should either withdraw the words that are supposedly objectionable, or I will have to resort to another course. I therefore ask the honourable member to withdraw.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I refuse to withdraw, and I will give my reasons for so doing.

The PRESIDENT: Then I have no option—

The Hon. Anne Levy: Under Standing Order 208, he can explain them.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the Hon. Dr Cornwall can explain to the Council's satisfaction that what he said did not mean what Government members thought it meant, I

will accept that. Does the honourable member wish to make that explanation?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Yes, I shall be delighted to do so. Members opposite, at the time I was trying to explain my question, were interjecting quite vigorously, and one said, 'Will it be on computers?' In reply, I said, 'No, not on this occasion, but it will concern another one of the lies of the Government.'

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: That's objectionable.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: It is not objectionable.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I believe that that is sufficient explanation. The Hon. Dr Cornwall now has an opportunity to withdraw his remark.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Mr President, what do you mean by 'That is sufficient explanation'?

The PRESIDENT: I do not want any further explanation. I ask you to withdraw the words.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: No, I refuse to.

The PRESIDENT: Then I have no option but to name the Hon. Dr Cornwall.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Under Standing Order 210, I move:

That the Hon. J. R. Cornwall be suspended from the service of the Council.

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (10)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, L. H. Davis, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, K. T. Griffin (teller), C. M. Hill, D. H. Laidlaw, and R. J. Ritson.

Noes (11)—The Hons. Frank Blevins, G. L. Bruce, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall, C. W. Creedon, J. E. Dunford, N. K. Foster, Anne Levy, K. L. Milne, C. J. Sumner (teller), and Barbara Wiese.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Dr Cornwall.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave, again, to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question about free spectacles.

The PRESIDENT: I believe that leave was granted. The Hon. Dr Cornwall may continue.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: In the *Murray Valley Standard* of 27 November 1980, under the heading 'Eye-to-eye on Spectacles', the following article appeared:

Pensioners and disadvantaged people in the Lower Murray area will be able to see 'eye to eye' with a new scheme allowing them free spectacles. Member for Murray, Mr David Wotton announced on Tuesday that free spectacles and optical aids would now be available for country pensioners. The State Government had, for many years, provided free spectacles for pensioners and other disadvantaged people through the outpatients' department of city teaching hospitals, Mr Wotton said.

However, country people had to travel to Adelaide for this service, often at their own discomfort and inconvenience. Eligibility for the scheme would be restricted initially to pensioners with health benefit entitlement cards and their dependents, he said. The scheme has been approved by Health Minister, Mrs Jennifer Adamson.

It will be progressively introduced throughout country areas, with initial services at 11 country centres, including Murray Bridge. This will extend the service initially to disadvantaged people, and provide it as close to their homes as possible, Mr Wotton said. At centres where adequate and appropriate ophthalmological services were available, professional work would be done by ophthalmologists. In other areas, optometrists would provide a professional service. Mr Wotton acknowledged the close cooperation and help of the Royal College of Ophthalmologists and the Australian Optometrical Association, in developing the scheme.

That scheme has never happened. The free spectacle scheme has not been introduced. The promise was made and this Government, which consistently tells untruths, made a firm announcement last November, but nothing has

been done. In those circumstances, I think I am entitled to say that the Government tells lies. I am in possession of a letter from the member for Murray, David Wotton, M.P., addressed to one of his constituents, Mr A. R. Pahl, of Murray Bridge, who wrote to the Minister in June. Mr Pahl was a patient constituent who had waited seven months for this service, which was announced seven months earlier in November.

Mr Pahl's letter to Mr Wotton asked why nothing had happened and why he was not able to get his free spectacles as he was the holder of a pensioner health benefit and was one of the disadvantaged people in the area. In reply, the Minister said:

I am afraid that your second query has been 'shelved' for the time being. Re-negotiations with the Government and the Australian Ophthalmological Association will be taking place.

That was despite the fact that in November Mr Wotton acknowledged the 'close co-operation and help of the Royal College of Ophthalmologists and the Australian Optometrical Association'. In those circumstances, as I said before, I think I am entitled to say that from time to time this Government tells lies.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Dr Cornwall is not entitled to do that. He has just been through one exercise where he escaped an order of the House, and I ask him to withdraw that statement.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Are you trying it again, Mr President? We have already had a vote on it.

The PRESIDENT: I am asking the honourable member not to continue in that vein. As a matter of fact, I have asked him to withdraw his remark and not to continue saying that the Government or anyone else is telling lies.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: With the greatest respect, Mr President, I did not refer to anyone as telling lies.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: You didn't have to.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I am on my feet, Mr Attorney. If you want to take a point of order, you can do so. I am looking for a bit of help from the Chair.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think I have given the Hon. Dr Cornwall all the help that I can. I have asked the honourable member to withdraw the accusation that the Government tells lies and not to continue repeating it. The Standing Orders are quite specific, which the honourable member knows. Therefore, there is no reason why he should be allowed to continue with that accusation.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Mr President, are you ruling that the words used by the honourable member that, as I understand it, the Government tells lies, or words to that effect (that is, without any reference to any individual or anyone mentioned in the Standing Orders), are objectionable or offensive?

The PRESIDENT: I am saying that they are unparliamentary. I do not need to explain every letter of my interpretation of the Standing Orders. I have asked the honourable member to withdraw and not to continually accuse people of telling lies.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Mr President, I have asked for a ruling on whether you deem those words to be objectionable or offensive within the meaning of Standing Orders.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You aren't even entitled to be speaking.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am taking a point of order.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Under what Standing Order?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Under Standing Order 193, which provides that the use of objectionable or offensive words shall be considered highly disorderly. I am asking you, Mr President, for your ruling on whether you consider the words used by the Hon. Dr Cornwall to be in that category.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think that your point of order needs any clarification. If I had not ruled that way I would not have asked the honourable member to withdraw.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Therefore, I move to dissent from your ruling.

The PRESIDENT: I have asked the Hon. Dr Cornwall to withdraw the accusation that the Government is telling lies and I have asked him not to continue in that vein.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am moving a motion to dissent from your ruling.

The PRESIDENT: It is not a ruling—it is just an order of the Chair.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I have asked for your ruling on those words.

The PRESIDENT: I gave a ruling inasmuch as I asked the honourable member to withdraw. That is what I have done. Either the Hon. Dr Cornwall withdraws or we go through the same process again.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I wish to dissent from your ruling.

The PRESIDENT: It is not a ruling but a request.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: In order to make a request, there must be a statement or a ruling from you that the words are objectionable or offensive. If they are not objectionable or offensive then you have no authority to ask the honourable member to withdraw or explain the words.

The PRESIDENT: I realise the Leader's ability to debate these matters in court, but this is a straight out direction under Standing order 208. I now ask the Hon. Dr Cornwall to withdraw those words.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: No, I refuse to withdraw. I do not consider that they are unparliamentary.

The PRESIDENT: I have no option but to name the honourable member.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Mr President, I wish to give you another opportunity on this matter. It seems that it ought to be taken in two steps.

The PRESIDENT: Order! This is not a matter that can be debated.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am taking a point of order.

The PRESIDENT: Order! You have not the right to request that on a point of order whatever. Please resume your seat.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I merely wish to give you the opportunity to make a ruling on those words and have the Council decide on those words prior to getting to a situation of naming the member again.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Again, under Standing Order 210, in the light of the fact that you, Mr President, from the Chair, have named the honourable member, I move:

That the Hon. J. R. Cornwall be suspended from the service of the Council.

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (10)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, L. H. Davis, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, K. T. Griffin (teller), C. M. Hill, D. H. Laidlaw, and R. J. Ritson.

Noes (11)—The Hons. Frank Blevins, G. L. Bruce, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall, C. W. Creedon, J. E. Dunford, N. K. Foster, Anne Levy, K. L. Milne, C. J. Sumner (teller), and Barbara Wiese.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I will ask my question without any further explanation. Why did the Minister make a firm announcement about the provision of spectacles which was false and misleading? What negotiations are taking place, and why? When will the Pensioner Spectacle Service be available?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring down a reply.

HEALTH

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to ask the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question about health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is quite out of order for the Minister to mumble innuendos prior to my asking him a question.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Does the Hon. Mr Foster wish to use the leave granted? If he does, he should use the opportunity.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I wish that the whispering giants would have the courage to raise their voices—

The PRESIDENT: I wish that you—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:—so that you would have the opportunity to put them in their rightful place—

The PRESIDENT: Order! If you do not wish to use the time, then please resume your seat.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am using the time, and if that is your wish—

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member will resume his seat.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order.

The PRESIDENT: What is your point of order?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: If I had asked a question about a 5ft. salami I would not be in this situation. You have aborted my leave. Under what rule did you abort it? I refer to what happened last Tuesday? I am sick and tired of this and I will not ask a question in your Chamber if you are not going to pull those animals into order for what is going on.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Burdett said, 'Who are you to ask a question about health?' Why shouldn't I take objection? Have your Chamber. That is what happened this afternoon, and you know it.

LAW REFORM

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Attorney-General on the matter of law reform.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: This explanation concerns the Attorney-General and probably the Minister of Health. The law is lagging far behind the advances being made by medical science. The problems being presented to lawmakers in coping with such questions as banks of frozen human embryos (potentially disposable,) *in vitro* fertilisation and artificial insemination are difficult and involved.

Similar problems exist in other medical areas owing to the inability of the lawmaking process to keep pace with medical technology. Some indication of the scope of the medico-legal vacuum that presently exists can be readily understood by examining the existing law relating to informed consent, minors' consent, definition of death, transplant of human tissues, storage of human tissue, sale of human tissue, anatomy law, contracting in or contracting out procedures for removal of human tissue after death, and many more issues involved in the medico-legal area.

Has the Government any legislative plans in the coming session for any of these areas I have mentioned, and has it

any plans of inquiry and investigation for future legislation covering any of the involved problems mentioned in my explanation?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Some aspects of the matters raised by the Hon. Mr DeGaris are currently being examined by officers of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. I think some aspects are also being considered by Health Ministers. I will obtain more information and let the Hon. Mr DeGaris have a reply as to the details. So far as the legislative programme is concerned, I know that the Minister of Health has some plans in respect of human tissue transplants specifically, but again I will seek more detailed information and bring back a reply.

SALES TAX

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to asking a question of the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, regarding sales tax on furniture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I have read with some concern that it has been rumoured since May this year that the Federal Government intends to increase the sales tax on furniture by up to 500 per cent, and Mr Simpson, Director of the New South Wales Furniture Manufacturers Guild, has written to Mr Howard, the Federal Treasurer, asking for assurances that this will not occur. He has received from Mr Howard a reply that is non-committal, and this leads me and most other people to believe that, by his being non-committal, the rumoured 500 per cent increase is on the board.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What is the tax now?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: It is 2½ per cent, and I believe the proposed increase is to 15 per cent. At present, about \$1 100 000 000 worth of furniture is being sold in Australia each year, which nets the Government about \$27 000 000 in sales tax. If the proposed tax rate of 15 per cent comes about, the Government will receive about \$165 000 000 in sales tax. Given the past record of this Government, I believe that some action ought to be taken. New South Wales has taken action. There has been no mention of any politician in South Australia taking action, and it has concerned me for a long time that the Premier (Mr Tonkin) seems to be the only one of the Liberal Premiers who never attacks Fraser federalism or decisions made by the Federal Government.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I rise on a point of order. The member is giving an opinion in his statement and, under Standing Order 109, he is not to put any argument, opinion or hypothetical case, nor inference or imputation. I take the point of order that he should not continue in that vein.

The PRESIDENT: I uphold the point of order. The honourable member was getting away from the explanation.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I am giving an opinion, the same as a person—

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: You are not allowed to, under Standing Orders.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: If everyone here stopped giving an opinion in this Council, we would have no-one here.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member must make an explanation.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: In my opinion, if this increase succeeds, unemployment will occur. Not only will people not be able to afford to buy their homes: they will not be able to buy a bed. I have said that here previously.

Will the Attorney-General ask the Premier to make the strongest possible representations to the Prime Minister against any proposed sales tax increase on home furnishings? Secondly, will he also bring to the notice of the Prime Minister the proposed increase in interest tax rates and inform him of his election promise to reduce interest rates by 2 per cent? We could nearly say that was a lie, but I am not saying that. The promise was to reduce the rates by 2 per cent, and they have increased by nearly 4 per cent since last July. We could nearly call the Prime Minister a liar, but I will not do that. It would offend the Council.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the question to the Premier for his consideration.

TOURIST INFORMATION

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Tourism, concerning tourist information.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: In November last year I asked whether the Department of Tourism could provide useful information on fishing for holiday anglers. I pointed out that fishing was the most popular participation sport in Australia and that South Australia enjoyed a national reputation as an excellent fishing resort. In February this year the Minister advised that the Fisheries Department had published a booklet entitled *Recreational Fishing Guide, 1981*, which was available from that department. He also advised that it had been suggested to the Department of Tourism that copies be made available for purchase from that department also.

Since then I have obtained a copy of this fishing guide and have shown it to people who have greater knowledge of the sport than I. I think the Fisheries Department should be congratulated on producing this booklet, which is apparently very useful as far as it goes. Unfortunately, it does not contain much of the information which is highly desirable for tourists, such as information about off-shore fishing spots, the availability of bait, launching ramps, and accommodation. It also does not contain information about places of access to beaches through private land. Without this sort of information, visiting anglers cannot fully pursue their hobby.

In addition, when I checked with the Tourist Bureau a few weeks ago I discovered that the fishing guide, with all its inadequacies, is still not available for sale there. Whilst I am dealing with tourist information, I point out that another area that has been sadly neglected by the Department of Tourism is the increasingly popular pastime of bushwalking. The Tourist Bureau has no information on walking trails in the Adelaide Hills and has no books or maps on the subject. Apparently, there used to be a book available on the subject but it is available no longer, and people inquiring about maps are referred by the Tourist Bureau to the Lands Department.

For a Government that makes a lot of noise about promoting tourism for South Australia it is doing very little to assist tourists to enjoy the State's pleasures and amenities. In view of the fact that walking and fishing are healthy activities and are increasingly popular with holiday makers, and since the Minister of Tourism is also the Minister of Health, would she direct her department to produce and distribute suitable written material on these activities? In the meantime will she direct her department to provide copies of the recreational fishing guide for sale immediately at Tourist Bureau offices?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I shall refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

SCHOOL PREMISES

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, a question on the use of education facilities.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I wish to repeat a question that I asked on 4 June this year to which I have not yet received a reply. As it was in the previous session I understand that no reply will be published in *Hansard* unless I ask the question again. I do so, but hope that it will be understood that the question dates from 4 June and not from 23 July. On 3 June the press reported an announcement from the Minister of Education regarding a new scheme on renting out State school premises to community groups and clubs. It was reported that school councils would be able to hire out their premises to any community groups or clubs and would be able to set charges for this instead of using charges that were set out some years ago by the Education Department. Furthermore, 10 per cent of the charges is now to go back to the Education Department to meet running costs. The charges to community groups will be greatly increased as a result of this measure.

In one case the cost of hiring a school hall increased from \$100 to \$250 for one night—a staggering increase in one go. These new charges will not result in greater community use, as surely fewer community groups would be able to afford the increased charges. Furthermore, the Minister's statement indicated that some groups using school premises would be exempt from such charges, and he instanced religious organisations using facilities for religious purposes. I seek an explanation as to why churches wishing to hold religious services of any sort should be allowed free access to State schools. I understand that at least one school council has unanimously rejected this notion and feels that it should have the authority to charge religious organisations the same amount as it charges any other organisation using the facilities.

Did the Minister consult the school councils before stating that school premises would be free for religious bodies? Did he consult with non-religious groups like the Humanist Society? Can such non-religious groups as the Humanist Society use school facilities also without charge? In the light of objections by school councils, will the Minister reconsider this decision and enable school councils to charge exactly the same hire charges to religious organisations as to everyone else? Will the Minister indicate, if he refuses to revoke this decision, whether he is determined that church and State be no longer separate in South Australia and that taxpayers are in this way to subsidise religious institutions?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I cannot help pointing out to the honourable member that religious institutions are catered for in legislation in several areas, one being the Local Government Act. However, I will refer the whole host of questions asked by the honourable member to my colleague and bring back a reply as quickly as possible.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Where death or injury results from a motor vehicle accident, damage to property is almost invariably involved as well. Thus the same incident may give rise to separate claims for personal injury and for property damage. Under the rules of estoppel a judgment given in respect of one claim may govern the determination of vital issues involved in the other claim, and similarly representations made in the course of negotiations leading to the settling of one claim may be held to bind the defendant in legal proceedings in which the other claim is litigated. These principles of estoppel create problems for insurers who may want to settle relatively minor claims for property damage unembarrassed by the possibility that the negotiations may create estoppels in respect of major claims for damages resulting from personal injury.

Section 125 (3) of the Motor Vehicles Act addresses itself to this problem by providing that evidence of negotiations or a judgment in respect of one claim is not admissible in proceedings relating to the other claim except where both claims are insured by the same insurer. The S.G.I.C. carries all motor vehicle third party insurance in this State and also a certain proportion of the insurance relating to property damage. Because of the exception referred to above, the S.G.I.C. has to be unduly cautious in processing claims for property damage, because its negotiations are not protected by section 125 (3) and may thus have ramifications in relation to a much more significant claim for personal injury. There seems little justification for the exception; it merely creates difficulties and delays for the S.G.I.C. and its clients; accordingly, the present Bill seeks to remove it. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 removes the exception referred to above. This will mean that negotiations or proceedings in relation to property damage can be conducted by the S.G.I.C. without impinging upon negotiations or proceedings in relation to personal injury.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 22 July. Page 112.)

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: In speaking to this motion, I wish, first, to thank His Excellency the Governor for the Speech with which he was pleased to open Parliament. I reaffirm my loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, the Queen of Australia, and to His Excellency the Governor, her representative in South Australia.

I thank His Excellency for his expressions of sympathy on the occasion of the death of Sir Thomas Playford, and I extend my sympathy and condolences to Lady Playford and to the Playford family.

I am sure that honourable members are aware of the recent death of Lady McEwin and I am sure, too, that our sympathies are all extended to Sir Lyell McEwin in his bereavement.

I wish also to express my pleasure and congratulations on the award made recently to the Hon. Ren DeGaris, and

am pleased to see that his length of service in this Council has been rewarded.

Amongst the matters touched upon by His Excellency were several questions of interest to me. I propose to touch upon four issues, the first being the matter of business and business confidence in South Australia in relation to the political philosophies of the two Parties. The second point of discussion will be the matter of deregulation, and I will say a few words as well about matters of resource development and education.

I think that a good starting point for considering the problems facing business in South Australia is to consider the history of the philosophy of the Party presently in Government. I will perhaps begin with the principles expounded by Adam Smith in the 18th century. It is of interest that the political history available to Adam Smith was that of powerful trade guilds, powerful and very large companies, and powerful monopolies that were sustained, in many cases, by the Crown. When Adam Smith proposed his free-enterprise theory, it could not have meant total freedom and no Government intervention, because, in order to achieve that freedom, it would have been necessary for substantial Government intervention in order to break the hold that monopolies exerted upon the economy at that time.

Even today, it is the guiding economic principle of the Liberal Party that the purpose of Government intervention is to ensure the continuation of a substantial measure of competition in all fields of business. The point that people need to understand quite clearly is that that is quite a different purpose from that of intervention by a socialist Government, because the goal of a socialist Government is that of total ownership and control of the means of production, distribution and exchange of wealth.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: That is completely wrong and you know it. It's total misrepresentation.

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: No, it is the role of a socialist Government. However, I am not accusing the honourable member of belonging to a socialist Party.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: I see.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: For these reasons, the business man might expect a pure Liberal Government to create a climate of competition, in which the competition comes entirely from other businesses and in which none comes from the State. A business man could expect a socialist Government increasingly to gather unto itself ownership and control of financial and industrial enterprises, regardless of the cost of inefficiencies and losses that occur when both management and labour are working for Governments rather than for self-betterment. But, of course, the pure models of socialist Governments and Liberal capitalist Governments seldom exist: there is usually a mix, and, while Parties have philosophical frameworks within which they work, often pragmatic decisions are made that appear at times to go against the mainstream of political thought that marks a certain Party or Government.

However, it still remains generally true that Liberal capitalist Governments and Liberal democratic Governments are increasingly working towards an atmosphere of competitiveness in the belief that it is this competition that is the stimulus for hard work and inventiveness, whereas it is generally true that Governments with a substantial element of socialism within their ranks will generally be moving towards more State ownership and Government intervention.

One of the things that business must realise in the heady excitement of working within a competitive economic climate is that the freedom to expand and to gain market dominance and make profits also necessarily includes a

freedom to go broke and to fail. Business under a Liberal Government probably must face this fact and realise that, whereas it can by all means expect a Liberal Government to nurture a business atmosphere, thereby making profits possible, it should by no means expect a Liberal Government to protect automatically against competition from competitors, make Government grants, or mount rescue operations. This reality of the market place sometimes frightens business people, particularly small business people, who feel vulnerable in the face of such competitive forces.

I was pleased to see His Excellency's reference again to the small business advisory mechanism which has been set up and which is primarily not a hand-out mechanism but a preventive mechanism to guide and advise people on the forces of the market place. However, it is often tempting for business to look at the stresses of the market place, and then to look to alternative systems and consider that there may be a choice between the two systems.

One of the reasons why one might think of choosing other than a Liberal Government is that the philosophical character of Labor Parties is never pure: it is never pure socialist or pure communist. It is this very mix of philosophies within the Australian Labor Party in South Australia that could, if thought was not given to the matter, make people feel that both Parties are very much the same from the point of view of business. But, of course, they are not. The A.L.P. has a good sprinkling of Christian democrats such as the member for Hartley and the member for Norwood in another place and, I suspect, the Hon. Gordon Bruce in this Council.

It has a sprinkling of sincere and able but perhaps misguided liberal democrats who joined the Labor Party with a keen sense of social justice and have not yet realised that they joined the wrong Party. There are the social democrats such as the member for Playford who delivered such an eloquent and stinging criticism of Marxist socialism last year, and the A.L.P. also contains some dedicated Marxist Socialists. Only recently the communist press was complaining that the left did not have the numbers to control the State A.L.P. Caucus and the *Tribune* went on to name the Hon. Mr Blevins and the Hon. Mr Dunford, and the members for Elizabeth, Salisbury and Stuart as the pillars of the State A.L.P. left. With this mix of philosophies it is difficult to ascertain the net philosophical character of the Australian Labor Party.

To understand it, I think it is important to look at what I call the parable of the ants. Once upon a time there were several columns of ants all going in different directions. As each ant passed another column of ants it perceived that it was going in the opposite direction to the other ants. However, the truth of the matter was that the ants were all on a log which was floating downstream. In spite of the fact that within the A.L.P. there are three or four groups thinking they are going in different political directions, the A.L.P. Parliamentary wing is continuing to float downstream. It is continuing straight towards the grey, cold ocean of Marxist socialism.

If the business community believes it is as well off with one Party as it is with the other, it ought to look again, because the system of government which the A.L.P. is turning towards has produced cultural drabness, economic inefficiency and impoverishment of the working class in every socialist republic that has ever been established. It may be that one just cannot draw conclusions by looking around the world at the track record of socialism. Some people would look at countries having a hard time with socialism and blame other factors such as geography, history, ecology, and language as being such that you cannot

attribute their plight to their system of government. That may be so.

Indeed, it may be that, if only one could conduct a controlled experiment, one could draw conclusions. If we could find a homogenous society and strip it of its wealth, its culture and instruments of Government and then divide it in half and govern one half by a system of socialism and the other half by a system of Liberal democracy, then perhaps after about 30 years we could determine the difference between the two systems. Such an experiment has been carried out. It was carried out not by design but by a tragic accident of history. Its results are quite apparent. If one wants to see the results of that experiment, one only has to look either side of the Berlin wall. I remind the Council that that is a wall designed to keep people in, not to keep people out. It is a wall designed to stop people escaping from a system that was set up side by side with a system of liberal democracy. The socialist half of that city seems to be a place that people want to escape from. As the business community looks at the various trials and tribulations and some of the pains of the competitive system of the Liberal philosophy, it should also look each side of the Berlin wall and around the world to see which system of government has a proven track record of prosperity.

I now turn to a matter affecting business confidence. It is not the fault of any political Party but a fact of life and it would operate regardless of the Party in power. It is a factor which I consider to be one of the key reasons why South Australia is perhaps not as exciting a place for industry as we might like it to be. That factor is lack of population growth. More than 80 per cent of the work force is employed either in manufacturing at a tertiary level or in the rendering of services. In fact, we have achieved what is known as a saturated society. That is a society in which each of us lives in some sort of a house; each of us has clothing to keep us warm; each of us rides in some sort of motor car; and most people have some sort of television set. You cannot have a growth in consumer spending and consumer services when you do not have a growth in consumers.

I will not enter the world of ethics and morality at this point, but I will make an observation. The number of pregnancy terminations that have been carried out in South Australia over the last 10 years, at the current teacher/pupil ratio, accounts for about the number of teaching jobs that would employ the number of teachers presently unemployed.

It is not only a story of teachers: it is the story of Monarto, it is the story of the Land Commission, and it is the story that zero population growth, in many cases, equals zero economic growth. A very fine and prominent member of the Australian Labor Party, the former Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr Hudson, observed this point. He looked not at the question of the termination of pregnancies but at the question of growth by immigration. He made a number of public statements indicating that he thought that low population growth was related to lack of economic growth and suggested increased immigration on the basis that these people come here unsaturated. In other words, they come here without a house, without furniture and without a motor car; and quite the opposite to threatening jobs they make their own jobs and others as well. Of course, that view was not acceptable to the unions and Mr Clyde Cameron publicly castigated Mr Hudson and the matter was dropped. However, Mr Hudson was quite correct.

I think that the question this society must ultimately ask itself when it backs off from a fundamental issue such as this, because of individual protests or sectional interests, is whether the good of the whole society is the same thing as the sum of the goods of individuals as perceived by those individuals, or is it something else? I do not expect to solve

that problem today, but I think it is worth placing it before Parliament for consideration.

I think that people in business have to understand that regardless of the Party in power, until we get a population growth of some sort, we are going to be left with our vacant Monarto and our empty building blocks. Another point of interest on the whole question of the validity of the Liberal theory of the market place concerns some of the remarks that have been thrown around in relation to petrol pricing. I am sure everyone knows that the Liberals stated quite clearly during the public discussion on this matter that they had faith in the forces of the market place.

Ultimately, as we know, a measure of Government interference took place. It was said that our faith in the forces of the market place had failed. I do not believe for a moment that the market forces failed on that issue. They were not exerted and then failed—they were just never there and they have not been there for a long time. The market forces determining the retail prices of petrol disappeared when the friendly little service station with pumps carrying seven different brands disappeared because the oil companies, although they are competitive certainly amongst themselves (they are not monopolies: they are a series of big companies competing viciously against each other), are not competing for the public dollar on the basis of price, quality or service: they are competing against each other for control of the market place.

When the oil companies first acquired ownership of outlet sites and the one brand service station became the rule rather than the exception and as they developed a rather complex and manipulative style of contracting with various franchise holders and site operators, they acquired much power, the use of which they did not explore at that time, because at that stage the fuel situation was one of bountiful supply and cheap prices. The form of competition then was, given the fact that the prices were rock bottom, how many chocolate rabbits or plastic mugs one got with one brand compared with the other.

The moment the market started to shrink, the oil companies started to fight tooth and nail for an increasing share of a diminishing market and, then realising the power that they had over the retail outlets, they began to use that power. The situation was almost like a group of people around a chess board playing a big chess game—my rook takes your bishop: you pay me three unprofitable outlets and I will give you a profitable outlet in a different place. The poor retailers and customers had little control over this. They had little control over the choice of brand, quality or price.

This situation is entirely consistent with the situation that Adam Smith faced when he proposed Government intervention to the extent necessary to reintroduce competition. In fact, that is the solution which the Minister of Consumer Affairs has proposed. He also explained why it is not presently achievable. It is not presently achievable because the true solution, that is, divorce, will be extremely difficult to achieve on a 'one off' State basis. A large amount of our petrol in South Australia comes directly from Altona in Victoria.

Large amounts of petrol are driven back and forth across State boundaries. As members know, as soon as a large vested interest is interfered with unilaterally by one State and has substantial interstate trading, it immediately resorts to the High Court on matters involving section 92 of the Constitution. Furthermore, the Federal Government has entered the legislative field without solving the problem, and the possibility of inconsistencies between State and Federal laws arise.

The South Australian Government, whilst seeing the idealistic solution, a solution that is perfectly consistent

with Liberal principles, in the end has settled for a more limited solution which is no ultimate long-term solution. In the whole sorry business it is simply not true that our faith in the market forces is misplaced. When we can achieve national divorce of petrol wholesaling from petrol retailing, then I am sure that the forces of the market place will work perfectly.

I want now to pass on to the matter of deregulation. Members of this Council are doubtless aware that the Government has announced a policy of deregulation, but I want to talk a little bit more about the implications of the word 'deregulation', because it flows from the sort of concept or notion of being overgoverned. It is useful to be a little more specific about what might be meant by it. The Leader of the Opposition was right when he said that we are not going to get rid of large quantities of regulations, that we are not going to suddenly cross off every second regulation in the body of the law. However, we are attempting to produce some sanity in the more anomalous areas. The sort of matters of substance that ought to be reviewed include several obvious examples. For example, we have had before this Parliament the repeal of the Appraisers and Auctioneers Act, the review of the Residential Tenancies Act, and many more.

However, my concept of deregulation goes a little further than that because this is dealing only with the question of a review of statutory anomalies. It is dealing only with a tour through the Statute Books to try to remove unnecessary or onerous provisions that have lain unnoticed for a time. As the Hon. Mr Sumner pointed out, the Legislature is only one branch of Government. We have Administration, the Judiciary and other branches of Government and, as I hope to show shortly, we have a fourth branch of Government which is not even supposed to be there but which I call the sub-system or the alternative Government.

It is useful to look at the question of Government as it affects these other branches of Government. While I congratulate the Government on the measures it has already taken to review some of the legislative anomalies, I would like to see the Government use the proposed statutory authorities review committee as an agent to look at some of these other aspects of possible over-government. Parliament is the agency which could play a vital role in such an examination. The development of Cabinet Government following the golden age of Parliament gave rise to the expressions of the need for Parliament to oversee the Executive branch of Government. It was Gladstone who summed it up in the words:

It is not for Parliament to govern but it is for Parliament to call to account those who do govern.

It is this matter of calling to account those who do govern that has been the subject of discussion not only by me but also by the Hon. Mr DeGaris and the Leader of the Opposition. It may be that the Statutory Authorities Review Committee can perform this function. The question of the statutory authorities is of interest to me, not because they are statutory *per se* but because some of them (and not others) can amount to a system of government which is not answerable to Parliament or the courts, and which is therefore an alternative system of government apart from and largely independent of Parliament, the Executive and the courts.

So statutory authorities that are subject to the general direction of the Minister, or statutory authorities that are advisory, are not of great concern to me. That is because I am one of those who believe that the system of responsible government (whereby the Government departments are ultimately answerable not to an unsackable unquestionable administrator but to an eminently sackable and eminently examinable Minister) provides sufficient accountability.

Having known a number of Liberal Ministers, I have no doubt that the access that people have through the Parliamentary cap that the Minister wears is a substantial check upon the exercise of Executive powers, coupled with the role of the media and the role of questioning in Parliament.

I believe that the responsible government system we have provides those checks in a Government where the Minister indeed has the power. But there are a number of bodies that have developed that seem to escape Ministerial control and, the moment that happens, the elector's right to have some say in how he is governed and in who governs him disappears. What is the use of going to see a member of Parliament, getting an appointment with the Minister, complaining, and seeking redress for an administrative procedure, and for the Minister to say, 'I am sorry, I have no power to direct'? To create administrative bodies not subject to administrative direction is to sever that part of the Executive Government from democratic control.

Similarly, to create *quasi* judicial tribunals that are not required to follow any of the rules that have made our system of courts such an impartial and just system and then to deny the right of appeal from some tribunals to the courts is to separate that section of the administration from justice. There is a hoary old argument that is often put up when independent bodies are created to administer various Government functions. The argument that is put up is that the purpose is to place certain important matters beyond politics.

I do not see why that should necessarily be a good thing, anyway, but there is the argument. It is that it places the matter beyond politics. Of course, it does not place the matter beyond politics. A lot of these independent bodies, once they become highly independent, become perfect agents for responsibility shifting. They become perfect instruments for the rewarding of friends and perfect instruments for the perpetuation of one Party's policies long after the Party has lost power at the polls, so they are highly political, but, by making them independent of the Minister and of the courts, you have put them beyond democracy, you have put them beyond justice, but put them beyond politics—never. It is impossible.

I hope that, if this Parliament approves the appointment of a committee to review these bodies, that committee will be reviewing not only the financial function and the efficiency of these bodies but will be addressing itself as to whether these bodies are part of the main system of government (namely, Parliament, administration, and the court) or whether they are an alternative system of government responsible to no-one. I am happy to say that this Government has, right from the beginning, declared its policy of increased Parliamentary oversight of the agents of Government.

Not only has it come to this Parliament requesting legislation in fulfilment of its policy of deregulation: it has made the Public Accounts Committee work critically for the first time. It has proposed the formation of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee, which I hope will function in the direction I have outlined, namely, to ensure Parliamentary oversight of the sub-system, and, indeed, its attitude to Parliamentary control is quite obvious. I think we all remember that in 1977 the Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, was ridiculed for referring to pilfering and the wasting of food in hospitals. No-one believed him and the Public Accounts Committee was sitting on the evidence and not releasing the report. After the election, out it came, but too late.

This Government, through its use of the Public Accounts Committee and now its proposed use of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee, has proved itself the most open Government that this State has known, and it would

have to be, even if it did not want to be, judging by the rate at which its private documents are knocked off by the Opposition.

I will pass from the matter of deregulation and Parliamentary control and talk for a moment about resource development. I think there is only one thing I want to say about that, and that is that the anti-uranium lobby is not really what it seems. The history of this, of course, is that until 1977 the Australian Labor Party was very keen on the mining and enrichment of uranium, and we did not hear of any dangers. The peaceful use of atomic energy was always spoken of as such and not automatically coupled with the unsound arguments about the threat of nuclear war. It was all very simple.

The left wing, having noticed that this new industry had something to do with capitalism and profits, decided that it was going to try to squash it, and certain actions began to occur within the Labor movement generally. By 1978 the former Labor Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr Hudson) had begun touring the A.L.P. sub branches addressing members and earnestly attempting to persuade them to continue to favour the mining of uranium. That was about eight months after the former Premier had gone on television and had shaken his head sadly and said, 'I have changed my mind about uranium.' Things were happening in certain magazines and newspapers other than the daily press. In about April 1978 the member for Elizabeth, writing in a magazine called *Pink* (which is a university campus paper), set out a lengthy article on left wing philosophies in general. In particular he reminded the students that there were three areas of legitimate activity suitable to the forces of the left, namely, the women's movement, the coloured people's movement and the uranium movement. Meanwhile, the month before in the *Tribune* (the official newspaper of the Communist Party of Australia), we find an article entitled 'Uranium: raising the stakes'. The issue, dated 29 March 1978, contains some statements by Dr Joe Camilleri, who is a lecturer in political science at Latrobe University and who travels interstate a lot. Amongst the aims stated by Joe Camilleri, we find:

What we've got to do is raise the political stakes. We have to make the prospect of mining and exporting of uranium so costly that ultimately the interests that are committed to it will be obliged to turn back as was done over Vietnam, by escalating the political conflict until it becomes an untenable policy.

There is nothing about health, welfare and safety there, because that is not the real political interest of the people behind this lobby. That is the superficial front to scare the general public. The real purpose is stated as follows:

... to inject political and economic dimensions into the debate. Uranium mining is a capitalist project based on a particular distribution of power and wealth within and between countries.

He goes on later in the article to say something which fitted very well with the statement of the member for Elizabeth. He said:

Aboriginal land rights is an important part of the anti-uranium campaign.

That is the communist view. I do not mind these people taking the view—it is their democratic right to pursue these arguments in furthering their particular political doctrine. I am raising this matter because the public has the right to know the true motivation behind various activities. I refer to an article in the *Advertiser* of Thursday 25 June 1981 which shows that Dr Camilleri is still active. The article does not identify him other than by name; it does not say 'devoted Marxist'. The article states:

A national task force will be set up to 'harass' the uranium mining industry. The convener of the Movement Against Uranium Mining, Dr Joe Camilleri, said the task force would include senior officials from key trade unions.

It goes on to outline the plan. Even though the *Advertiser* article does not display its true political persuasion (and the *Tribune* does), it is fairly honest. It is straightforward politicking: Dr Camilleri is pursuing communism.

We then come to Friends of the Earth. We again find in the *Tribune* of March 1978 an article about the Port Pirie tailings dam. That article produces a lot of statements about health and welfare, and it describes the activity of the convener of the Port Pirie Friends of the Earth, Ms Ally Fricker. I suppose we have to take that at face value and accept that she is really a friend of the earth and is not really concerned with the destruction of capitalism after all. However, I find three years later, when reading the South Australian supplement of the *Tribune*, the following:

Communist Party of Australia—What's on: Communist Party discussion group, emerging social issues in the 80's introduced by Ms Ally Fricker.

I would hope that the Australian Labor Party can sort itself out. I hope that the wishes of their former Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr Hudson, hold sway over the wishes of the Communist Party, which seems to be fairly good at changing people's minds. I believe that only recently the Leader of the Opposition in another place and the Hon. Dr Cornwall in this Chamber made some statements which sounded rather favourable to the mining of uranium. Yet, within 24 hours they quite independently but simultaneously had their minds changed back. I wonder what the approach of the Australian Democrats will be if any resolutions, indentures, or Bills dealing with uranium come before the House.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Don't we all?

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: Yes. The Leader of the Democrats in another place is clear on this point and is in agreement with the left wing. I shared a platform with the Australian Democrat Senator Haines recently, and she explained to the audience that the Democrats drew more support from the Labor end of the political spectrum than from elsewhere. I guess that, as a Party policy, the Democrat Party policy on uranium is no longer subject to review. As the Hon. Chris Sumner said yesterday, the problem for the Democrat is that, having stood in this place and having explained to us all on each side of this Chamber the terrible limitations on the way in which we are to varying degrees bound by Party loyalties, and having explained to the Council the great benefits of having an independent balance of reason—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I didn't say that.

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: No, you did not, and I did not say you did. Stop reading the paper or stop interjecting. Will the Democrat in this place follow the Party line or follow his view on Party politics?

Finally, I refer to education. I am not going to discuss the question of funding, a matter which is in the Government's hands. The people who wish to continue to describe the highest Budget allocation for education in the history of the State as 'education cuts' will continue to do that for their own reasons regardless of what anyone says. I do not wish to discuss the question of quality of education, a matter which is in the teachers' hands. However, I wish to make a few remarks about politics and education. I am doing this only because this Government has been accused of bringing politics into education. It is therefore necessary for me to defend against that accusation.

It is with some reluctance that I do what I am about to do, because I have the most enormous regard for the teaching profession. My wife teaches, and I know that the overwhelming majority of teachers are concerned primarily with their professionalism, and their politics is a private matter for themselves. However, the question of politics in edu-

cation has been made a real one by the accusation that has been levelled against us.

The problem is to find a starting point. If we wanted to look at the peripheral issues, we could start with matters such as the progressive communisation of the Australian Teachers Federation or of the Australian Union of Students, or indeed the suggestion regarding the involvement of the Palestine Liberation Organisation in relation to funding of the recent High Court challenge concerning Federal aid for private schools. A small number of people have conducted heavy politics in this regard.

In particular, we in South Australia have a small number of people who are doing more than simply expressing casual political opinions. The *Tribune*, (the official communist newspaper), stated in its issue of 19 November 1980 that much of the credit for mobilising teachers in South Australia must go to a group called 'Teachers for an active South Australian Institute of Teachers' (the TAS group). The report names Craig Campbell, Clair McCarty and Sandra Weekes as members of the centre-left ticket of the TAS group who were successfully elected to the executive of the Teachers Union.

The report goes on to name Leonie Ebert and David Tonkin (not the Premier, but a different David Tonkin) as previously successful TAS groupers, and the report expresses some disappointment that the group controlled only five of the 14 executive positions, but expresses satisfaction that the group controlled both vice-presidencies.

The interesting thing about the report is that, according to the *Tribune*, the TAS group was organised by a part-time organiser called Don Barnes. However, the High School Teachers Association has a part-time organiser called Don Barnes, and the President of that Association is Andrew Alcock. He is also Information Officer of the Committee for Independent East Timor.

Andrew Alcock is a driving force on the Teachers Institute's Uranium and Environment Committee, and his name appears in the *Tribune* as a donor to the Communist Press Fund. Andrew Alcock has addressed a Communist Party meeting on the subject 'Communist Party Policy and International Alignments'.

At the recent Annual General Meeting of the Council of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, 100 per cent of the policy resolutions on the agenda were moved by Andrew Alcock. It would not be too unreal to draw the conclusion that the TAS group organised by Don Barnes has something to do with the High School Teachers Association run by Andrew Alcock and also employing Don Barnes.

We find in the South Australian supplement of 18 June 1980 issue of the *Tribune* an advertisement headed 'Left Teachers Workshop for Radical and Left Teachers'. So, the evidence goes on and on.

Because of the constraints of time, I will leave the evidence at that point, although I have kilograms of evidence that demonstrate this sort of activity. I will not say that teachers should not indulge in that sort of activity. It is their association, and they are free in a democracy to do it. I will not say that they are any less worthy or competent teachers for their being Marxist activist. However, the accusation that our Government brought politics into the education debate is quite false and wrong. There is a lot of heavy politics in education, but we did not put it there, and it is not our politics. I support the motion.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: In 1981, Australia will spend more than 8 per cent of its total gross national product on health care delivery. In return, we will receive a medical technology and technical expertise that is second to none in the world. On the other hand, that vast amount of money will be channelled into a system that is very

heavily oriented towards treating illness rather than maintaining health.

Further, it is a system organised predominantly towards providing care for acute or short-term hospital patients. This tends to be at the expense of chronic long-term patients, particularly the elderly, both in institutional care and at home. Moreover, medical and hospital care, as it is presently organised, is entrenching a two-tier system: private and public. In the private tier, treatment within existing knowledge and technology tends to be limited only by the patient's level of insurance or ability to pay. In the public tier, it tends to be limited by the obduracy of conservative politicians and the selfish myopia of the predominantly conservative Australian Medical Association.

It is stating the obvious to say that the funding and delivery of health care in Australia is in an ever-increasing mess. Despite its technical excellence it is expensive, inefficient and inequitable. There are many historical, political and economic reasons why this is so. Let me outline some of the more significant ones. Since the 1930s, the individual health systems in most Western countries have grown as a natural and caring development from their history, culture and traditions. This evolutionary process in Australia was first thwarted by the intervention of Sir Earle Page and the Menzies Government at the behest of the medical profession in the early 1950s.

This intervention stopped the logical movement to a universal, rational and comprehensive health system. Instead, it resulted in the foundation of an inefficient and often ineffective system of voluntary private health insurance—a system with which we have been saddled in varying degrees ever since. For better or for worse this enshrined the fee-for-service system of medical care. It also perpetuated a system overwhelmingly biased towards treatment of the sick. The health funds in practice became sickness funds. A balance was never struck with preventive medicine and community health maintenance programmes.

At the same time, it reduced the level of political debate on health to the marginal model. Instead of ranging over the whole spectrum of health care, the health debate ever since in Australia has tended to concentrate on insurance. Even within those narrow confines it has often been restricted even further to debate on specific benefits for specific conditions.

The direct effect of these actions was also to shore up the medical establishment. Medical and hospital services have been organised by and for a politically powerful and predominantly conservative medical profession. In a system which was (and largely remains) blatantly paternalistic there was little room for community or patient input. It was mostly a simple, undisputed case of doctor knows best.

With the exception of the brief period of Medibank, another major practical difficulty has always been the voluntary nature of the health insurance scheme. A medical entitlement card automatically qualified pensioners to participate in the pensioner medical scheme. However, for the rest of the population health insurance was voluntary in the worst sense.

Historically, one of the most sacred beliefs of the A.M.A. was that this should be so. They have consistently interpreted any suggestion of rational universal health insurance cover as naked, rampant socialism. Unfortunately, successive conservative Governments have endorsed this as the conventional wisdom for more than 20 years. Approximately 10 per cent of the population (those who could not afford insurance or who chose to chance their luck) had no cover at all. For them, a major illness was a financial disaster. With some tortuous adjustments, this is the system to which the Federal and State Governments are now returning us. Between 1953 and 1973, the scheme lurched along with a

lot of running repairs and substantial Government support. One of the last major adjustments was John Gorton's 'heart transplant for \$5' scheme. It was eventually replaced by the original Medibank scheme.

Before briefly summarising the operation of Medibank and assessing its performance, I must draw attention to the world-wide explosion in medical technology which has been occurring throughout the seventies. It has become part of the folklore of conservatives in this country to blame all the problems of that decade on Edward Gough Whitlam. However, I think even the most jaundiced observer would now have to concede that Gough Whitlam was not really responsible for the OPEC oil price hikes of 1973 and 1974. Nor was he responsible for the so-called energy crisis. He was not even directly responsible for the world-wide recession and inflationary spiral which followed.

Similarly, despite the popular mythology, it was not the Whitlam Government which initiated the revolution in medical technology and the world-wide explosion of medical and hospital costs. The fact is that at the beginning of the seventies developed countries around the world were spending between 2.8 per cent and 4.5 per cent of their G.N.P. on health costs. By 1979 that percentage had more than doubled. Moreover, in Australia the cost escalation was relatively greater in the five years to the end of 1980 than it was in the three years to the end of 1975. These figures discount and discredit any notion which may be abroad that Medibank itself was a significant contributor to the cost spiral. Certainly there were a small number of unscrupulous medical practitioners who fraudulently exploited the scheme. However, with computerisation their detection was increasingly easier and, because most of the fraud was occurring outside the hospitals, their contribution to overall costs was small.

Of far greater significance is the often gross over-utilisation of the system by many doctors which has occurred in the last decade. This is a matter which I intend to discuss at some length and in detail during the Budget debate. But let me go back briefly to the original Medibank. Members will no doubt recall that it provided universal medical and hospital cover for the first time in Australia. Visits to the family G.P. were reimbursed at 85 per cent of the common fee, and doctors were encouraged to bulk bill so that there was no direct cost to the patient. Patients requiring hospitalisation received free medical treatment in standard ward accommodation or in other accommodation according to their medical needs. Patients who wished to be covered for private hospital accommodation and treatment from 'specialists of their choice' could take additional co-insurance at their own expense. You will remember that the profession made great play in public of the 'doctor of choice' argument. However, they privately conceded that in practice this nearly always meant doctor of the doctor's (rather than the patient's) choice.

Members will also recall that Medibank was originally to be financed by an income tax surcharge. This plan had to be abandoned when the necessary legislation was rejected by a hostile Senate. Ultimately it was financed from the General Revenue Account. No one ever suggested that it was free. What the Labor Party did was to ensure that hospital and medical care was financed on an 'ability to pay' basis. As a method of equitably funding sickness care, as distinct from health maintenance, it was brilliantly simple.

Since December 1975 there have been many major changes which have effectively destroyed Medibank. I do not propose to waste the time of the Council or to further confuse the picture by detailing them here. However, I do intend to analyse some of the practical implications of the horrendous system which the Federal Liberal Government

is about to introduce. From 1 September, free public hospital and medical care will be available only to the most profoundly disadvantaged in our community. Those in receipt of special benefits, the unemployed, holders of a pensioner health benefit card and new migrants will qualify for free treatment in public hospitals. This will include medical treatment at the hospital whether as an outpatient or inpatient. They may also qualify for treatment from their local general practitioner, but only if the general practitioner is prepared to bulk bill and accept 85 per cent of the scheduled fee. They will not qualify for care in community, religious or private profit hospitals unless the State Government makes special arrangements. All other low income earners must pass a stringent, flat-rate, 'all or nothing' means test to qualify for free public hospital treatment. In the case of single people the cut-off point for the means test is a gross, total income of \$96 per week. For couples the total gross combined income must not exceed \$160 per week. Additional income of \$20 per week is allowed for each dependent child.

The unemployed will be issued with their poverty card—the so-called health card—every fortnight. The working poor—those whose income is below the miserable levels I have just described—must apply personally at an office of the Department of Social Security. From 3 August complex forms will be available for these applications. They will be extremely difficult for most people to follow. However, if these grossly and grimly disadvantaged people do not complete the form and produce documented evidence of their poverty they will not get their poverty card. Moreover, this is a process which must be repeated every six months. The form will consistently categorize and stigmatize. The situation is perhaps even worse for people whose income is marginally above the vicious means test. A married couple with a gross combined weekly income of \$161 per week or a couple with two children on a gross income of \$201 per week must be fully insured. They will pay the same for their health insurance cover as the Prime Minister on \$2 200 per week. That is disgusting and disgraceful.

Let me give some examples of the extraordinary anomalies and injustices it will produce. Since the destruction of Medibank many aged pensioners who currently hold pensioner health benefit cards still make great sacrifices to pay hospital insurance. Whether this is wise or desirable may be a matter for debate. Certainly, it is something which they choose to do. However, they do feel it gives them greater medical security. It ensures that they can gain admission to their local community hospital or the hospital of their doctor's choice. From 1 September they will pay 60 per cent more for their insurance but, unlike the rest of the community, they will receive no tax rebate whatever. People without taxable incomes cannot receive rebates.

Now let me illustrate why the health card system is almost completely unworkable. From 1 September, health care recipients will be allowed to earn up to 25 per cent above means test amount for a maximum period of four weeks without losing their entitlement. However, if they obtain some additional work for even two or three weeks which puts them over that 25 per cent limit, they must surrender their card. Furthermore, if they exceed the limit by any amount at all for more than four weeks—even if the period is only five or six weeks—they also lose their entitlement. I inquired at the Department of Social Security this week as to what they should do. What advice should I give these people? My office is flooded with calls about the new system everyday, week after week. The first response was that they should take out health insurance in the meantime and apply at the Department of Social Security for reassessment. But how will it be possible for them to take out short-term health insurance? From 31 October

there will be no cover for pre-existing illness. Furthermore, there will be a two-month waiting period before they are entitled to receive any cover at all from that insurance. The Department of Social Security does not know. It has not been told, because nobody has been able to work it out. What will happen in practice, of course, is that people will not surrender their poverty cards, and neither they should.

Then there is the greatest anomaly of them all—the person or family whose gross income exceeds the means test by two or three dollars. It will pay them to have their wages reduced by \$3 or \$4 to qualify for a health card and avoid having to pay health insurance. Mr Acting President, you would know that this is so from your experience with pensioners and I am sure, like the rest of the members on this side of the Chamber, you come across this every week. Pensioners who exceed the limit by \$1 or \$2 are in danger of losing their Pensioner Health Benefit card, and they will do anything to retain that card. Similarly, people who are marginally above the very stringent, very callous means test are obliged to do something to try and obtain or retain their card. They will literally have to go to their employer and ask to be paid \$3 or \$4 less per week. What a ridiculous situation that is.

On the other hand, there are those who are on \$1 or \$2 below the means test limit. They will have to beg their employer not to give them a small rise or ask them to work overtime. They will say, 'Please do not give us any overtime; please, whatever you do, do not put us over the limit.'

The Hon. Frank Blevins: There is an alternative—they could demand that employers give large rises, and they could go out on strike to get them.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: That could be an alternative which many of these people will have to take. I agree with the Hon. Mr Blevins completely. Surely, this must be the most iniquitous and insane system ever devised in any industrialised country in the world. It cannot and will not work.

The problems go on and on. Let me give another example. Most of the 'working poor', that is, those who are below the stringent means test, people who are working in the country who are below the poverty line, have no occasion to be in regular contact with the Department of Social Security. Obviously, a large number will fail to apply for their 'poverty card'. What will be their position when a medical or surgical emergency occurs at a public hospital? That is yet another question which the Department of Social Security cannot answer.

There will also be a large number of people in the community just above the means test limits. They will not be entitled to a health card and they will be unable to afford insurance. Theirs will be the most desperate plight of all. How can any person or family already on a survival budget find an additional \$7 or \$8 from their pockets per week? The proposed means test is despicable. Traditionally in Australia all means testing for allowances or social security benefits has been based on a tapered scale. Full benefits have been allowed up to a certain income level, reducing on a sliding scale as income increases from that point.

In addition, calculations for benefits have been based on the previous year's income. The reason for this is twofold: it is the only fair way to apply means tests and it is the only practical way to administer them.

The alternative is to use the personal income tax scale, either directly or by a surcharge based on taxable income. For financing health care—a responsibility which must be spread equitably over the entire population—this is easily the most just and effective method. The difficulty for the Government is that neither of these proposals satisfies the private health funds, private profit hospitals or the conserv-

ative elements of the medical profession. The result is a mean and vicious cut-off point based on a monthly means test. The system is cruel, callous, unjust and unworkable. May its proponents rot in hell!

Where does the South Australian Government stand in this? It is just as guilty as its Federal Liberal colleagues. South Australia had a 10-year contract with the Federal Government which guaranteed that the Commonwealth must pay half the cost of public beds in Government and recognised hospitals. The contract was signed between the two Governments in 1975. We were the only mainland State with such a generous agreement. This means that, if this State had insisted on its rights, free public hospital treatment for uninsured patients could have continued until 1985. Because of a mixture of incompetence and political extremism those rights have been surrendered.

It was very clearly spelt out in the contract that South Australia must not apply means tests in recognised hospitals. The Minister of Health has consistently been in technical breach of that provision for more than 12 months. She has consistently supported stringent, flat rate means testing in public and in Parliament. Even more importantly, she has been a vocal supporter of the scheme at successive Health Ministers' conferences. The transcripts of those conferences have been related to me in some detail from an interstate contact.

However, it is also clear from the transcripts that she did not understand the full significance of her position until the Health Ministers' conference in Perth in March. It is also clear from the transcripts that, despite her grandstanding, she was resigned to going along with the Fraser Government's proposals by the time the Ministers met again in Canberra on 8 May to finalise arrangements. During April and May she conducted a deliberate and cynical political campaign to obscure the truth of her position. The Minister made a series of conflicting press statements and, in the *News* of 10 April 1981, she stated:

Free public hospital treatment for uninsured patients would continue in South Australia.

A news release from the Minister's office of 14 April stated:

The State Government favoured abolition of the Commonwealth/State cost sharing agreement

There is some contradiction there. An *Advertiser* report of 30 April states:

The South Australian Government will not immediately decide whether to accept the new funding arrangements for hospitals.

The Minister changed her ground a little there. Then in the *Advertiser* of Saturday 9 May, the day of the Canberra Health Ministers' Conference, the Minister made several contradictory comments reported in the press in that one day. The Minister stated:

The Commonwealth could not force South Australia to abandon the present cost sharing contract which could remain in force until 1985.

She then stated:

The State Government would not want to abandon the present 50-50 funding agreement in exchange for a deal that was not good for South Australia.

Then contradicting both of those statements, the press report states:

She expected the Commonwealth would force South Australia to impose hospital charges.

The Minister knew well that the Commonwealth could not force South Australia to accept that change if she stuck to the letter of the Commonwealth/State hospital cost sharing agreement. Finally, in that *Advertiser* report of 9 May 1981 the Minister stated:

We support the 'user pays' principle. The overall financial deal being offered by the Commonwealth leaves the States, including South Australia, no choice.

By 20 May the Minister had changed her tack again and warned South Australian people that they should take out private health insurance. In the same *Advertiser* article the Minister stated:

The income test being proposed by the Government is reasonably generous in normal circumstances . . .

That is not exactly the statement of a true humanitarian. Then in the *News* of 26 May, less than a week later, the Minister made yet another contradictory statement, as follows:

It is now unlikely that South Australia will opt out of the hospital funding deal with the Federal Government.

She then went very quiet on the whole issue. She refused to publicly debate the issue with me despite requests through the A.B.C.'s *Nationwide* and a call through the *News*. On 8 July she announced the new public hospital charges. They were to rise, according to her announcement, from \$50 to \$75 a day to \$85 from 1 September. This was again quite deliberately misleading. For uninsured people they were in fact rising from nothing to \$85.

At the same time the Minister said details of the renegotiated contract with the Federal Government had not been finalised, that the details would not be available until early August. That was a deliberate untruth. The details of the new funding arrangements with Mr Fraser had to be known before new public hospital charges could be calculated. Obviously, they had to be known before they could do multi-million dollar calculations.

The Minister of Health has deliberately held back the announcement to try and create the totally false impression that the South Australian Government is involved in some tough negotiations with Canberra. In fact, the cost-sharing contract has been surrendered in the name of stupid, blinkered, conservative politics. South Australia has thrown away one of the best deals it ever received from the Commonwealth. What will we receive in place of more than \$100 000 000 a year for public hospital funding which we currently receive? About \$27 000 000 in the first year and ever diminishing amounts after that. Yet, the Minister will try and tell us when she makes the announcement about a renegotiated agreement that she has got a good deal for South Australia.

In October 1979, one month after Mrs Adamson was appointed Minister of Health, I said in this Parliament that she had neither the intellectual capacity nor the compassion for the job. Those remarks have been completely vindicated by her actions over the health funding fiasco. I would now have to add that she sadly lacks any trace of political integrity.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I support the adoption of the Address in Reply and, in following what other members have done, I also express my deep sympathy to Lady Playford and her family in the loss of Sir Thomas Playford. I was not in the Parliament at the same time as Sir Thomas, but I did get to know him well from the time I came here, and I am very proud to have known him. He was a statesman in the highest sense of the word but, at the same time, never lost the ability to deal with ordinary people. The South Australian people have much to be thankful for that he was at the helm at such a time.

Once again, from what was contained in His Excellency's Speech, it appears that we are in for a busy session. Last year, when seconding the adoption of the Address in Reply, I mentioned this same thing, namely, I hope that all of these measures are necessary. I believe that we are in danger, not only in South Australia but in Australia as a whole, of becoming over-governed, of having rules and regulations governing too many aspects of our daily lives.

I will not go into specific details: I gave some examples last year. I simply again express the hope that all of the

legislation which we are to consider in the coming months is really necessary, although Governments are Governments of whatever country or side of politics and I fear that hope is a forlorn one. There was one ray of light in this regard in the Speech and that was in paragraph 7, as follows:

In line with my Government's move towards deregulation and improvements in public sector efficiency, it is proposed to repeal several obsolete Acts and to abolish the bodies established by those Acts. Legislation will also be introduced to establish a Parliamentary committee to examine the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of statutory authorities.

This is a good move and is, of course, a fulfilment of an election promise. I am sure that all members of the community who feel as I do will welcome the move and I commend the Government for it. All I say is that, while it is good and long overdue to repeal obsolete Acts and abolish unnecessary statutory authorities, please do not replace them with Acts that are equally unnecessary.

Another matter which I mentioned last year and which is still relevant this year is the Murray River and the vital necessity to maintain and improve the quality of water which comes to South Australia. Last year, when opening the second session of this Parliament, His Excellency said:

Inter-government approval has recently been obtained for the drafting of legislation to amend the River Murray Waters Agreement to enable the River Murray Commission to take water quality into account in its planning. My Government gives a very high priority to the management of the River Murray, which is in effect South Australia's lifeline, and will be seeking an early agreement to enable the legislation to be brought before Parliament.

Unfortunately, when opening the third session last week, the Governor said:

My Government will continue to be most active in its efforts to improve the quality of water available in the State.

While progress has been made on interstate negotiations to widen the terms of reference of the River Murray Commission, full agreement on a revised River Murray Waters Agreement has not been forthcoming. My Government will continue to press for this. It will also continue legal actions in the courts of New South Wales to try to halt further irrigation development along the Darling River and its tributaries.

One is forced to wonder just how much progress has been made and just how intransigent Victoria and New South Wales are being. This matter is vital to South Australia, not only for the millions of dollars and thousands of people involved in irrigation along the river, but also for water supplies for the northern cities of Whyalla, Port Augusta, and Port Pirie, and towns and rural holdings along the various pipelines which come from the Murray, as well as the city of Adelaide in drier years when our reservoirs cannot cope with demand. In fact, one has only to look at a map to see how dependent South Australia is on water from the Murray River and how important it is that water quality and quantity be maintained.

We are treated as poor relations in this matter by Victoria and New South Wales. I include Victoria in this, although at the moment New South Wales is the biggest problem. New South Wales has the two biggest tributaries of the Murray, the Darling and the Murrumbidgee, with thousands of hectares under irrigation along their banks, as well as the northern banks of the Murray itself. The intention of the New South Wales Government to open further areas along the Darling to irrigation development indicates a complete contempt for existing developments downstream on the Murray-Darling system and is quite rightly being challenged by our Government in the New South Wales courts.

While many of our problems in the Murray, particularly salinity, are the result of South Australia being at the bottom end of the river and are the result of actions upstream which at the moment are beyond our control, some responsibility for salinity must rest on our own shoulders. We have extensive areas of irrigation in the Riverland in

particular which must and do result in increases in levels of salinity downstream. The Government is working on this problem and as mentioned in the Governor's Speech work on the Rufus River and Noora saline drainage scheme will continue. This will do much to ameliorate it, but more needs to be done.

With the growth of industry in South Australia, particularly in the post-war years, and the consequent growth of urbanisation, there is often a tendency to forget that South Australia started as a colony whose economy was based on agriculture, and that agriculture remains a very significant factor in the State's economy, particularly when it comes to overseas exports.

Early reports of what was to become South Australia were contradictory regarding the suitability of the area for settlement, but, contradictory as they were, the accounts reaching England were enough to convince those who wanted to found a free colony on the Australian continent that the available fertile land was more than adequate.

I do not intend to give a potted history of the founding of South Australia but that their wisdom was justified is shown by the fact that, despite the trouble and mismanagement which marked the early years of the colony, by 1844 South Australia was producing wheat in excess of its needs and by 1845 was completely self-supporting.

Nevertheless, then as now, it was mining which provided a very great impetus to South Australia. Copper was discovered at Kapunda and Burra and with those discoveries came the inevitable heavy migration. The export of copper added to the prosperity of the colony but the increased population meant bigger markets for meat and grain, and the agricultural industry grew with it.

Most of the exploration of South Australia which took place after colonisation resulted from the need to open up more farming and grazing land and to establish stock routes to and from the colonies on the eastern seaboard, so right from the beginning agriculture was of vital importance to the economy of South Australia and despite the growth of other industries it remains so today. Nevertheless, there are times when country people feel that they are a forgotten race. Until seven or eight years ago, apart from my time at university, I had lived all of my life in the country. For three years I represented a country electorate and I know how hard it is to obtain for the country things that we in the city take for granted. One of the biggest problems facing the country is population drift.

In 1856 when South Australia first obtained responsible government the ratio of population was two-thirds rural to one-third urban. Since that time there has been a steady and continuous alteration in that ratio. It passed through the 50-50 point in 1918, until at the time of the 1976 census there was an almost exact reversal where Adelaide's population was 68.85 per cent of the total and 31.15 per cent in the rest of the State. Even those figures do not show the true picture. To do this it is necessary to look at the population of urban centres. An urban centre for census purposes has a population of 1 000 or more, and there are 50 of these in South Australia, including Adelaide. The majority of these are dependent on the surrounding agricultural and pastoral land for their existence, and quite rightly, can be counted in the rural population. There are other areas such as Crafers and Bridgewater, which has a population of 6 600 and which can hardly be classed as rural in the true sense. The majority of people living in that area would no doubt commute to Adelaide to work.

We then have the provincial cities of Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Port Pirie and Whyalla. Whilst some of these—Mount Gambier, Port Augusta and Port Lincoln—were originally based on a rural economy, that is not the case today. So, when assessing rural populations as it concerns agricultural production, they should not be

included. Frankly, I also have some doubts about Gawler, which has a population of 8 600: it is practically suburban Adelaide. For the purposes of this exercise it is included in the rural population. If we remove the population of these centres that I have mentioned from the country total, we find that the percentage of the population which could be said to be truly rural in the sense of which I am speaking (that is, involved in agricultural production in some way) has been reduced to 23.19 per cent. Yet, this section in 1978-79 produced 40 per cent of South Australia's overseas exports. Nevertheless, with such a constant erosion of its population it is little wonder that the rural community believes that it is losing its voice and becoming a forgotten sector. I can assure country people that members on this side of the Council at least recognise the contribution that they make to the economy of this State.

I have already mentioned the fact that rural exports account for 40 per cent of our overseas trade. This is in cash value, and that percentage has remained fairly static for the past several years. There would have been a time when almost all our overseas exports would have been agricultural, but I did not go back that far because such figures would have no relevance today. In any case it would be wrong for South Australia to be dependent on any one industry, as a collapse or depression in that industry would have a disastrous effect on the State. The point I am making is that agriculture is still a significant contributor to our economy and that we are inter-dependent—city and country alike—one upon the other.

I was saying that figures that I have given are in cash value, and because of inflation in recent years it is very difficult to make out an exact comparison over the years when using cash value figures. Although the percentage value has remained fairly static at around 40 per cent, there have been variations within that total. For example, in 1974-75 the total export of wheat and barley was 2 100 000 tonnes. In 1978-79 the total was just under 1 700 000 tonnes—a drop of about 20 per cent in quantity exported. The drop in value was a little over 12 per cent, but with inflation taken into account the value to the farmer in real terms dropped substantially. On the other hand, the export of live sheep went from 275 000 in 1974-75 to 1 069 000 in 1978-79, with a peak of 1 957 000 in 1977-78. Monetary value of that large sheep export went from \$3 900 000 to \$25 900 000 with a peak of \$40 200 000 in 1977-78. Even with inflation taken into account, that represents a very substantial increase.

Do not let me hear that old story about the live sheep export trade taking work away from the meat processing industry. This market is a new one, and to say that if we did not export live sheep they would be killed here is nonsense. They are exported live for two reasons: first, they go to Moslem countries where the slaughter of animals is a religious rite; and secondly, and more importantly, they are sent to developing nations which do not have refrigerated storage facilities to be able to cope with meat carcasses. I know that it is possible to kill under the correct religious conditions here, and it is in fact done in some areas, but it will be very many years before the storage problems at the other end are overcome. One day they may be and we can then export carcasses to them, but at the moment it is a market which we would not otherwise have, and any export market from any sector is a benefit to the State as a whole.

In the same way, if any sector of the economy is depressed for any reason—be it lack of markets or industrial strife—there is an effect on the State as a whole. No section in the community should look on itself in isolation. In recent years there has been a drop in the area of land devoted to agriculture in South Australia, from 64 800 000 hectares in

1974 to 62 600 000 hectares in 1979—a drop of 3.4 per cent. All States over that same period, except for Queensland and Western Australia, showed a similar drop. This does not mean that there has been a drop in production—quite the contrary, in fact. The farmer of today is an extremely efficient producer; he has to be to survive. I mentioned earlier, the decline in rural population. It is often debated, rather fruitlessly because it is like the question of the chicken and the egg, whether the drift to the city caused the farmer to look for more efficient means of production because of a lack of labour or whether increased efficiency caused a slackening of demand for labour, thus causing the drift. However, whichever came first is really immaterial.

The fact is that modern farming is extremely efficient. Like all industries, farming is hit by rising costs beyond the farmer's control. Unlike most other industries, the prices he gets for his products are in the main also beyond his control. Most other industries can and do pass increased production costs along to the consumer, but the farmer, for the bulk of his products, has to accept prices fixed elsewhere in the world and in competition with other countries. In other words, he has no cushion against internal inflation. To this must be added the uncertainty of production and markets. It is only necessary to look at the value of our cereal crops over the past few years to see the uncertainty of production. Wheat, for example, dropped from a gross value of \$163 900 000 in 1974-75 down to \$50 300 000 in 1977-78. The following year, in 1978-79, we saw a huge jump to \$263 000 000.

You, Mr President, will appreciate more than most members in this House how difficult it is to budget with fluctuations like that. The same proportional figures were true of barley and oats. I refer also to the export of live sheep and lambs. That market showed a very nice increase over seven years both in quantity and value, and in one year, from 1977-1978 to 1978-1979, it saw a drop from \$39 400 000 to \$25 400 000. As I said, it is very difficult for one to budget with fluctuations like that.

All these things (rising costs that cannot be passed on, uncertainty of production and markets, as well as overseas prices, together with the fact that it is a capital-intensive industry) mean that agricultural production is also a high-risk industry and that it must be recognised as such. Ironically, a matter that is vital to the economy of South Australia, and indeed to that of Australia generally, namely, resource development, has the potential to be damaging to the rural sector. As we sell our vast mineral resources on overseas markets, the value of the Australian dollar will increase. This will, unfortunately, have the effect of lowering the prices that primary products will command on overseas markets.

The history of the rural industry in South Australia has been one of challenge and consolidation. Land was opened up for farming that should never have been opened up, and it had subsequently to be abandoned. The challenges are still there, and always will be there. I refer to rising costs and uncertain markets. All these things will probably get worse instead of better. However, I have no doubt that our rural community will meet and surmount those challenges as it has done in the 145-year history of South Australia, and that the agricultural economy will continue to be an important part of our total economy.

In conclusion, I should like to raise a matter of concern to my former electorate of Flinders and, in particular, Port Lincoln. I refer to the lack of suitable protection for the fishing fleet in that city. Honourable members may not realise the size and value of the fishing fleet that is based at Port Lincoln. I should like to quote briefly from a copy of the 8 July 1981 issue of the *Port Lincoln Times*, which

shows a photograph of a large number of fishing boats anchored in Boston Bay. Under the heading '>\$20m. on Anchor Chain', the report states:

More than \$20 million hangs from anchor chains off Port Lincoln's foreshore, a situation which has caused many sleepless nights during the city's recent rough weather. The large sum is the value of the fishing boats which are now wintering off the city. They have no shelter despite repeated calls for a breakwater, and boat owners on stormy nights continue to worry about the safety of their vessels. When this photograph of a section of the moored fleet was taken, eleven trawlers, a similar number of tuna clippers and a handfull of shark boats were clustered into the bay between the shipping pier and Stenross slip. In addition, and not included in the \$20m figure, five tuna boats and a prawn trawler lay alongside the pier and other boats were moored in Porter Bay.

With the vessels mentioned but not included in the photograph (that is, those elsewhere), the total value of the fishing fleet in Port Lincoln could easily be \$40 000 000. One must add to that the fact that there is \$2 000 000 worth of pleasure craft moored in Boston Bay.

I return to the matter of fishing, which is perhaps more important, although yachtsmen (of whom I am one) may not agree with me. Nevertheless, this industry needs protection because it is, at the best of times, a high-risk industry. That risk should not be added to when the vessels should be at their safest, namely, in port. Unfortunately, this is not the case at Port Lincoln.

Hardly a winter passes without fishing vessels going ashore. There was a recent example of this during the storm on 1 June. On that day, two fishing vessels broke their moorings and went aground. In addition, three yachts were washed ashore, two other vessels were sunk, and one was swamped. Further, a tuna clipper that was tied up at the main fishing wharf lost its stern lines, swung around and did extensive damage to the wharf.

All this happened because, in the premier fishing port in Australia, no protection is provided for vessels at anchor. There is an urgent need for a breakwater. About 12 months ago the Minister said that the matter was being considered. I do not blame the people of Port Lincoln, or the fishermen in particular, for being cynical, because this has been said by successive Governments for many years, and this Government is as much at fault as former Governments.

The fishing industry is an important industry to South Australia. In tuna alone, over 8 000 tonnes was landed, most of it at Port Lincoln. At \$875 a tonne, that alone represents a \$7 000 000 a year industry. A new tuna clipper today costs in excess of \$1 000 000, and probably about \$1 250 000. As I have said, this is a high-risk industry not only commercially but also physically. In the years that I lived at Port Lincoln, over 20 fishermen lost their lives. The industry is of commercial value to South Australia, yet, although we expect people to invest that sort of money and take the risks involved, we will not provide the most basic protection for their vessels when they are in port.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What would it cost?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Several million dollars. At the same time, we would be protecting in port a fleet that is worth \$40 000 000. So, the costs are relative. The studies have been done, and the work could commence immediately if Government approval was given. I appeal to the Government to take action as soon as possible in this regard. I support the motion.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Although I do not have a very big audience in the Chamber, that will not dampen the sincerity of my contribution today. I support the motion. This debate gives me a good opportunity to review not only events and circumstances here in South Australia but also what is happening nationally under a Conservative Government.

The most ironic feature of the present-day Australian economy is that the average person who for so long believed there were to be great benefits to all from the so-called resources boom in this country now finds that the boom has commenced and that his living standards have been eroded enormously. One may well ask what has gone wrong and where are all the benefits promised by Mr Fraser and Mr Tonkin.

True, one should not ignore that, especially in the resource-rich States of Queensland, New South Wales and Western Australia, employment will pick up. That is not occurring in South Australia, Victoria and Tasmania but, irrespective of where anyone lives, the past year has seen their living standards eroded at a faster pace than in any year since the Second World War. Home mortgage repayments, together with higher Housing Trust rents, combine to reflect record high interest rates that have been brought about essentially by the so-called resources boom. The demand for money is such that an average income earner, the truck driver, shed hand, wool presser, shearer, cleaner or stenographer, is made to compete on the open market.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you employ a shearer for your sheep?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: No, there are scab shearers down there, and I would not employ scab labour. I bought a plant myself. All the people to whom I have referred are made to compete for money on the open market with the giant multi-nationals that are moving into this country at an unabashed pace.

I have mentioned these people because they are close to my heart, and I am referring to the working people. Only last week I attended a public meeting at Aldinga with the Hon. Peter Duncan. That evening a young couple had to walk out of their home because of the high interest rates, and we met two other couples there who were also losing their homes for the same reason. In every other Address in Reply speech I have made I have spoken about multi-nationals. All the things I have mentioned in the past six years are now bearing fruit. The average working man cannot compete with the multi-nationals or the bank. Workers are continually looking to the Government and appealing for some help, but it is not forthcoming.

The multi-nationals want to build their mines and their smelters and their wharves, when all our citizens want to do is be able to give themselves and their families a decent standard of living. No-one told them that in seeking their support for all this development of our resources they were going to vote themselves a substantial decrease in their living standards. We are now witnessing people walking out of their homes with their families because they can no longer afford to pay off their mortgages. And, right at the time that this is occurring, the Federal Government has seen fit to again change the medical health insurance system in this country to make sure that almost every wage and salary earner has to now pay at least \$400 a year in insurance.

The Hon. Dr Cornwall, the shadow Minister of Health (and soon to be the Minister of Health in 1983), indicated just what is going on. He referred to American multi-nationals entering Australia to take over private and possibly public hospitals. Many Federal politicians have exposed the American multi-nationals in this area. I blame the Federal Government for most of the problems now facing South Australia. It is very hard to talk about the problems that are affecting people in South Australia unless you place the blame where it belongs.

A report in a recent publication of the *Metalworker*, headed 'From the man who promised us honest Government we bring you: his record of broken promises', states:

Writing in the February *Nation Review* Alan Austin makes the point that a dictionary says that 'trust' can mean among other interpretations—'An arrangement by which property is transferred to another person'. Obviously this is what Fraser had in mind when he made that election promise in 1975. Austin then goes on to list what he considers to be the top 40 broken promises.

In the corner of that document appears the following:

I can promise you honesty and integrity in Government. I'd like to have a Government which people can trust.

Malcolm Fraser said that on 5 November 1975. These broken promises have been mentioned in many papers from time to time. I have read them, but there are many people in the real world who read my speeches and I would like them to have an opportunity to be reminded of these broken promises. Mr President, I seek leave to have this page of the *Metalworker* inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The PRESIDENT: The ruling is that, unless the material to be inserted is statistical, it cannot be inserted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: If by statistical you mean figures, Mr President, it deals with figures in that it is about Medibank and how Fraser said he would not dismantle it.

The PRESIDENT: If the Hon. Mr Dunford wishes to give me time to study the document I will be able to tell him categorically 'Yes' or 'No'. Unless the document is purely statistical, I suggest that it cannot be inserted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: It raises the question of the ability of people to pay increased prices, increased interest rates and now virtually compulsory health insurance at a time when both this Government in South Australia, combined with its conservative brothers in Canberra, have embarked on a campaign to restrict and limit the avenues for organised labour to win wage increases.

Partial indexation decisions which have been continually given by the Arbitration Commission since 1975 have eroded the purchasing power of working people but the killer in the latest run of increases is interest rates. So, although the unions may go to the courts in October to argue for a full flow-on of the cost of living in the six months to 30 September, the extra \$20, \$30, \$40 or \$50 per month which people have been forced to pay in mortgage repayments is not included in the increased cost of living. This is only one of the many reasons why industrial relations are in turmoil in Australia. People in the community feel that all their main cost of living expenses are incorporated in the consumer price index. The very thing that I am trying to explain to the Council is that the interest rates, which are killing people, are not reflected in the partial wage indexation increases that people receive from time to time.

Anybody can see that the present wage system with all the injustices inherent in it cannot survive. The Government, by continuing to maintain its policy on wages, is provoking massive industrial retaliation by workers who are not living as well as they did 5, 6 or 7 years ago. People should just ask themselves how families live where the take-home income for a family is between \$150 and \$200 per week; and there are many thousands of such families here in South Australia.

Let me make my position quite clear. I support the transport workers claim for \$20 per week. If I were a transport worker I would be going crook at my union, but I would be doing so because it was not going for \$40 a week. Not many members of this Chamber have had experience as a transport driver, but I have. Driving a truck is very involved, especially if one drives for a big carrying company as I did about 30 years ago. When I took on truck driving for a very large company in South Australia I found to my dismay that I had to load my own truck. There is certainly an art to loading and unloading a truck. Most

drivers have to make up to 40 deliveries in the metropolitan area, ranging from small boxes to drums of detergent and furniture. It is an experience to see a proficient truck driver loading and unloading his truck. It is a remarkable experience, and I have that experience.

Little do the people who are now criticising the Transport Workers Union and their members know that a man driving a similar truck to the one I was driving about 30 years ago receives less than \$200 a week. Recently, Mr Fraser received an increase of \$300 a week. If the transport workers are successful in their claim, more strength to their arm. I hope that the Transport Workers Union at least wins for its members \$20 a week. That will then give them a gross pay of \$220 a week. Truck driving is highly skilled, it is dangerous and it involves a lot of lifting. It is also demanding work, because deliveries must be made on time. I believe the Transport Workers Union should receive its increase, and it should not be hampered by the Fraser Government interfering with the Arbitration Commission. Every time a worker makes a claim, the commission says that it is outside the guidelines. When that occurs, there is disruption to the public and, worst of all, those workers who receive their increases forgo one week's wages. Anyone who knows anything about industrial relations or the arbitration system should know that, if a State award provides \$20 more than the Federal award, the Federal award will be varied or amended to at least equal the State award.

In fact, from my knowledge of awards when I first started union organising in 1961, the parent award was always the Metal Trades Award, and this was always supported by the employees. It was the most oppressed award in Australia. Changes usually flowed at the request of employers into State awards from that award. If the New South Wales State Government gives a \$20 increase to transport workers in that State, although those workers are on strike, I believe that in the short term they will win their strike and will win their \$20 a week, and the Federal Government must know this without my having to say it today.

As I said, it is only the Government's policy holding up the settlement. I mentioned that in my question to the Minister of Industrial Affairs (Hon. D. C. Brown) the day before last. I support a much higher figure for people to be classified as disadvantaged so they do not have to pay health insurance. No family on less than the average weekly earnings should have to pay health insurance. It is in this way that we can bring some equality into the living standards of Australians.

Of course, when circumstances such as I have described arise, people live in the false hope of being able to answer these with gimmicks. We now hear of proposals for South Australia to have a casino. It may be that a casino would be visited by some of the better-off members of our community, and it may be that it would be attractive to some people from interstate to travel here, but South Australians should not be deluded into believing that any of the problems they face are going to in any way be assisted by the establishment of a casino here in South Australia. That will not occur any more than that South Australia will overcome its massive unemployment problem with the development of one mine such as is being proposed by the present Government.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Are you in favour of a casino?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I have been a gambler all my working life—a quite unsuccessful one. I agree with the bookmaker who was talking with his comrades and colleagues some months ago and said that he would far rather his daughter marry a drunk than a gambler. Nevertheless, that has not stopped me from gambling, and I have managed to support my family, although we have come close to the line now and again.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Have you a foot in both camps?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Yes. I have visited casinos, and I would not tolerate Federal Hotels running a casino in South Australia along the lines of the casinos in Darwin or Hobart. I would not allow that group to come here and rip people off. I am sure that the Hon. Mr Hill, when soldiering for this country in the Second World War, saw the game of two-up played, but if he wanted to see an abortion of that game he should go to Darwin or Hobart and see people being ripped off. I am keeping my options open about a casino. It could have benefits for South Australia in regard to tourism and amusement, but in no circumstances would I vote for a casino in South Australia if it was run under the present system operated by Federal Hotels.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Should a casino be controlled by a statutory authority.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I would like everything to be controlled by a statutory authority. You know my political objectives.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: Nationalisation?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I see that the aggressive little Attorney-General is grinning, as he does whenever the matter of nationalisation arises. He grins even more because he knows that it is a long way away. I heard him talk about death duties, and I wished then that I had the opportunity to tell him what I felt about his Government's doing away with death duties. It has left a gap that cannot be filled.

The Hon. G. L. Bruce: The Government is now taking from the little man.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: True, it is now taking from the little people, but they have no more to give.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: If I am here next time, Mr President, I will vote for you. You have afforded me a fair bit of protection in the past, and one needs protection from members like the Hon. Mr Griffin, the Hon. Mr Burdett and the Hon. Mr Hill. Obviously, Government members do not understand what I am saying; otherwise they would blush with guilt because they are well off and well secured. Here we have the Transport Workers Union, which I know the Government will deprive and which is holding the gun at employers heads seeking \$20 a week, when the Government's colleagues in another place supported and voted for a 20 per cent increase. These workers want only \$20 and not 20 per cent. Indeed, these workers have to go without a week's pay or more to obtain wage justice.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What is Mr Hayden's view?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I cannot speak for Mr Hayden, but I notice that he said he burnt his fingers once and would not like to do it again. He was foolish enough to support them before. I was disappointed with Bill. I was one of his close friends and supporters and, when I see him next week, I will tell him. I think he has found out that one cannot trust a Liberal and Country Party Government. They made a deal, and of course Malcolm did a somersault on him when he came back from riding horses with cowboy Reagan.

What is needed in South Australia is a period of facing the truth, not a continuation of telling the people of South Australia that there are no problems and that all will be fixed as a result of the resources boom in this country. The resources boom will, as I have said, help some States more than others and, because of the massive build-up in State jealousies over the past seven or eight years, the resource-rich States will not be looking at policies to share their good luck. States have become very selfish, and the Governments of Western Australia, Queensland and New South Wales

will all have policies of looking after their own States. South Australia will still be left very much to its own devices.

I can speak with some authority on that because, even though we are out of Government, I have retained my position on the Industries Development Committee, and members will be aware of that committee's charter. They will know how business people approach that committee for hand-outs through establishment payment schemes to large companies with great wealth. Other States have similar development committees, and multi-nationals shop around from State to State, so that the highest bidding State gets development in its State. I have referred to this matter because it is about time that multi-nationals stopped exploiting the greediness of those States that make much money available and offer attractive packages to multi-nationals at the expense of States needing development and industry to offset unemployment.

We have the highest unemployment in Australia. These are the things one finds in a country that is large in area and small in numbers, with six different States all selfishly looking after their own interests. In some respects, of course, this leaves us in a very fortunate position. Why should we be jealous of the housing boom in Sydney? What benefit can there possibly be in having to pay \$100 000 for a home in Sydney when a similar one can be purchased in Adelaide for half of that price? We do not need, and we should be careful to avoid, any superficial real estate boom. We should be proud of the fact that circumstances may well exist in South Australia that make it easier for people to own their own home than it would be in any other State, but what is of the utmost importance to us in South Australia is that we do not marry our policies to that of Fraser Federalism. It is almost ludicrous that the most vocal opponents of Mr Fraser are those States with all the resources. Mr Court is critical of Mr Fraser, Mr Petersen is super-critical of Mr Fraser, and Mr Wran is super-critical of Mr Fraser.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: You're not saying a Labor Premier is in favour of resource development?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: He wanted to send some resources over here that had already been tapped.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: What do you think of that?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: What do you think I would think of it?

The Hon. L. H. Davis: I would be interested to know.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: The honourable member is asking me to attack my colleagues in another State. I will not do that. I would not even do that to a Liberal. Mr Wran is super-critical of Mr Fraser, but our Premier, Mr Tonkin, has again started talking of Mr Fraser in glowing terms as though Mr Fraser is about to do something for South Australia that we have not heard of yet. That is the strange part, and it is sad, because I do not think that Mr Tonkin is a bad person. He is a weak leader, has no prestige, and is sucking up to Mr Fraser. I would like to know why. The papers are saying this. All the information I have is not from Mr Tonkin but from observation and reading press reports. It is hard for me to make that decision about Mr Tonkin, because I think he is quite a nice fellow. However, he is not strong enough to lead this State.

We have a Leader in this State in John Bannon, the next Premier. He is forceful, courageous, young, and vigorous, and he knows the Labor cause and has served it well. We will see in 1983 what the people have to say.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: He can't get the numbers.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: He has great support in our Caucus. There is no doubt about that. Honourable members opposite would like to see him go. He was cheered yesterday by the farmers and graziers. They tell me that the Liberals

went into a real spin after the meeting because our socialist Leader was cheered at a meeting of the United Farmers and Stockowners Association.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: He has a good school background.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Yes, St Peters. Things are changing, and they cannot change soon enough. I challenge members opposite to give us a list of the decisions which have been taken specifically by the Fraser Government and which have been of benefit to this State. There is complete silence. Would honourable members opposite also give me the reason why Mr Tonkin should be so warm in his relationship with Mr Fraser? I would have thought that a State like South Australia had more reason to be critical of Mr Fraser than did other States. Of course, with a Labor Government, that is exactly what will occur.

There is no doubt that, as a result of our resources, this is an extremely lucky country. These resources belong to the people of Australia. The benefit that flows from these resources should be shared by the people of Australia, which includes the people of South Australia. I have made my position quite clear on the subject of uranium mining. I have observed what has happened overseas and have seen what the people have been left with, namely, waste dumps and lung cancer. There are children playing on waste dumps, and we have never had that.

If we are ever to mine uranium in this State, there should be safeguards, and the benefits of that mining should not go to overseas entrepreneurs, Arabs, Chinese or the friends of Mr Fraser in the White House. We should have safeguards for the people of South Australia. I believe that there ought to be orderly development, not a mad rush like the gold rush days of last century. Foreign companies should not be the main beneficiary. This means that we will have to change conservative Governments, and that is not very far away.

Experience throughout the world has shown that conservative Governments still like to lick the boots of foreign companies. Last night my colleague, Mick Young, referred to Malcolm going overseas on his 27th trip. Yet, in 1975 Mr Fraser said that we would not have a tourist Prime Minister. I believe that Malcolm should stay here, as there are a lot of problems in Australia. Mick Young was sure that Prince Charlie would be looking around at the wedding for Malcolm Fraser.

It is true that a conservative Government licks the boots of foreign companies, and that is a tragedy. I feel embarrassed to say that I am a politician when I see the Liberal Government selling out our State. Hopefully, in 1983 with State and Federal elections, we will see a change of Government. We had an unfortunate position today in Question Time when one of my colleagues said that the Government told lies. I will not say that but I will say that this conservative Government has misled and let down the people of South Australia. That will be reflected in the 1983 election.

We were told that, as a result of State Government promises, 7 000 new jobs would be created by cutting spending and letting private enterprise get on with the job. That policy has failed, as the private sector is not creating jobs and Government cuts are just adding to unemployment. The Government has cut spending and thousands of jobs have been lost. We have increased unemployment and people are leaving South Australia, which is a matter that the Hon. Mr Hill talked about when we were in Government.

There has been no improvement in the State economy and to us and the people we represent that means a reduction in the quality of education, hospital services and water. I am pleased that I am able to drink rainwater but most people in South Australia do not have that opportunity. Low-cost housing and community and welfare services will be affected. No jobs for school leavers will be available in the Public Service, and it is the first time that I can recall the Public Service not creating jobs for school leavers since I have been in South Australia, which is more than 30 years.

The cuts also affect private enterprise. We have heard the Hon. Mr Burdett time and time again talk about private enterprise and the free market system. However, Government cuts in spending mean that fewer goods and services are provided by the private sector. The Government is the largest employer, employing 20 per cent of the work force, and cuts mean the loss of thousands of jobs, with fewer people able to buy goods and services from the private sector, and, as a result, the community has higher and higher unemployment.

The Premier does not know the answer, but I will give him the answer. The Government must take responsibility. I heard the Hon. Mr Dawkins grunting, but I can tell him that the Government of which he is a member must take responsibility for its actions. The Government is the State's largest employer and the biggest user of goods and services from private enterprise.

When such services are cut, the public goes by the way, private enterprise goes by the way, and most of all, the worker goes by the way. The Premier can stop job rot by maintaining community services, by increasing Government spending and by implementing a few job-creation programs similar to those that the Labor Government had in its term of office.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That at its rising the Council adjourn until Tuesday 4 August at 2.15 p.m.

Motion carried.

At 5.42 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 4 August at 2.15 p.m.