

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 9 December 1982

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

STUDY TOUR

The **PRESIDENT** laid on the table the report of the study tour from 1 to 30 May 1982 of Mr E.K. Russack, former member for Goyder and Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee, and Mr L.D. Hourigan, Secretary, Public Works Standing Committee.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ELDER SMITH
GOLDSBROUGH MORT LIMITED

The **Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Minister of Corporate Affairs)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. C.J. SUMNER**: With reference to the special investigation into dealings in securities of Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort Limited and Petroleum Distributors Pty Ltd, I advise that I have received and examined a copy of the report of the Special Investigator, Mr John von Doussa, Q.C. The report made to my predecessor on 29 October 1982 is an interim report and I understand that Mr von Doussa may be in a position to advise the Government regarding its finalisation in the near future. In response to questions shortly after my appointment, I indicated that this was a matter that would receive my early consideration and that I would seek advice as to what steps should be taken by the Government regarding matters raised by Mr von Doussa.

As a matter of principle, I am concerned to ensure that, where a special investigation is conducted, and where it is appropriate to do so, the issues dealt with by that inquiry should be made public. However, before any action is taken by me to table the report or a part of the report in the Parliament, it is essential that full and proper consideration be given to matters relating to the possible prejudice of any party who may be mentioned in that report and who may subsequently be the subject of legal proceedings.

I have arranged for a detailed legal analysis to be made of the issues raised by the interim report relating to possible offences and I have requested the Corporate Affairs Commission to make appropriate inquiries regarding any commercial negotiations and/or arrangements that may be currently 'on foot' and that could be prejudiced and/or disadvantaged by any action taken relating to the tabling of the report. I have requested that the inquiries that are to be undertaken be dealt with as expeditiously as possible, so that I am in a position to inform the Parliament at the first available opportunity of the Government's intentions regarding the tabling of this report.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WAGES FREEZE

The **Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General)**: I seek leave to make a statement on the subject of the Commonwealth wages freeze.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. C.J. SUMNER**: I regret that this statement was not available to the Council yesterday when a similar statement was provided in another place.

The Australian economy has been severely affected by the international recession, depressed commodity prices and domestic drought. The position in South Australia has not been any better. Our manufacturing industries have been hit, unemployment is extremely high, inflation is not falling, and there is a general recognition in the community—from all Governments, all political Parties, from groups representing trade unionists as well as employers—that existing policies are inadequate and that action needs to be taken.

The **Premiers' conference** which was held on 7 December 1982 was designed as a means of discussing methods of dealing with the deteriorating situation. The South Australian Government welcomed the conference because we believed that it was possible for a consensus to be established which could tackle this very real problem which was facing all Australians.

South Australia, together with New South Wales and Victoria, went to the **Premiers' conference** with positive and practical proposals which ranged right across the spectrum. They also went with a preparedness to negotiate, a preparedness to compromise. Unfortunately, the Commonwealth did not have a reciprocal attitude: it had a simple straight forward position; it made no proposals for the conference other than that there should be a 12-month freeze on wage increases so that the so-called 'savings' could be devoted to public works and employment programmes. There was no question of their discussing a wider range of ideas, a broader package of proposals which would tackle the economic problems that are facing the entire country.

The attitude of the Commonwealth Government at the conference was similar to the attitude that the Commonwealth adopted during the weeks leading up to the **Premiers' Conference**; it rejected all proposals to widen the agenda to consider other aspects of economic policy and determine strategies for countering the recession; it rejected proposals to include representations from trade union and employer representatives; it rejected proposals for up-to-date assessments of the States to be made; it rejected requests for clarifications of their position which had become confused because of media speculation, and relied instead on an emotional appeal for a 12-month wages freeze as the one and only way of dealing with rising unemployment.

It must not be forgotten that a short-lived attempt in 1977 to introduce a wages freeze produced no positive benefits at all, yet they insist on adopting the same strategy five years later. It is not only the Government of South Australia which lays the blame for the failure of that conference with the Federal Fraser Government. It was pointed out in the *Age* newspaper of 9 December 1982 'that the Federal Government was not prepared to compromise on anything'. The paper went on to suggest that the Fraser Government had torpedoed any hope that the conference might produce a consensus on how to halt the slide of the economy. It said of Mr Anthony as conference Chairman that 'he refused to budge an inch to arrive at common ground'. This was not the attitude that the South Australian Government went to the **Premiers' conference** with and it was certainly not the attitude of any of the other **Premiers**, all of whom were prepared to talk about a much wider range of proposals than were on the Commonwealth's agenda.

Consensus is not an easy thing to achieve and it certainly cannot be achieved by unilateral and high-handed statements being made by people who are not prepared to negotiate, to compromise and to canvass the opinions of employee and employer organisations. That was the position adopted by the **Premiers of South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales**.

In the weeks leading up to the **Premiers' conference** and following the **Premiers' conference** they have consistently said that there is a necessity for there to be wide discussion

within the trade union movement and with the employer groups so that a package of proposals on which there is wide agreement can be got together and used as mechanism for putting the brakes on cost rises in the economy.

The South Australian Government was concerned and has continued to be concerned that there has been an excessive reliance on proposals for a wage freeze. It is a one-sided emphasis which neglects the fact that an essential element of economic recovery in Australia is an expansionary policy and a regeneration of investor and consumer confidence. The Commonwealth has placed great stress on the need to increase the profitability of business but has ignored the fundamental fact that business will not invest and employ more workers, if it does not have adequate markets for their products.

The South Australian position, both in general terms and in some of its specific elements, is not different from the position adopted by the other States, including the Liberal States. The Commonwealth, even when offered, refused to consider a national approach to some form of price control or price surveillance; it refused to consider policies designed to reduce interest rates; it refused to ease monetary policy; it denied the States the right to increase their borrowing power so that vital capital works programmes which could employ people could be undertaken; it refused to consider a 12-month pause in the reduction of tariff protection; it was unable to provide estimates on the impact of its wages freeze proposal and the consumer price index; and it refused to consider a return to centralised wage fixing following an agreed wages pause (even though it was wanting to indulge in a centralised wages freezing policy itself).

The Commonwealth, at the conference, offered as some form of compensation a \$300 000 000 package of job creating, public works programmes, most of which was to be distributed to the States and some of which was to be distributed to local government. It was to be distributed on a population basis, which took no account, as the Premier has argued repeatedly, of the needs in individual States. There is absolutely no substance in the suggestion that had South Australia been more 'co-operative' it would have been able to attract more than its entitlement on a per capita basis. Similarly, there is absolutely no substance in the proposition that had South Australia been more 'co-operative' that it could have been given extended borrowing powers and that a meeting of the Loan Council would have been convened.

From the day this Government assumed office we have been working on programmes designed to stimulate employment and provide jobs and employment opportunities for the tens of thousands of South Australians who have not got work, as well as for the thousands of young people who will be coming on to the labour market in the next few weeks. These proposals, which are denigrated by some critics as resource wasting, job creating schemes with no lasting value, are accepted by this Government as a commitment not only to the economic well-being of our community but also to its social well-being.

Having returned from the Premiers' conference, having noted the unco-operative attitude that had been adopted by the Commonwealth and having discussed further with the other main manufacturing States of New South Wales and Victoria what they intended to do, the Government immediately initiated discussions with employer and employee organisations to both brief them on the conference, on the attitude of the Commonwealth, on the attitudes of the other States, and to discuss with them the proposals that would be possible in South Australia. Those discussions have taken place and one can only say that they have taken place in an extremely co-operative, intelligent and rational way. The attempt by the Premier of South Australia to get widespread support for whatever programme is finally decided on has

met with a very positive reception. As a result of those discussions, it is still possible that in South Australia a consensus will be developed amongst all the parties. This attitude will, in the end, be the only one that will work.

Even those States who have promised to legislate are starting to back away from the proposal. They recognise that, if any wage freeze is going to be effective, it has to be voluntary. Other States are backing away from the hard-line attitude that they had adopted before and are now accepting that, unless there is widespread community support and agreement between the major organisations involved in industrial organisation and in the work place, then a wages freeze will simply not work by legislation. It should also be remembered that this Government has made the point repeatedly that not only is legislation a heavy-handed and unnecessary way of proceeding with this type of proposal: it is terribly difficult to ensure that the net is cast wide enough to catch everyone.

Other Governments are recognising that South Australia's position is a sensible one. There are well over 50 per cent of employees in South Australia who are covered by Federal awards, over which the South Australian Government has no control whatsoever. It would be divisive in the extreme for a Government to insist on one set of conditions for one set of employees and to then allow another group of employees to operate under different conditions. Similarly, this applies in both the Federal and the State arenas. If there is going to be a halt it has to be a halt that is accepted by employees and employers right across the board, irrespective of whether they are in the private or the public sector, irrespective of whether they are covered by State or Federal awards, and irrespective of whether they are wage and salary earners, employed in the professions, or receive their income from investments.

The burden has to be equally spread and this Government's approach will ensure that the consensus which it believes can still be established will bring about an effective and agreed position. The Government has met with the Executive of the Trades and Labor Council, who have been briefed, and who have undertaken to consult with their members, and who have called a meeting for next Tuesday, which the Premier will attend to listen to their arguments, to respond to their proposals and to make suggestions which will help and contribute to the debate. Similarly, the Premier has already talked to the employers and they accept the necessity for an economically significant wages pause. They acknowledge that the South Australian Government is trying to establish common ground between the parties and hope that that common ground can be established.

That common ground could not be established if the one-dimensional approach which is suggested by the Commonwealth is being advocated in some quarters in South Australia. A blanket 12-month wages freeze sounds disarmingly simple, but it clouds a myriad of complex issues, the resolution of which can only lead to more argument and more divisiveness. South Australia is not out of step with the other States; rather, the other States are now coming to accept that the consultative and positive approach that has been taken by this Government is the only way that a wages pause can be agreed to. The Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria have agreed, together with the South Australian Government, that it is better to develop a workable six-month agreement than a cosmetically attractive longer period agreement that would just not be workable.

There is no disagreement with the proposition that there is widespread community support for a wages pause. What the South Australian Government is trying to do is find the common ground, to find the proposal for a wages pause that will get the agreement of all of the parties that are involved. If our approach is not recognised by our critics

in the community as being valuable and sensible and the only path to go, it is certainly recognised by some of the newspaper writers. Today's *Age* editorial says that it is vital that we must try again before all the efforts that have been made over the past month to gain a consensus are dissipated. The Federal Government, it says, should concede failure and call an immediate follow-up conference to hammer out a genuine agreement. It should go back to the conference table and this time do it properly.

What we are doing here in South Australia will prove in the end to be the only way to go to get some rationality into this debate about a wages pause, and we will come up with a programme that will work, because it will be based on consensus, on an acceptance of common ground, and on an even-handed approach and goodwill by all parties, because we have consulted with all of the parties that are involved.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: WAGES FREEZE

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Cameron has informed me in writing that he wishes to discuss a matter of urgency, namely, the implementation of a wages pause. In accordance with Standing Order 116, it is necessary to establish proof of urgency by the rising in their places of at least three honourable members.

Honourable members having risen:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the Council at its rising do adjourn until 1 o'clock tomorrow.

I have moved this motion for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that, because South Australia is the only State not to give a clear commitment to the implementation of a wages pause, this Council calls on the Government to give such a commitment immediately and in doing so recognises the need for members of Parliament to set an example to the rest of the community. It also calls on the Government to take the necessary action to implement a freeze on the salaries and allowances of all members of Parliament for a period of 12 months.

There have been attempts in the past to impose wage and/or prices freezes, and we should be under no illusions as to the difficulties. However, times have changed. The aim of a wages freeze is not to contain inflationary trends, although this may be a desirable offshoot. The real reason for the call centres around the crucial economic problem of unemployment.

Any savings that can be achieved through reduced pressures on wages in the public sector can be redeployed to promote employment and aid the unemployed. In the private sector the release of funds would not be the goal: rather, the maintenance of jobs is the goal. By eliminating wage increases for 12 months, profitability will be restored and fewer companies will be forced to go to the wall. Their ability to compete at home and abroad would be improved. I quote from the 17 November edition of the *Financial Review*, as follows:

The impact of growing uncompetitiveness of Australian industry, best measured by the rise in hourly employment costs, has been enhanced by the poor economic situation which was facing Australians, anyway, even without the extra impact of the wage and conditions push. At the same time the actual real disposable income in the Australian economy is being limited by the huge fall in agricultural output (a billion dollars down in next year's wheat income alone)—

and most people in the State would be recognising now that that is the case—

and the prospective loss of export income from price falls and reduced demand for commodities overseas. There is no way in

which city populations (and that means everybody, not just the blue collar union members) can continue to increase their real incomes in the face of the situation facing Australia in 1983. One way or another, belt-tightening is inevitable. If it is not imposed by a Government wages freeze, it will be imposed by a collapse in employment as the jobless percentage heads into double figures and wages claims disappear as employees cling with increasing desperation to their existing jobs.

The need for a wages freeze is just as relevant—perhaps more so in the public sector. To understand this we need to consider the pressures on our own State Budget and the consequences on taxes and inflation and, therefore, business profits of wage increases in an already protected sector of the economy. The Premier has expressed surprise and concern about the likely level of the State's deficit. That concern is just, although the extent of any deficit should be of no surprise and will be severely aggravated by the Government's own actions. The Tonkin Government consistently drew attention to the pressures on the public sector and the problems of excessive wage increases. The continued deficit on the State's Revenue Account—

The Hon. B.A. Chatterton interjecting:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: We will have an argument about that one day. The continued deficit in the State's Revenue Account is principally the result of excessive wage and salary increases and high interest rates. Increases in both these items have, to date, been beyond the State Government's direct control. The previous Government took significant steps to reduce salary and wages costs and the interest burden on the Revenue Budget. The level of public sector employment has been reduced by more than 4 000 in the past three years and new borrowings were tightly controlled. The semi-government borrowing programme was also reduced substantially.

If the Government continues to add costs to the deficit, which will have to be funded by borrowings at high interest rates, the State will be in deep financial trouble with an uncontrolled deficit on the Revenue Account. Already we have seen additional State commitments being effectively financed by competition with the private sector for money, thus keeping interest rates high. It has provided a 38-hour week for many more Government employees, more teachers and extra ancillary staff.

This pressure on the State's finances, if it is to be financed by more taxes, will also seriously inhibit employment in the private sector by placing greater burdens on employers and enterprise. Under these circumstances there is an even greater need and urgency for the Government to support fully the call for a 12-month salary and wages freeze. There is growing acceptance for the need and advantage of a wages pause or freeze. I do not mind what one calls it. The New South Wales Premier, Mr Neville Wran, was reported on page 5 of the *Age* of Monday, 6 December 1982, as saying: . . . a wages pause would give some relief from growing pressure on the State budgets . . .

Earlier, Mr Wran had said in the *Age* of Friday, 3 December (page 1):

. . . a new round of wage increases cannot be entertained under any circumstances.

Mr Wran and his Ministerial colleagues have also deferred any salary increases for themselves for at least six months in recognition of the problem. Mr Hayden, in the aftermath of the A.L.P.'s Flinders debacle, pointed out that the vote for the Liberal Party 'reflected an acceptance of the Government's proposed 12-month wages pause.'

The call for a wages freeze has extensive community support, despite what the heads of a few organisations motivated by self-interest might say. In the most recent Gallup poll, 65 per cent of Australians supported a wages freeze, and a freeze of 12 months was more favoured than any other time period.

Of the Government's A.L.P. supporters, 58 per cent supported a wages freeze, and more of them supported a 12-month period more than any other. I suggest that instead of running around to union leaders, the Government might look at that particular question. If South Australia refuses to join the other States in a wages freeze this will place our industry and economy at a huge disadvantage.

While our Government remains indecisive, the leaders of every other State have taken action that will benefit them. Queensland, Western Australia, Tasmania, and the Northern Territory will have a 12-month freeze. Victoria and New South Wales will participate for six months. Inevitably, the cost structure in South Australia will rise dramatically above the rest of Australia. The end result can only be the loss of industry to South Australia and a massive loss of jobs. If wages rise in our State but are restrained elsewhere, we will become the high cost State of Australia. This we cannot afford. If for no other reason than this simple economic fact, the Government must institute a wages freeze immediately. We must eliminate uncertainty and we must keep our competitive edge. In his election policy speech, the Premier said:

In Government our major goal will be to get South Australians back to work in a productive way.

Well, here is his chance to start. In his speech, the Premier also said:

South Australians have had enough of political bickering. Politics should be about policies and not point scoring . . .

The Premier added:

There are many matters of importance that should be tackled in a bipartisan and consensus way.

The community has made its wishes clear on this vital matter. The Opposition has also made its position clear: we will support the Government in either a six-month or 12-month freeze. The Opposition would clearly prefer a 12-month freeze, as that would be an effective freeze. In its view, a six-month freeze would be too short a period. But, the Premier has our indication of support for such a move.

Economic times are tough. Unemployment is high, and our ability to compete is falling. No sector can be, or should expect to be, isolated from our problems or unprepared to respond to them. That is why a wage and salary freeze is very important for the public sector and for politicians.

At a time when workers in private enterprise are recognising the need to reduce their demands, and even to accept reductions in pay and working hours, the Government must resist any effort for the public sector to become a pace setter for wage increases and improved conditions. This is particularly the case when we remember the permanency from which public servants benefit, unlike private sector employees. If this freeze can be achieved, at least in the public sector, there will be considerable savings in expenditure that would otherwise have to be incurred to pay rising salaries. It is a question not just of getting new jobs but also of saving jobs, and that is what this freeze would do. In South Australia up to 1 500 jobs could be created and many others saved.

The Premier has been reported as saying that, because salary increases to public servants have already been granted and backdated to August, the \$80 000 000 set aside for wage and salary increases has already gone, and that therefore no savings can be made. Even a layman will see the folly in the Premier's statement. Certainly, the money already set aside may have been eaten up, but what about future wage increases? The money for these would have to be found, so that if they could be deferred there would be potential savings.

Additionally, we are talking about a 12-month freeze, which will cut across two financial years. As half the freeze will be in the next financial year, if \$80 000 000 was again

needed to be set aside for increases in a full year, a minimum of \$40 000 000 could be saved. The sum of \$40 000 000 could go a long way towards boosting jobs and securing employment. In addition to the public sector, members of Parliament should be seen to show the lead to the community. Certainly, the economic impact of a freeze on the pay of members of Parliament will not be great; however, we have an obligation to give a lead.

So we come to Tuesday's results in Canberra, of which we have heard some discussion from the Attorney-General. I thank him and the Government for at last having the courtesy of giving that statement to this Council. No South Australian can take any comfort from the *Advertiser's* huge headlines yesterday, 'S.A. splits from national pay freeze'. Whilst all other States have agreed to some sort of wage freeze, Mr Bannon, claiming to represent South Australia, has not. Mr Bannon is not prepared to make a decision without checking back with those who really control the new Government. He is a puppet to others, and his actions will seriously disadvantage us. All our Premier could say about the Premiers' Conference was that 'it was quite good fun'. Perhaps he will claim that the *Advertiser* article got it wrong when reporting that the Premier said that 'it was quite good fun'. It is not good fun. It is cold comfort to the unemployed and to those who will become unemployed as a result of Mr Bannon's lack of decision.

One must question Mr Bannon's motives. Two weeks ago he was crying about the extent of the potential deficit and likely shortage in funds. Well, he has turned down a potential income of tens of millions of dollars. Is it his own interests or those of the State that are really concerning him? What deals have been done with the unions that Mr Bannon is now expecting the State to pay? Already, indecision and an unwillingness to act have been the hallmarks of South Australia's new Government. In May this year, the A.L.P. released its economic policy statement. It said that it was only the first part of its plan for the economy of the State. It said that the rest would be released before the election. It never was, and we are still waiting for it. If the Premier's current performance is any indication of either his grasp of the economy or his ability to make decisions, we will be waiting for much longer still.

Let there be no mistake: the Opposition views this matter seriously, and we give notice that if the Government is not prepared to act we will. The Premier says that the South Australian Government is not working towards a wages freeze at this moment, but rather that he is talking with industry and union groups about the best approach to economic revival. He says that he is not asking for a wages freeze but is asking for the unions' response to one. Well, the time for talking is over. The Premier must be poorly informed if he does not know already what some of the unions are saying. If he takes their advice, our economy will suffer further, and the recent losses in jobs will become a flood.

Here is the advice that we know the Premier will get from his trade union friends, because it has been made public already. If Mr Bannon asks the P.S.A., the A.G.W.A., the Miscellaneous Workers Union, the Institute of Teachers, the Australian Nursing Federation, the Fire Fighters Association, the Australian Workers Union, the Australian P.S.A. or the A.C.O.A., they will all say 'No' to a wages freeze because they have already said it and have said it since the conference.

The Hon. R.C. DeGaris: The United Farmers, too.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I am sure that the United Farmers will be delighted to see a wages freeze.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: They said the opposite.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Well, that is their problem.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: I thought that they were your supporters.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: No, they are very apolitical. The industrial officer of S.A.I.T. has been quoted as saying that business as a whole is quite prosperous. If this foolish attitude continues to be held by South Australia's unions in the face of our serious economic recession, what hope is there for us? Every other State leader has been able to take action quickly and forthrightly. Why not Mr Bannon? In his many conflicting and confusing statements on this issue, the Premier has said that his attitude is no different from that of Victoria or New South Wales, yet both these States have already said that they will act to freeze wages for six months, and Victoria has already frozen a range of Government charges and fees. Mr Bannon's attitude is different from that expressed in every other State, including the Labor States.

While Mr Bannon rocks to and fro, other States will benefit from their acceptance of the Federal Government's proposals. Their wages bills will not go up; their competitiveness will improve; their industry will benefit; their economies will get a lift from a big inflow of Commonwealth money. But what for South Australia? It will mean here reduced competitiveness, little stimulus for the building and construction and other industries, the loss of millions of extra dollars effectively freed up from the State sector, more unemployment, more bankruptcies, and more confusion. I say to the Premier that it is far from good fun for South Australia.

I indicate also that we have a very serious unemployment situation, figures relating to which, I gather, have been announced today. There are now 552 600 Australians out of work and 54 100 unemployed persons in South Australia. South Australian unemployment has gone from 8.4 per cent last month to 8.7 per cent this month, and that is well above the Australian average of 7.9 per cent. We are facing a very serious situation to which this Government should face up. It should not be running around trying to find whether anybody supports a freeze. It should take a lead and decide, as every other State has decided, that it will have a wages freeze. It should be done either voluntarily or by legislation, and that is the only way in which the Government can show leadership in this State.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Tell us about prices.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: The Government can go ahead with a prices freeze if it wants it. It already has the legislation to do that. It is entirely up to the Government, but let us at least get this on to the road.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Would you support it?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: The Government can bring it forward, and Opposition members will make up their minds when they see it. The Government does not need the support of Parliament. How on earth can it make a decision on that when it cannot decide even on this issue? The Government is now trying to say that the rest of Australia is wrong and that it is right. That is not so, and it is time that this Government showed some leadership.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The Leader has presented an extremely strong case for a wages freeze and has given reasons why the Government should take all necessary steps now to implement it.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: In a vital issue like this, which is fundamental to retaining our quality of life even at a reasonable level, it is essential for the Government to state publicly its contingency plans. It must state now what it will do if its discussions to try to reach agreement for a freeze are not successful. In Western Australia, Cabinet

authorised the Premier of that State, Mr O'Connor, to recall Parliament to pass legislation enacting a freeze on wages and working hours if he failed to reach agreement on the freeze with the Western Australian T.L.C., the Confederation of Western Australian Industry and the Western Australian Industrial Commission, and that is reported in today's *Financial Review*.

The Hon. Mr Cameron pointed out the inevitability of a halt in the rise of wages in real terms. In the current national and international economic climate, the economy just will not stand it. The halt will come. The question is how it comes. It can come about by Government action, and that is what we are asking for. The alternative is that it will come about through a complete collapse in the economy. Enough hardship has already been brought about by unemployment. The hardship that would follow a collapse of the economy would be immeasurably greater. It is, therefore, essential that the Government states its position now clearly and unequivocally, without running around like a chook with its head cut off and making such confusing statements that it has confounded the press and the public. No-one knows just what the Government intends to do, least of all, itself.

The Government should now clearly state that it will try first to achieve an effective freeze by agreement. It should also state now, as the Western Australian Government has done that, if this fails, it will take legislative action, if necessary, to effect a freeze. There has been much shilly-shallying on the part of the South Australian Government, which should make clear what it intends so that Opposition members know whether they themselves should initiate legislative action. Certainly, we will consider doing that if the Government will not tell us what it intends.

Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition asked the Attorney-General to clarify the Government's position. The Attorney said that he would have to consult with the Premier. The Hon. Mr Lucas and I also asked questions about the Government's attitude and ran into the same brick wall: the Attorney would make no commitments without first consulting the Premier. Then we had the astonishing situation which has been referred to by my Leader that a Ministerial statement had been made by the Premier in another place yet this Council was not accorded the courtesy of hearing that statement. Of course, we have heard it today but, in any event, the statement did not clarify the matter.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: He reckons that he consulted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: That is so. The Leader referred to the Premier's call in his policy speech for a bipartisan and consensus approach. This call was repeated yesterday in His Excellency's Speech with which he opened this Forty-fifth Parliament. The Opposition would be delighted, as my Leader has suggested, to join in a bipartisan and consensus approach on this issue but, until we know exactly what is the Government's stand, we can hardly join in a consensus—a consensus about what?

The Leader has pointed out that the State Government, through not unequivocally seeking a freeze, has turned its back on a potential income of tens of millions of dollars. It has turned its back on achieving great savings in the State's beleaguered Budget. Today's *News* carries a story that the Premier will seek a freeze. However, we need more than that.

An honourable member: What will tomorrow's *Advertiser* say?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: That is so. In any event, seeking a freeze is not enough: we want to know what is the plan of action if agreement does not produce a freeze.

Finally, will the Government freeze Government charges? The Victorian Government has said that it will do this. With the massive increases that it imposed contrary to its

election promises, that Government could well afford to do so. However, the South Australian Government has said that it will not use State charges as a form of taxation. Will it give an undertaking to freeze State charges?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: There are some indisputable facts about this problem. One is that we are in the midst of a national recession, and another is that the question of excessive wages is a principal problem in the whole area. Another point is that the State has a weapon at its disposal to tackle the problem through a wages pause or freeze.

In the national situation, the Federal Minister, Mr Hunt, stated only recently that the drought would cost Australia \$3 600 000 000 in lost rural production. It has been estimated that the drop in rural production will be 44 per cent as a result of this drought. Mineral prices are down in export areas, and export markets for minerals are now in doubt. Australia's secondary industries are in a most serious situation, and a recent report concerning the motor industry estimated an 18.6 per cent cut in production next year.

Of all the secondary industries, motor vehicle production is a vital industry for South Australia. In regard to the overall employment, although I do not have the figures that have apparently been released today, the former figures that were made public by the Australian Bureau of Statistics indicate that during October unemployment increased by 1 735 a day. In the light of that national situation, surely the State Government should be looking to protect the interests of people in this State through concerted and definite decision making. In the year ending in the September quarter, average weekly earnings of adult males employed full-time in Australia increased by 18.2 per cent. Wages increased by 50 per cent faster than the rate at which prices increased during that period.

The Hon. Anne Levy: By how much did female wages rise?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I do not have the female wage figures, but I am sure that the honourable member has a note of them somewhere. As I said, wages rose 50 per cent faster than did prices over the year ending in the September quarter. Our own international competitiveness is severely affected and businesses cannot pass on cost increases. Therefore, they are forced to reduce staff.

In the 12 months to May, the most recent O.E.C.D. figures that I could obtain internationally show that the average increase in wages was 10.7 per cent and falling, but that compares with the 18.2 per cent in the year ending in the September quarter to which I have already referred. It must be accepted that these excessive wage increases destroy jobs, and the whole situation can be seen in our daily press, both in South Australia and nationally. Only a week ago our own local paper made the position clear when it commented on the September figures of the Bureau of Statistics. I refer to the heading 'Economic growth halts as recession bites deeper', and another heading declared, 'Economic gloom worse, finds a recent survey'. Internationally an important report was headed, 'Stalled economy set for a big fall'. It must be admitted that some controls are difficult to impose by a State to help overcome the situation but, on the wages front, the State certainly can and should attack the problem.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: How?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: By taking concerted action and coming out and declaring its stance on a wages freeze. However, the Premier is hesitant and is procrastinating. He is politically weak on this subject. The Premier is behind all the other States, and the people of South Australia are now wondering what they let themselves in for at the last election.

An important factor which has been overlooked, and about which the Premier is not creating much publicity, is the benefits that can come from further Federal funding if

the Premier comes into line and decides to support the other States and the Commonwealth in regard to a wages freeze. Employment programmes can be set in train with funds that the Federal Government is waiting to provide if the Premier declares that he supports a wages freeze and will impose it in South Australia.

Amongst those employment opportunities is a programme for further welfare housing. Certainly, we heard enough at the last election about what was needed and what a Labor Government would do. Now the Labor Government has an opportunity to get more welfare housing funds but it does not know whether or not to grasp the opportunity.

The second point dealt with in the motion concerns the question of pausing or freezing the remuneration of members of Parliament. Certainly, I am very proud to be a member of a Party which has been the first Party in this State to come out publicly today and say that it is willing to set an example. We support the freezing of remuneration for Parliamentarians. It is not much good the Premier's talking about what he will and will not do unless he is willing to stand up and say that Parliamentarians should set an example. This motion today calls on the Government to do just that.

This indicates that we on this side of the Council are prepared to show the way. I am sure that that will be welcomed by the people of South Australia. What the motion seeks is firm, deliberate action. We want members of Parliament to set an example. We want to assist in the problem of dealing with the economic recession, particularly as it applies to employment. The State can do that by supporting a salary freeze. All members of this Council should support this motion because it is, without a doubt, in the best interests of the people of South Australia.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I do not think that honourable members opposite have given me much to reply to. I indicated the Government's position in the statement I made at the beginning of proceedings this afternoon. It was basically the position I outlined to the Council yesterday. That seemed to get honourable members opposite into an agitated frenzy. I said yesterday that the Premier, on his return from the Premiers' Conference, was having discussions with interested groups in the community—the trade union movement and employer groups. It is clear from the statement I made this afternoon that those discussions are proceeding. Quite clearly, honourable members opposite think that one can create a wages freeze or wages pause overnight, but that is not the position. Anyone who has any experience or knowledge in this area would admit that this is so. I think that the Hon. Mr Lucas, who I understand has some economics training, would admit that.

Anyone would know that the solution to unemployment is not a simple wages freeze. Whose wages do we freeze—the public sector wages? Do we freeze farm incomes such as the Hon. Mr Cameron's? Do we freeze the Hon. Mr Hill's income from his real estate business? Do we freeze doctors' fees, or lawyers' charges? Do we freeze dividends from shareholdings? I say that it is not possible to have a one-dimensional approach to this problem. Anyone who has studied the economic proposals put forward throughout the world during the past decade to deal with economic problems would come to the conclusion that there is no short, easy, simple solution to economic difficulties by means of a wages freeze. I would like to put the situation in context for honourable members opposite, who seem to have no sense of history or understanding of this matter.

For most of the period following the Second World War it was possible by use of Keynesian economic techniques, when there was a recession looming, to increase employment

and reduce unemployment by deficit funding and by ensuring that money was pumped into the economy, whether by way of deficit budgeting or tax cuts. This would produce a flow-on, or multiplier effect, in the community thereby providing a stimulus for jobs. That policy was used in one form or another by all Western countries after the war. It was the generally accepted form of economic management in all countries, whether they were governed by democratic socialist Governments or by capitalist Governments. There were differences in emphasis, but that was the policy followed at that time.

In about 1973 or 1974 the world economy had reached a situation where those policies were not working to the extent they had previously. In 1973 there was a substantial world recession. From 1977 onwards, there has been if not a recovery some levelling off in terms of economic activity. Since 1973, however, there has been a great debate in economic quarters as to what policies should be followed. Should Keynesian policies be discarded and monetarist policies implemented? (They are the policies advocated by Professor Milton Friedman; that is, that market forces are allowed to determine the level of economic activity. If unemployment is up, then wages will come down and that in turn will reduce inflation, so there is a simple remedy if one relies on the market—there are no problems.)

That has been the prevailing economic policy that the Fraser Government, the Tonkin Government, the Thatcher Government and the Reagan Government have had, all with significantly unsuccessful results up to the present. That policy relies on free market forces and does not admit wage pauses or wage freezes.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: Are you a Friedmanite?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No. I am saying that that is what has happened in the past 10 years. The solution to stagflation (a combination of high unemployment and increasing inflation) for the Friedmanite was to try to increase unemployment further thereby achieving a reduction in inflation and an increase in economic activity. That policy has not been particularly successful over the past 10 years.

Some people in the world community have been looking to a reformed Keynesian policy to get economies stimulated, but stimulated in a way whereby prices and wages are held down. That is why some countries have moved towards the development of what are called 'Prices and incomes policies'. I suppose that a wages freeze is one aspect of a prices and incomes policy, although a very unequal aspect of it. People have advocated developing a consensus involving deficit budgeting or tax cuts that do not have inflationary effects on the local economy and therefore do not reduce competitiveness overseas.

The policies to which I referred are quite attractive in theoretical terms, but they have not had a great deal of success. Ironically, it was during President Nixon's term of office in the United States, even though he was a free enterprise Friedmanite in some senses, that they tried a prices and incomes freeze or agreement in the United States. It did not work particularly well.

Likewise, Prime Minister Heath did the same sort of thing in the early 1970s. An attempt was made by the Federal Government in Australia in 1973 to obtain powers over prices and incomes so that, if the economy demanded it, it could try to get together some kind of wages and prices package, or incomes and prices package. That attempt was opposed bitterly by the Liberal Party at that time. It did not want increased power. It did not want national power over prices and incomes and opposed the move bitterly. As a result, we have no national powers over incomes or prices and that, to some extent, is part of the problem faced in reaching an agreement and a consensus in Australia.

By way of comparison, I understand that a prices and incomes policy has been, to some extent, successful in Sweden, but that is a unitary State and not a Federal one and it is able, because of the smaller territorial size and smaller population, to develop a consensus around prices and incomes policies. In order to do that in a country like Australia the national Government needs powers in this area, yet in 1973, when this proposition was put to the people for the Federal constitution to be amended to give the national Government (as I believe any national Government should have) powers over prices and incomes, the Liberal Party rejected it.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: The people rejected it.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Had the Liberal Party supported that constitutional amendment in 1973, it would have been passed with the support of the two major Parties. Now the Liberals have come up with one part of a package—a wages freeze. That is all they have considered, despite the fact that, when they had the opportunity to give the national Government powers to develop an equitable policy on prices and incomes, they did not do so. I am not saying that there are not problems in relation to prices and incomes policies but, if one is considering the matter in terms of equity for the community and of injecting some stimulus into the community while ensuring that one group in the community is not discriminated against or sat upon under such an arrangement, one needs a movement towards some kind of prices and incomes contract.

There are difficulties in relation to the proposition of a simple wages freeze, and that is what the Federal Government has put forward. The only way in which such a policy will work is by its developing a consensus in the community. The problem is that in Australia there is a Federal Government and State Governments and separate arbitration procedures at the Federal level. There are no actual price control powers at the Federal level, and separate industrial arbitration systems in each State. In that constitutional and social context, the only way to achieve any agreement on this issue is by a consensus of all groups involved—employers and employees.

That is the way in which the present South Australian Government is heading. The Government has entered into negotiations, it is having discussions and, indeed, the situation here is not very different from what is occurring in other States. The *Advertiser* of this morning referred to what is happening in Queensland, where I understand the Premier will not introduce legislation for a prices freeze. It was stated in the *Advertiser*:

The Queensland Government said it would meet industry and union leaders on Monday to pave the way for a 12-month freeze on wages and a possible hold on prices. The Premier, Mr Bjelke-Petersen, favors setting up this package by co-operation rather than legislation.

That is the Country Party Premier of Queensland. Therefore, to say that the approach that is being adopted by the South Australian Government (to try to negotiate and gain co-operation in this matter) is a one-off situation is quite untrue.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: What about New South Wales and Victoria?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr Cameron has already referred to those States. In regard to Victoria, the *Advertiser* stated:

The Premier, Mr Cain, said the Government was in a good position to hold Public Service salaries for the rest of the financial year.

It was not stated that Mr Cain will legislate.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: What about the first part?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As the Hon. Mr Cameron indicated to the Council, Mr Cain said that he will also

institute several changes. It is not true to say that the situation in South Australia is out of line with the situation in every other State.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Come on, you can't say that!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr Cameron says that I cannot say that. I have just quoted the situation in Queensland. I do not want to have to repeat myself in regard to negotiations, because I understand that other members wish to contribute to the debate, but I have indicated that the Premier of Queensland is talking about setting up an arrangement by co-operation rather than by legislation. In summary, the situation is not really much different today from what it was yesterday.

Negotiations and discussions are proceeding. We believe that the success of a proposal such as this must have some basis in equity and that equity can be achieved only if it is brought in by some form of co-operation and consensus between the parties involved. Such a proposition simply will not work by straight-out legislative action. If South Australia legislates, what will it legislate for? Will we legislate in regard to public sector wages, private sector wages, the 50 per cent of employees who are governed by Federal awards—

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: They will already be covered.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: They will not be covered. The Federal Government specifically stated that it would not intervene through the Arbitration Commission and impose a wages freeze, even if it had the constitutional power to do so. The Hon. Mr Cameron should do his homework. Obviously, he does not understand the constitutional situation in South Australia. I have a suspicion that, if the Hon. Mr Cameron goes on in this vein of ignorance, honourable members opposite will wish that they had kept the Hon. Mr Griffin as the Leader of the Opposition. At least he has some understanding of the constitutional set-up.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M.B. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In fact, I have given a detailed analysis of the history of these schemes. They do not work. Throughout the world, history indicates (as in this country in 1977) that, unless there is a package for all groups in the community that does not single out one group, the chances of success are not very good. If we can reach a situation of co-operative agreement, I believe that we may be able to get somewhere, and that is what the South Australian Government is working towards. That was the position yesterday and it is the position today.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I want to make a few comments on this rather crude political motion that has been brought forward in a very crude and political way by the Hon. Mr Cameron. I expected that, when the honourable member was made Leader of the Opposition, he would get away from a larrikin-type performance in this place and develop a little bit of statesmanship to give the Opposition some appearance of gloss, but apparently that will not happen and we will remain with this rather cavalier and crude approach. It is entertaining, but it does not get us very far.

The first part of the motion moved by the Hon. Mr Cameron relates to Parliamentary salaries, and I believe that that deserves some comment from the Government. Our position in that regard is quite clear: if some general agreement is reached in the South Australian community, quite obviously the salaries of South Australian Parliamentarians will be part of that agreement. Whatever agreement is reached in the community as a whole will include Parliamentarians, who are part of the community and who, I am sure, will accept their responsibilities to the community. There is nothing very startling in that. To make that fatuous

statement a central part of the motion shows the childishness involved.

I refer now to the public sector bashing that goes on all the time by members opposite. The Opposition is now changing its tune slightly and saying that it will bash public servants, save the money from wage increases (which is nonsense—but we will leave that aside) and create jobs with the money saved. All of a sudden, after telling us for seven years that job creation schemes are nonsense, members opposite are talking about job creation schemes. At least they are learning. They are very slow learners but, slow or not, they are learning, and I congratulate them on this advance in their thinking, however slight it is.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Will you tell us how successful your schemes were in 1977?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will tell the Hon. Mr Davis a few things. It was the Hon. Mr Cameron who said that the time for talking is over. What kind of approach is that? How will that achieve any agreement in the community in regard to recognising the very difficult circumstances? The Hon. Mr Cameron says that the time for talking is over and that we should pass the matter to legislation.

The Government takes a completely different approach, and I am sure that the same applies to the Democrats. The Government says that the time for talking is never over, that the channels of communication between the various competing factors in our society must always be kept open and that people must be able to sit around a table, talk out the problem and, hopefully, as reasonable people, arrive at a solution.

To say that the time for talking is over and that the legislation should be bashed over their heads just will not work. Do not take my word for it. Opposition members should listen to some of their more sensible people in the Federal Parliament. Those Federal members say exactly the same thing. Ian Macphee and others say that to bring in legislation every time there is a problem is not the way to solve those problems. I agree with that. If this proposal that the Liberals want for a legislative wage freeze is accepted, what about the inequity it produces?

It is all right for members of Parliament to say that we will freeze our salaries: that is easy on \$30 000-odd a year. What about workers taking home \$150 a week after working a 40-hour week? Where is the equity in freezing the salaries of those people? They are already in desperate straits. To suggest that there is some morality in those people's salaries being frozen because the salaries of members of Parliament are frozen is absolute nonsense.

The Hon. Mr Hill advocated this and made an emotional speech around it. What about the profits from the 11 companies that he has admitted in Parliament he controls? Are those profits to be frozen? Of course not. I suggest that the salary of some of the Opposition members of Parliament is merely pocket money and that their real income is from outside sources. Not only is there no question of income from profits being frozen, the opposite has been categorically stated.

Mr Macphee stated categorically that some prices need to be increased for profitability and that prices will not be frozen. I give Federal members who advocate this full marks for honesty, but none for morality. The Federal Government and members opposite say that there will only be a wages freeze, not a prices freeze or anything else.

Let us look at who is against this particular measure. The trade union movement and the A.L.P. are not the only ones that do not agree with this legislative approach. What about the National Farmers Federation? That is hardly a radical body, although I have been told that they are really just agrarian socialists that want everything for their own particular corner and want their slice of the cake. That federation

is opposed to this approach and is made up of rational people. Significant employer groups are also totally opposed to it. These groups have said clearly that it will not work by legislation, and that they are already negotiating with the unions for a wages pause. These groups say that they are negotiating agreements for no wage increases to cover the next six months and that it should be left to them to negotiate this pause.

What about the retail traders? They have already stated that in the new year, due to a downturn in the retail industry and a lack of spending power within the community caused by the already significant reduction in wages that has taken place over the past seven years, they will be laying off staff. If this approach is continued that industry will lay off far more staff. If one reduces the purchasing power of the worker, obviously the worker cannot buy back the material that is produced. That then causes a very long, slippery ride downward. I will come to that in the Address in Reply debate later today.

The Government's approach is clear: it is a consensus approach and has a chance of working. I will not put it higher than that as there are also some economic laws in operation that, with the best will in the world, will operate to the detriment of the consensus arrived at. We should consider not just wages, but prices, tariffs imports and job creation schemes. What happens after the pay freeze? What happens about the question of catch-up and of maintaining a wage level? What about interest rates? Financial institutions are making a killing in this time of economic recession.

I know that the Hon. Mr Milne wants to speak for five minutes. I conclude by congratulating this Government on the sensible approach it is taking on this question and by totally condemning the simplistic and inequitable line that the Opposition is taking.

The Hon. K.L. MILNE: On behalf of the Hon. Mr Gilfillan and myself, I rise to indicate that we believe that it is very important and is worthy of being an urgency motion. However, we can see the dilemma in which the Government finds itself and in which the Liberal Party would find itself if it was in Government, in trying to do the best for the State in this most controversial area where there could be conflicts of interest and where, in fact, there are. However, from my inquiries in the real world of business and commerce, I find that the depression has reached such a stage that something drastic has to be done on a national level. At least the suggestion of a wages and salaries freeze is a beginning.

The Democrats support this motion and will make some comments which, I hope, will be helpful both to the Government and the Opposition in coming to a consensus in this State. First, the Democrats believe that a 12-month freeze would be better than a six-month freeze. What is necessary is not only a stimulation of the economy, but a stimulation of demand, while instilling confidence to ensure that that demand continues.

The pause in salaries and wages is only part of the solution to unemployment and a pause in the Public Service sector is only a part of that part. It is probably fair to ask the Public Service to exercise restraint as it has substantial job security, which workers in the private sector do not have. That is seen to be very unfair at the moment and it could be fair to ask the public sector to start this freeze. Any attempt for a pause must include everybody in the nation. It must be shared by as many people as possible. This would create practical problems that should be sorted out before legislation is attempted, if it is drafted at all.

In the Federal sphere the Democrat Senators have said that, first, it is an inadequate response to the present economic emergency to impose restrictions on wages alone.

Wages are always talked about, but when they are talked about I hope that people mean wages and salaries, including Parliamentary salaries, the salaries of professional people (especially accountants, lawyers and doctors), commissions, interest, dividends—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.L. MILNE:—not only that, but that together with all allowances, expense accounts and perks of that kind. Let us face it; it has to be a pause for everybody and for every sort of income. Secondly, the Federal Senators say that the Government should re-establish the Prices Justification Tribunal with the specific task of preventing profiteering and of containing the cost of 'necessities of life'. Thirdly, they say that the Reserve Bank should be requested to reduce interest rates and that all banks and financial corporations should be asked to drop service fees and other charges for loans and overdrafts. Fourthly, they mention professional charges, as I outlined previously. Fifthly, the Democrat Senators say that there should be urgent reforms to the income security system to overcome specific 'poverty traps' as identified by Senator Chipp.

I note that the Federal Government is saying that it will spend \$300 000 000 on the creation of jobs. The Democrats believe that it is essential that the whole of this \$300 000 000, or whatever the saving is, should be spent on wages and salaries and that money for materials and other expenses should be found elsewhere. The reason for this is that withdrawing \$300 000 000 from the Public Service and redistributing it to other sections of the community is not creating anything. It would have the effect of increasing the velocity of the circulation of money to some extent, which in itself is helpful—and probably something which the Hon. Mr Davis understands—but the real booster would be from the additional funds added to the wages and salaries.

Relating what the Australian Democrats have said in Canberra to the State scene, it means that the State Government would have to ensure that the State Government charges would not increase, and possibly it means the reintroduction of State price control. The Premier has a right to be cautious. Everybody should realise how many businesses have gone out of business altogether and how many businesses have reduced staff to two-thirds or a half and, on top of that, are actually working a four-day week by agreement with the staff, whether the unions like it or not; it is getting chaotic and very serious. Consensus could be arrived at very quickly. I am pleased that the Opposition has seen fit to make this a matter of urgency. The Premier is right to be cautious and to be discussing it fully with those who are affected by this. He should state clearly that he supports the principle of a freeze or something like it, so that we and the people know where the Government stands while we, as those who have to make the thing work, have time to make up our minds.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Call on the Orders of the Day.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): As I understand the practice in the past, the ruling has been that the mover of the motion (it is still before us; it has not been adjourned) has to seek leave to withdraw the motion. That is the traditional practice.

The PRESIDENT: No, that is not quite right. The motion lapses when the Orders of the Day are called on.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: That is not what you have done before, Sir.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, many times. On few occasions has the motion been withdrawn. I call on the Orders of the Day.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER

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

That, for this session, Standing Order No. 14 be suspended.

Standing Order No. 14 deals with the Address in Reply and says that it must be dealt with immediately following the Governor's Speech opening the Parliament, and that no other business can be dealt with until the Address in Reply has been disposed of. It has become traditional in the last three or four sessions of the Parliament that this Standing Order be suspended. On this occasion the Government wishes to deal with some urgent legislation, which has been introduced in another place. In any event, I think that it is reasonable for the Standing Order to be suspended to enable the Council at least to consider some matters before the conclusion of the Address in Reply. That does not mean that the Address in Reply will not be considered as expeditiously as possible. This was a move that the previous Government adopted. It had also been adopted on some occasions during the period of the previous Labor Government, and I ask the Council to accept the reasons on this occasion.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition has no objection to this suspension. It has, as the Attorney-General said, become a custom. It is imperative that this new Government be allowed to put forward as many parts of its programme relating to promises to the people in terms of relief to the community as quickly as possible. So, we are quite happy to support the motion.

Motion carried.

ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

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

That the Hon. Anne Levy and the Hon. R.I. Lucas be the members of this Council on the Council of the University of Adelaide.

Motion carried.

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

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

That the Council do now proceed to elect by ballot two members to be members of the Council of the Flinders University of South Australia.

Motion carried.

A ballot having been held, the Hons L.H. Davis and Barbara Wiese were declared elected.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT COUNCILS OF BALAKLAVA AND OWEN

A message was received from the House of Assembly requesting that the evidence taken by the Legislative Council select committee, which did not report before the prorogation of the last Parliament, be made available to a new House of Assembly select committee on the same matter.

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

That the minutes of evidence taken by the Legislative Council Select Committee be tabled and that the request contained in the House of Assembly's message be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner laid on the table the minutes of evidence of the Legislative Council's select committee.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The House of Assembly notified its appointment of sessional committees.

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE

The House of Assembly intimated its appointment of four members to the Joint House Committee.

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

That, in accordance with section 4 of the Joint House Committee Act, the Legislative Council members on the committee be the President and the Hons. G.L. Bruce, R.J. Ritson, and Barbara Wiese.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

A message was received from the House of Assembly requesting the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment of a Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

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

That, in accordance with Standing Orders 19 to 31, the Legislative Council members on the committee be the Hons. Frank Blevins, G.L. Bruce, and J.C. Burdett.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Speech:

1. We, the members of the Legislative Council, thank Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to all matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

In moving for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to His Excellency the Governor for the official opening of the Forty-fifth Parliament of South Australia. In doing so, I hasten to reaffirm my loyalty, not only to His Excellency but also to all South Australians and to my Party for entrusting in me great confidence. Also, I would like on this occasion to extend my sincere welcome to the honourable members who were recently elected to this Parliament for the first time. I wish them well.

Today, I will refer to my maiden speech and take this opportunity to develop in more practical detail some of the issues that I raised previously in this Chamber. My commitment to the people remains the prime motive for my presence in this Parliament. The change of Government provides me with the opportunity to influence its policies affecting all South Australians, especially migrants.

Honourable members will remember how in my maiden speech I addressed myself to the issues affecting the minority groups of Australia. In that speech, I stated that Australian society was composed of many cultural backgrounds. This is a fact in reality, and therefore needs no proof beyond acknowledgment of the statistical evidence. I also stated then that it is equally a fact that this multicultural compo-

sition of our society is not reflected in its social and, especially, political structures. Honourable members will also remember how I pointed out that even in this very Chamber there was only myself who could trace his immediate background to an ethnic group other than an Anglo-Saxon one.

I pointed out then that until such time as the political and social structures of our society were dominated by a single ethnic group in a society composed of many ethnic groups, the imbalance was a sign of maldistribution of power and a clear sign of inequality. Today I wish to take this issue further, and take the opportunity of a new Government in South Australia to make these points even more explicit. In doing so, I will make more direct reference to specific areas where I believe improvements are overdue, necessary and demanded.

The election of Labor to government is seen as a great hope for the future of ethnic minorities. Whichever way one compares the two Parties, one is bound to conclude to the superiority of the Labor policy to the Liberal policy. The three years of the past Administration have demonstrated an uncanny disregard for the most basic needs of migrants. I suspect that it will take a long time for the Liberal Party to live down the image that it has created with migrants. While migrant communities were prepared to give the benefit of the doubt to the Liberal Government, and even to co-operate with it, they were continuously and methodically frustrated. One is hard pressed to think of any area where the previous Liberal Government has won a favourable response from the ethnic communities. Indeed, the Liberal Government has shown itself to be either totally naive or totally unconcerned about the reaction of the migrant communities to its programmes, or lack of them.

No wonder that at the last election the swing to my Party was consistently strongest in areas of high migrant concentration. This reaction of the migrant communities, however, can itself be a warning to any Government, unfortunately even to the present Government of which I feel proud to be a member. Contrary to a myth which seems to have been spread a few years ago, migrants are neither donkey voters nor one-Party voters. Migrants today are becoming thinking voters, voters for the Party that serves their needs best. The support given by the migrant communities to the Labor Party in the 1982 election is a reflection of the difference in policy between the two Parties. Indeed, the Liberal Party's policy on migrants and ethnic matters was outstanding for vagueness and puerility. Coupled with the evidence of the past three years, in retrospect, the result could not have been otherwise. But, the point I wish to make abundantly clear is that no Government can depend on the loyalty of people it does not serve well. Promises made and expectations raised will be the criteria by which the present Government, my Government, will also be judged by the migrant communities.

I must confess to my Leader, and to my Parliamentary colleagues in this Chamber, that while my loyalty to the Party will remain of true allegiance, I am perhaps required to remind them of this fundamental and essential fact: that, my loyalty to the whole community and, in particular, to the needs of the migrant communities demands also that I shall continue in my efforts to obtain a better deal for them. The elements that were the cause of my criticism of the previous Government remain unresolved. The new Government has not yet had time to implement any changes, nor should anybody expect to see the situation changed overnight by the mere occurrence of an election. Our Party, I am sure, will slowly and progressively implement the policies with which it has come to power. There is, of course, no expectation of sudden or immediate change, but one does expect to see the first steps in the implementation of its promises. The process of implementation should be

progressive and carefully planned. In the light of the critical financial constraints of the current state of the economy, and especially because of the disastrous management by the Liberals, one would be less than realistic if one expected more.

However, the fact that it appears such a vast problem does not mean that there cannot be a start and that this start cannot represent the beginning of a well planned, progressive programme of improvements. So, what are the specifics to which I am alluding? It seems to me that the final purpose of any democracy, by whichever process it is achieved, is some kind of equality: equality of opportunity, equality of access, equality of participation, or a share in the power base of society, a share in the common goods of society, or a share in the process that changes society itself. My contention is that, currently, the imbalance in all these aspects varies greatly between various groups. Invariably, Aborigines and migrants occupy the lesser rungs of the statistics. The statement, of course, is not new—but would it not be a pity if familiarity with the fact bred unconcern?

For example, at a recent conference in Sydney, Leonore Mandersen presented a paper which she titled 'The Reserve Army of the Reserve Army'. We are speaking here, of course, of the army of workers—of the workforce. The phrase, in simple terms, means that in our society some workers are considered to be part of the 'ranks' of the workforce, while others are considered to be 'reservist'. This last group represent the 'expendable' workers, the workers who generally are employed and dismissed first, the workers who, in time of crisis, have their right to participate in the workforce questioned. An obvious example of this is the statement that mothers should not work when their husband works because the demands of motherhood requires that they give priority to that occupation.

A more vicious argument has been expressed recently in regard to migrants and refugees. In the current economic crisis, they become easy scapegoats for the ills that surround us. It is claimed that migrants cause unemployment among the resident Australians, that they take the jobs of the legitimate citizens of this country. I cannot resist asking a question—what has happened to the reverse argument that has caused Australia for so many decades to entice migrants to this country? Have we all forgotten how much this country owes to its overseas-born populations?

Australia is, in fact, a population of migrants from way back, and its migrants have never come from an exclusive source or country. It was these migrants who made this country what it is today. It has been the migrants of every country who have developed this continent, and let us not make mistakes about that. The research to which I referred previously indicates that migrants invariably occupy the lower levels of employment and the higher levels of unemployment, and, in time of concentration of the economy, the migrants are those who suffer most. We cannot and should not attribute this discrepancy to accident. As I pointed out previously in this Chamber and elsewhere so many times, the system is deficient. Our society is ill-equipped to right the overdue imbalance.

The structures that govern our society need changing. There are currently two basic types of inequality that cause the kind of difference to which I have referred. One is the inequality of opportunity and access to Government services and to the benefits that society, in principle, is supposed to make available to all. The other inequality is the uneven distribution of power in society. This second inequality is particularly disturbing. Ultimately, if democracy is to be seen to be practised, power must be made accessible to all sections of the community. It is no secret that this is unfortunately not so in Australia and in South Australia. Generally, ethnic minorities do not share in the power to influence

Governments from inside. More and more evidence comes to light to testify to this fact.

I wish to refer again to research which was conducted under the previous Administration and which has not yet been released. The former Minister of Ethnic Affairs will certainly remember my question of 15 September 1982 in relation to the Rimington Report. The research, we have been told, has analysed the presence of ethnic persons within the Public Service. I hope that the present Government will endeavour to release that report soon and will act on its findings as soon as possible.

From the outset, I do not believe that significant and valid changes will take place until the persons affected are represented on those bodies that are entrusted with the responsibility of making decisions. Without pre-empting the findings of the Rimington Report, one would be surprised if it did not discover that there is an imbalance in the composition of the Public Service. This imbalance is present also in committees nominated by the Government. It is generally the exception, rather than the rule, to find migrants included on advisory committees, members of commissions, and bodies of inquiry. Unfortunately, the absence of an authoritative voice to represent migrant issues is only too obvious in the reports presented by these various bodies.

I personally believe that there is no Government in Australia today that can legitimately establish any body of inquiry without charging it with the responsibility to consider the multi-ethnic composition of our population and without ensuring that the body itself is composed of persons of ethnic origin. Therefore, I strongly urge my Government, and particularly my Leader in this Chamber, to make this standing consideration in any of its future deliberations. I can promise that the composition of the personnel of Government bodies will come under scrutiny by me in the future in this Chamber.

I would like now to identify some Government responsibilities which can be subjected to greater scrutiny so that they can become better suited to the type of society that we now have. I will begin with what can be construed to be the basic network of any society, namely, its body of laws. The Labor Party, my Party, under its ethnic affairs policy, has promised that it will undertake an analysis of the existing legislation. I hope that the Government will extend its analysis in order to look for positive actions that can be taken in order to advance the cause of those minorities which in the past have suffered unnecessary discrimination and which, as a consequence, have lagged behind in taking their rightful place in our society.

I cite here, for example, a mandatory law for courts to use interpreters in cases where language is a difficulty. No civilised society can claim to be democratic if it claims to administer justice without the active participation of the accused at all stages of the procedure. It is a natural right to understand and to be able to respond in court when under accusation. And yet nowhere in Australia is this right yet recognised in law. Therefore, I hope that the new Government in this State will implement this policy as soon as possible.

Another area of concern to me is education. It is true that this State has not only led the rest of Australia in the field of multicultural education but has also done extremely valuable and advanced work. The experience gained especially in the past decade should now be evaluated in terms of future developments. Languages have now been fairly entrenched in the South Australian system of education. Language is the single most important element of any culture. The efforts of the Education Department to introduce and maintain languages at all levels of schooling should attract nothing but praise. There cannot be a true commitment to multiculturalism and to the preservation of our many cul-

tures without a commitment to maintain their languages.

However, probably because language is such an obvious element of culture, it has perhaps obscured other equally important aspects of culture. I refer here to the mentality that underlies our educational systems. The principles and the goals of our schools are certainly logical and enlightened, but mostly they represent the point of arrival of mainly one culture—the Anglo-Saxon culture. Multicultural education, laudable as it might be, is still attached to the overall system of education as an appendix. The time has come to review the assumptions underlying education in South Australia in the context of the diverse cultural background of its pupils.

The composition of our society and our schools is multicultural and it follows, logically, that the nature of our educational system should also be the same. Similar comments can be made concerning welfare. This Council will by now be familiar with my concern on this topic.

I have already praised the former Minister for introducing a provision in the new Act on welfare to the effect that the Minister is required to take into account the cultural attitudes of the client in the delivery of services. Unfortunately, the statement found expression only in the objectives of the Act and was not reflected in the programmes of the Act. I repeat that there is an urgent need to do so. The Labor Party platform envisages that this be done, and I express my hope that the new Government will act without unnecessary delay.

Similarly to education, in the field of welfare there are issues which are not easy and which are fundamental. Again, probably the most glaring ones are those that confront traditional values attached to the family. Intervention by the department, as I said before, which does not allow for the difference in cultural values, is bound to meet with suspicion and resistance. Most migrants have fresh in their minds the strong and unchallengeable attachment that one must have to the family and the clear definition of one's responsibilities within the family structure.

In most non-Anglo-Saxon countries the law sanctions such attitudes. To quote an example familiar to me, in Italy there is a series of laws defining the legitimate authority of parents over their children. It defines the duties and rights of parents, as well as the duties and rights of children. Minors, for instance, should reside in the abode of choice of parents. Once again, I do not wish to extol one system above the other. I simply wish to state that attitudes and laws differ around the world, and that many migrants not only come from those cultures but also live by those principles and, as a consequence, still believe that they are the only principles suitable for their children. Unfortunately, however, they are caught within a different system: the law in Australia does not allow for an alternative approach.

Again, I do not believe that it is a question of either black or white, or of one system or another. The question of control and care of children is complex and delicate. However, I do not believe that our society has yet explored the issue in sufficient breadth. For instance, as I have said before, despite the fact that approximately 20 per cent of our society has a non-English speaking background, all studies conducted in preparation for legislation and management of services are always conducted in Anglo-Saxon countries. There seems to be an underlying assumption that if it is Anglo, it is automatically correct and universal.

Although I do not query the validity of the above-mentioned approach, I do query its presumed universal applicability. My view is that it is essential that other systems be studied seriously. After all, they represent the cultural heritage of a large proportion of South Australians. In a public debate conducted through the press some months ago many citizens of Anglo-Saxon background expressed the same concern. The allusion will not escape the previous

Minister for Community Welfare. I am sure that he is as equally concerned as I am about the issue of care and control of children and about the rightful role of parents.

I have previously paid a tribute to this concern on this matter. However, I do not believe that the Minister took sufficient steps to ensure that the matter was properly investigated. Care for children has been one of the most fundamental concerns of any society. So, I urge the new Government (the new Minister), in its own way of approaching this issue, to take into account the experience and testimony of the migrants themselves. After all, statistics show that most migrant communities with strong family structures have a far lower incidence of crime than any other ethnic group and, therefore, such evidence should not go unnoticed.

I strongly hope that in the planning, provision and delivery of welfare services the present Minister will begin with the fundamentals—the assumptions which constitute the attitudes that we presume to have towards ourselves—of society, authority, and so forth. Once this process has taken place, each service needs to be analysed in the light of the assumption. Services such as family counselling, adoption, fostering, services to young offenders, budget advice, women's shelters and any other services will assume a new dimension and a wider scope for applicability.

A fourth area of specific concern is in the area of health. For many years now any amount of research has proved that health services are inadequate or ill-suited to the needs of migrants, yet no serious undertaking has ensued. As usual, it takes some kind of startling report which sometimes highlights the most startling event to indicate that things are not too well.

I refer, for instance, to the report on health services for migrant women in South Australia, published this year by the office of the Women's Adviser. Some of the specific situations described in that report are shameful and unworthy of any advanced society such as ours. Yet, in spite of its discoveries, no action has commenced. Even the most simple and straightforward recommendation has not been implemented. (I am speaking of the recommendation to employ an adequate number of interpreters, especially in hospitals).

Unfortunately, there still exists among professionals the haughty belief that they are skilful enough to deal with migrants despite language difficulties. However, the consequence of this professional reluctance causes grave risk to the health of their patients. When, for instance, a wrong is done, it is ironic to note that in one particular case a doctor who performed an abortion on a woman without her knowledge said in self-defence that it was not his fault because he had taken the word of her husband. On the other hand, the doctor assumes the responsibility of deciding that he does not need a professional interpreter and, therefore, he refuses to accept the moral responsibility when things go wrong.

Health services will need reviewing and revamping. The commission and training institutions will have to take into account not just what is good for the professional but also the nature, attitudes and expectations of the patients.

I now wish to refer briefly to some of the most vulnerable groups of people in our society, the young, the women and the aged. First and foremost, today our young people are facing a world that has never been so inimical to them. Those of us who came to Australia 20 to 30 years ago will remember the pleasant surprise with which jobs and work was available to anyone wishing to work. Some of us had come from countries where unemployment was chronic and endemic, but because of the social structure people out of work were able to survive. Today the most unfortunate aspect of Australia's unemployment scene is the lack of experience in how to survive it. This is particularly true of

the young.

We have all wished to build in this country a great future, a world where our children did not have to face the uncertainty of the difficulties which we had to face. Instead, the reality is that the prospect of employment for them after leaving school is nothing more than an unachievable goal. So what kind of adult generation are we training if they grow up with this sense of insecurity, economic and psychological? Therefore, Mr President, the efforts by the new Government to initiate activities and programmes directly aimed at creating opportunities for the young are heartily supported by me.

On the subject of women, coming as I do from a culture which is often accused of having enslaved women, I cannot fail to say a few words. Let me first of all refute the myth that the Italian woman is a slave to the Italian man. Anyone who maintains this view has an ignorant understanding of the relationships in our culture.

Women in our society have an exalted state. Women represent and are the softer aspect of life. They are the unseen binding force of our family. They are the strength which supports every endeavour and the organism of the family. However, this does not deny the fact that the very definition of its role in terms of its functions has produced some problems. It is part of the nature of any culture, as a living organism, to be continually changing. So, I have been and am a supporter of services which provide crisis intervention for women who are abused. I have already said before, and say again, that I feel strongly enough about this subject to support the establishment of a migrant women's shelter. I do not belittle the efforts made by the existing shelter.

However, it is easy to see that a woman seeking refuge from an untenable situation in her own home can hardly be asked to relax in a situation which will appear totally unfamiliar. For this reason, therefore, I suggest that the place for shelter reflect as closely as possible the cultural background she recognises better.

Finally, I make some comments on the subject of the aged. This topic has finally come of importance because of its economic implications. I was interested to notice in the recent study conducted by the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission that the needs of the migrant aged are found to be real and critical. Migrants, as a whole, have a higher percentage of older people than the population at large, and provisions available for them are negligible. The problem of growing old in a foreign country is one of the most depressing fears that, unfortunately, many old migrants have.

It is not that they have not learnt to love Australia, or that they have no means of looking after themselves, but it is the fear that, when they are incapable of tending to their needs, they may be hidden away in some unknown unfamiliar environment. For some of these people who might have lived in this country for 30 to 40 years, the last years of their lives can be the most depressing ones. So it is with some consternation that I learn that, at the seminar which followed the publication of the report on the migrant aged referred to above, the South Australian Health Commission said that nothing would be done for them because of lack of funds. Mr President, legitimate as the reason may sound, I simply do not accept and, indeed, fail to see why for every other need the commission begins by assuming that the need has a right to be heard and considered, whilst, for the need of the migrant aged, the automatic response is that no funds are available. It appears to me that this approach lacks not only interest, but also imagination. Improvements of services can be obtained often by changes to existing approaches and services. The question of funds is secondary in importance and priority. Mr President, finally, I wish to

thank you and all honourable members for allowing me this opportunity. I support the motion.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I second the motion that was moved so ably by the Hon. Mr Feleppa, and I congratulate him on the research that he has done on his speech and on his manner of delivery. It is certainly a credit to him and to the Party on behalf of which he led this debate.

Along with the Governor, I wish to express my condolences to the families of the late Cyril Hutchens and the late Gordon Gilfillan. I did not know either gentleman very well at all. I met them from time to time within the Parliament and found them to be very pleasant people. I am sure that they represented very well the people who sent them to this Parliament. The Hon. Cyril Hutchens had a very, very good reputation within the A.L.P. of being a superb door-knocker and campaigner. I know that many of my colleagues here, and others in the Party, got their initial training as political campaigners from the Hon. Cyril Hutchens, and many of them benefited greatly from that training by being eventually elected to Parliament. So, certainly, the Hon. Cyril Hutchens served the A.L.P., as well as the Parliament, very well indeed.

I did not know the Hon. Gordon Gilfillan very well, but I found him to be a very nice person on the odd occasion on which I met him. I understand from discussion around the place that he at one time acted as Whip for both sides; at first glance that seems to be rather an extraordinary job to have and one which would be very difficult. Considering that there were 16 members on one side and only four on the other, perhaps whilst the late Gordon Gilfillan's job was unusual, in that respect it was not particularly arduous. However, I thought that the Council would be interested in that small detail of the Hon. Gordon Gilfillan's career. As I said, I wish to express my condolences to both families.

I also congratulate all the new members who have been elected to this place, although I express some regret at the absence of some members whose company I enjoyed over the years in this place. The Hon. Mr Laidlaw was elected at the same time as I was, in 1975. He was a very pleasant and humorous person, who took his Parliamentary duties very seriously, but that did not stop him on many occasions from interjecting or, during the course of a speech, relating something to us that lightened the atmosphere considerably, and he made the place from time to time much more pleasant to be in. Over the last three years I would have liked to see the Hon. Don Laidlaw as Minister of Labour. He would have made a good Minister of Labour and been a real asset to the State of South Australia. He was possibly a total contrast to the Minister of Labour whom we had. In this first speech I do not want to be at all nasty, but certainly the Minister of Labour whom we had did nothing but attempt to confront by legislation the workers of this State, and I am sure that that would not have occurred with the Hon. Mr Laidlaw.

That is not to say that the Hon. Mr Laidlaw would have given the workers of this State anything out of the ordinary because, as an employer, I knew of him for many years before I came into Parliament. Whilst he was always very nice and pleasant, about the only thing one would get out of the Hon. Mr Laidlaw as an employer was a cup of coffee, because he always said, 'No' to everything else, but he was much more pleasant than the Hon. Dean Brown. Again, in regard to the Hon. Mr Dawkins, I regret in many ways that he chose to retire. Indeed, he was the type of person whom I had certainly not often come into contact with previously. As a blue-collar industrial worker before entering Parliament my path did not to any degree cross the paths of wealthy squatters: there were not many around Whyalla or Manchester, England.

However, I came to appreciate the Hon. Mr Dawkins in certain ways. He was virtually the other side of the coin of the late Hon. Jim Dunford, who, I am sure members opposite will agree, was representative of a certain type of rural industry worker, and all honourable members in this Chamber came to respect him. He was a particular type of Australian who was certainly refreshing to meet. The Hon. Mr Dawkins really reflected the other side of that coin, and I would like to think that there is still a place within the State Parliament for Australians of the type of the late Hon. Jim Dunford and our retired colleague, the Hon. Mr Dawkins. I suspect that there is not, and that is to be regretted.

The Hon. Mr Carnie was another colleague who entered this Council with me in 1975 and I was disappointed (I am sure, not as disappointed as was the Hon. Mr Carnie) when he was not preselected again by his Party to stand at the recent election. The Hon. Mr Carnie was an extremely good legislator, but I suspect that if he had a failing it was that he did not seek out publicity sufficiently and, therefore, his name was not continually before members of his Party who made preselection decisions.

I suspect that he did not buy enough cups of tea or brandies for the delegates over the years: it was not his style and he paid the price, and to me that is a great pity. As I said, the Hon. Mr Carnie was an excellent legislator, and time will tell whether the people who have replaced him in this Chamber are as good at legislating as he was. The Hon. Mr Carnie will have a lasting monument in South Australia, and I do not know how many honourable members appreciate that. Perhaps the monument that he will have is one of the reasons why he was discarded. The Hon. Mr Carnie was one of two Liberal Movement members who entered this Council in 1975 and who insisted on democratic voting procedures throughout the State. The present Electoral Act as it relates to another place will be a monument to the Hon. Mr Carnie, and I hope that his abilities will not be wasted in the years to come in regard to the people of South Australia.

In my comments I cannot leave out the Hon. Mr Foster, who also entered this Council with me in 1975 but who is no longer with us as a member. I shared an office with him for seven of his 7½ years as a member of this Parliament. It is best that all I say about Mr Foster is that he was a very interesting guy indeed. Whenever Mr Foster was around, whether it was in this Chamber, the Party room or a social occasion, there was no doubt that one would never be bored. I hope that the Hon. Mr Foster has a long, calm and gentle retirement.

We have some new members, some new faces in the Council, and I think that all honourable members who have been here for 7½ years will welcome that. Whilst we regret the departure of other members, it is always a pleasure to look across the Chamber or along the benches and see new faces. To some extent these changes will stop us getting bored with each other.

The Hon. Mr Gilfillan is the first of the new members whom I want to mention. When I met him in the corridor shortly after his election, I said that I could not pretend that I was pleased to see him. Of course, the Hon. Mr Gilfillan is here at the expense of our Labor Party candidate and, with the greatest of respect to the Hon. Mr Gilfillan (I am sure that he understands), I would prefer to say 'Hello' to Terry Roberts than to Ian Gilfillan. However, that was not to be the situation. The system that elected Ian Gilfillan and all of us is less than democratic, and I will speak about that later in this debate.

Nevertheless, it was the system that was in force at that time. The Hon. Mr Gilfillan won that seat fairly and squarely, albeit by a very small majority, but I am sure that he will enjoy his six years in the Council along with the rest of us.

The Hon. Mr Gilfillan is the first of the new members whom I mention, and he is also a country member, just as I am. I can warn the honourable member that he will pay a price in attempting to represent the people of this State in this Parliament while living in a country area of South Australia. He will find that to be extremely difficult, just as I have found it difficult while living at Whyalla and, if there is anything I can do to make that a little easier for the honourable member, I shall certainly be pleased to do it.

With the experience of the Hon. Mr Milne over the last three years (and I say this kindly), one can say that now that there are two Democrats in this place the potential for chaos in the Council has increased by 100 per cent. I am sure that the Hon. Mr Gilfillan will add considerable interest to the activities of the Council.

The Hon. Mr Dunn is also a country member and a person who will pay dearly in attempting to represent the people of South Australia while living in the country. My understanding is that the Hon. Mr Dunn has a private plane and flies it himself, and perhaps he will thus avoid some of the hardship encountered by other country members who sit in this Council. However, he, too, will pay some penalty through a lack of any reasonable home life. Further, I have read in *Hansard* from the last Parliament certain information about the Hon. Mr Dunn. Apparently somewhere along the line he has crossed the Country Party on Eyre Peninsula, and all I can say is that anyone who is at odds with the

Country Party has a lot of potential, and I welcome him to the Chamber.

The Hon. Mr Lucas is also a new member, and I welcome him as well. I know very little about the Hon. Mr Lucas, except that he makes a good scrutineer, and I will leave it at that. The Hon. Mr Lucas is, I suppose, more of a Party apparatchik, as he comes from the Liberal Party office. It has been my experience that Party apparatchiks are usually rather dull and humourless people and I look forward to the Hon. Mr Lucas proving to be one of the exceptions to that rule.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Is Mr Gregory one?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Lucas was a political apparatchik and Mr Gregory a trade union apparatchik. I did not deliberately exclude any Party. The Hon. Miss Laidlaw is already well known to all members of the Council because of her role as a Ministerial assistant. She was always efficient and pleasant and I am sure will be a real asset to her Party and to this Council. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.42 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 14 December at 2.15 p.m.